
From: PUC

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 10:19 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: BHP RATE CASE, EL14-026

Ms. Farrington:

Thank you for your comment. It will be added to the Black Hills Power rate case docket, <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2014/EL14-026.aspx>, along with this response. Because commissioners have a decision-making role in docket matters, any discussion with a commissioner about an open docket must take place in an open, public forum. By placing your comments in the docket file, other commissioners and interested parties will have access to your comments for consideration.

Here is a document which explains the processing of electric utility rate case requests which may be helpful to you. It references the South Dakota Codified Laws governing utilities and the commission regarding electric rate requests: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/electricratecasehandout.pdf>

Chris Nelson, Chairman
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

003747

From: South Dakota Public Utilities Commission[SMTP:PUCDOCKETFILINGS@STATE.SD.US]
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 9:15:20 AM
To: PUC Docket Filings
Subject: General Information
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Last Name: Godlewski
First Name: Aaron
Company: personal



Fax:

Email:



Comments: The rates for Black Hills Power need to be cut, and their meters need to be evaluated and records checked. Despite numerous changes, such as compact fluorescent bulbs, new refrigerator, non use of baseboard heating, etc., as well as a milder winter, the usage shows close to the historical for each month, and the bills are ridiculous. We are now over \$300 for one month. BHP states they will check their meter at my house for \$10. That is a scam. Further, these digital meters are easily manipulated. You can find much information, including how to do it, on the internet. While I expect the PUC to do nothing, I am voicing this complaint. PUC approved this overcharging in the first place.

From: PUC

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 9:47 AM

Subject: BHP RATE CASE, EL14-026

Mr. Godlewski:

Thank you for your comment. It will be added to the Black Hills Power rate case docket, <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2014/EL14-026.aspx>, along with this response. Because commissioners have a decision-making role in docket matters, any discussion with a commissioner about an open docket must take place in an open, public forum. By placing your comments in the docket file, other commissioners and interested parties will have access to your comments for consideration.

Here is a document which explains the processing of electric utility rate case requests which may be helpful to you. It references the South Dakota Codified Laws governing utilities and the commission regarding electric rate requests: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/electricratecasehandout.pdf>

Chris Nelson, Chairman
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

003749

1-21-15

Public Utilities Commission
500 East Capital Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501

I am concerned about the recent electrical rate increase granted to Black Hills Power (BHP).

My energy charge was \$0.0667/KWh before the increase. It is now \$0.07877/KWh. This is an outrageous increase of 18%. I have had the math verified by a professional engineer. This increase is 4 times the average rate increase of 4.4% granted to BHP by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC).

Why did the PUC allow BHP to increase some residential rates by 18%? If some rates are increased by 18%, what portion of BHP customers had no increase or a small increase?

It appears the residential customers are bearing a large portion of the rate increase which is wrong.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Darwin Hoefl
Darwin Hoefl

[REDACTED]

RECEIVED

JAN 26 2015

SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION



Chris Nelson, Chairperson
Kristie Fiegen, Vice Chairperson
Gary Hanson, Commissioner

South Dakota

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

500 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5070
www.puc.sd.gov

Capitol Office
(605) 773-3201

Grain Warehouse
(605) 773-5280

Consumer Hotline
1-800-332-1782

Email
puc@state.sd.us

January 27, 2015

Darwin Hoeft
[REDACTED]

Dear Mr. Hoeft:

This is in response to your letter regarding the Black Hills Power rate case increase request application currently being reviewed by the commission.

The BHP rates which went into effect Oct. 1, 2014 are interim rates. As noted in BHP's application, the utility requested an average increase of 9.25 percent. The increased rate request varies somewhat between customer classes, however, the percentage change between classes is not vastly different.

One item that can be confusing for consumers in their bills is the Cost Adjustment Summary. This is the billing question most frequently asked. These charges consist of: 1) Environmental Improvement Adjustment (EIA), 2) Energy Efficiency Solutions Adjustment (EESA), 3) Transmission Cost Adjustment (TCA), 4) Fuel and Purchased Power Adjustment (FPPA), and 5) Transmission Facility Adjustment (TFA). All these charges are per kWh charges and require commission approval. An explanation of these charges with current rates can be found under Section 3C, pages 12 through 22 of BHP's tariff at the following link:

<http://puc.sd.gov/Tariffs/electrictariff.aspx>

Items such as plant construction and maintenance are included in base rates, which are composed of the Customer Charge and Energy Charge. BHP can only change these rates through a rate case request application.

By law, public utilities are allowed to implement their proposed increased rates once the required 180-day suspension ends. If the commission ultimately approves rates lower than the interim rates, BHP will refund its customers the difference in rates plus interest for the interim period.

If you are interested in learning about other possible energy-saving tools, I encourage you to check out such resources from BHP at www.BHPsavemoney.com or by contacting BHP's Melanie Toney at (605) 721-1709. You may be a candidate for the utility's onsite assessment and whole home energy audit, seeking cost effective energy savings for your home.

When a utility files a rate case, the commission is obligated by law to thoroughly process the case. This process can take almost a year to complete. Each commissioner, the commission's staff and expert consultants hired by staff will review the entire case – referred to as a docket – separately, along with any intervenors in the case. We request and review additional data and information from the utility before a decision is rendered.

003751

The cost of electricity is on the rise not only for you and me, but for other investor-owned, rural cooperative and municipal electric systems' customers throughout South Dakota and the U.S. as we are learning in news reports daily. South Dakota has six investor-owned electric utilities, and of these, four currently have open rate case request dockets before the commission. The most-cited reason for these increased rates is new federal mandates, particularly those from the Environmental Protection Agency. American Electric Power reports that 65,000 MW of electric capacity are being retired largely because of EPA regulations. That is nearly 30 times the amount of electricity the state of South Dakota uses at peak demand. EPA mandates were one of the four reasons cited by BHP in filing this rate increase request. You can read BHP official Vance Crocker's testimony about this in the docket, EL14-026, at <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/dockets/electric/2014/EL14-026/crocker.pdf>

I appreciate your distaste for increased energy costs. None of us wishes to see our rates increase including my fellow commissioners and me. However, the law requires the commission to allow utility rates that are proven reasonable and justifiable. As a commissioner, I can assure you that I am not interested in inequitable percentage increases across customer classes, and I am certain my fellow commissioners would agree.

Enclosed is a document which helps explain the commission's process in handling rate cases such as this.

Thank you for contacting the commission with your concerns. All discussion involving commissioners on the case must be available to the public. Therefore, your comments and my response will be filed in the docket.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Chris Nelson".

Chris Nelson

Electric Rate Increase Requests

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

This guide is intended to offer a simple overview of the Public Utilities Commission's process in considering a rate increase request from an electric service provider within its jurisdiction. This guide is informational and does not discuss all situations, variations and exceptions of the rate case process and proceedings of the PUC. See South Dakota Codified Law 49-34A for additional information, on the Internet at legis.sd.gov/statutes/Codified_Laws/QuickFind.aspx; enter 49-34A to view the chapter.

Electric Utilities in South Dakota

There are six investor-owned utility companies that provide electric service to specific geographic areas in South Dakota. These companies are owned by their investors and are managed as private enterprises. The PUC has regulatory authority, including ratemaking authority, over these investor-owned utilities: Black Hills Power, MidAmerican Energy Co., Montana-Dakota Utilities Co., NorthWestern Energy, Otter Tail Power Co. and Xcel Energy.

The PUC does not have ratemaking authority over electric cooperatives or municipal electric organizations. Each electric co-op is governed by a board of directors, elected by its membership. Municipal electric organizations are managed by the local government entity. The leadership of each of these groups is responsible for setting rates paid by its electric customers.

Rate Case Process

When an investor-owned electric utility wishes to modify its rates, it must seek permission from the PUC to do so. The company begins the process by filing an application with the PUC that states the proposed rate of increase for each of its customer classes – residential, commercial and industrial, for example – and the rationale for the requested increase. The PUC has six months to investigate and make a decision about a rate request before the utility may put interim rates into effect, subject to refund depending on the PUC's decision.

PUC Authority

The South Dakota Legislature gave the PUC authority to ensure utility companies in South Dakota provide safe and reliable service at fair and reasonable rates. In considering a rate case, the commission weighs the public's need for adequate, efficient and reasonable service and the need for the utility to collect revenues to enable it to meet its total current cost of furnishing such service and the opportunity to earn a fair and reasonable

return. The commission determines these factors based on definitions, standards and references specified in South Dakota Codified Law. In rendering its decision, the commission may approve, deny or approve with modifications the proposed rate increase as the commission finds appropriate and legally within its jurisdiction. The decision of the commission can be appealed to the circuit court and, ultimately, to the South Dakota Supreme Court.

The commission strives to issue a reasoned decision and modifications, where appropriate, that uphold the law and discourage a potentially expensive and lengthy appeal process.

PUC Staff Role

Members of the PUC staff assigned to work on a rate case typically include one attorney and several analysts. Staff attorneys have educational and practical experience in administrative law, business management principles and trial procedure. Staff analysts have expertise in accounting, economics, research and engineering. The staff conducts a comprehensive analysis of the company's request and gathers additional information from the company, intervenors and outside experts as necessary. Company operating expenses, employee benefits, executive compensation, corporate advertising, and the cost of generation and transmission facilities are among the many facets of the rate case the staff examines. In addition to reviewing the data and evidence submitted by the applicant and intervenors, PUC staff request and analyze opinions from experts and question the parties. The staff considers the information relative to state laws and rules and presents recommendations to the Public Utilities Commissioners.

See page 2 for information about public involvement.

Public Involvement

South Dakotans with an interest in a rate case have a variety of ways to stay informed and involved.

- **Review the electronic docket.** A docket is the continually updated collection of documents filed with the commission for a particular case. Dockets are accessible under the Commission Actions tab on the PUC Web site, www.puc.sd.gov. Dockets are labeled to correspond with their type and filing date. For example, Black Hills Power's rate case docket is EL14-026; EL for electric, 14 for 2014 and 026 to indicate it was the 26th electric docket filed with the commission in 2014. Xcel Energy's rate case docket is EL14-058. MidAmerican Energy's is EL14-072. NorthWestern Energy's is EL14-106.
- **Submit comments.** Members of the public are encouraged to relay written comments or questions about a rate case to the PUC. These informal public comments are filed in the docket and reviewed and considered by the PUC commissioners and staff. Public comments must include the commenter's full name and address and should include the docket number or name of the company proposing the rate increase as well as the commenter's e-mail address and phone number, if available. These comments should be sent to puc@state.sd.us or PUC, 500 E. Capitol Ave., Pierre, SD 57501.
- **Become an intervenor.** Individuals who wish to be formal parties in a rate case may apply to the commission for intervenor status. Intervention deadline is clearly indicated within the docket. Intervention is appropriate for people who intend to actively participate in the case through legal motions, discovery (requests for facts or documents), the written preparation and presentation of actual evidence, and in-person participation in a formal hearing. Intervenors are legally obligated to respond to discovery from other parties and to submit to cross-examination at a formal hearing. Individuals seeking only to follow the progress of a rate case or to offer comments for the PUC's consideration need not become intervenors.

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

500 E. Capitol Ave.

Pierre, SD 57501

Toll-free Phone: 1-800-332-1782

Local Phone: (605) 773-3201

www.puc.sd.gov

E-mail: puc@state.sd.us

Thursday
January 23, 2015

RECEIVED

JAN 26 2015

SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

To: Public Utilities Commission;

I am writing today to dispute the cost adjustment charge that shows up on my bill monthly beside the energy charges that I pay monthly for the energy used at our home

Black Hills Power is meant to provide a service to their customers, not to steal so it's almost impossible for them to receive this service. This month \$53.96 last month \$81.14 plus tax - Merry Christmas (boy wouldn't that have been a nice Christmas present to customers of B.H.P. to not have a cost adjustment charge on their December bill). Nov. 2014 - \$27.91. I don't have other statements for the other months of 2014, but I've ~~almost~~ paid ~~close to~~ 163.01 plus tax for three months of cost adjustments. When will this end? Enough is enough I'm sick of my financial gain being taken to ~~provide~~ provide owner or owners of B.H.P. (plus high up employees) with large paychecks at the expense of the loss

003755

of my earnings and my neighbors thru out this state
you know we thought we also had a environ-
mentally sound strategy, we bought a new furnace
this last April which was more energy effecent
than the original one put in our home from
previous owners (we had no furnace last winter
thats why usage was low) but than with the
cost adjustments and interm rate we may not
have heat again if its up to you. We the South
Dakota customers are providing your jobs start
standing up for us! Also B.H.P. should be
paying us or at least not charging a \$ 10.00 @
month - \$ 120.00 a year charge since we are a
customer. Since weve lived here 16 yrs they
hare penalized us \$ 1920.00 for being there customer.
Some thing is way wrong with this picture.

Sincerely, Mike and
Debra Parmley,



Chris Nelson, Chairperson
Kristie Fiegen, Vice Chairperson
Gary Hanson, Commissioner

South Dakota

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

500 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5070
www.puc.sd.gov

Capitol Office
(605) 773-3201

Grain Warehouse
(605) 773-5280

Consumer Hotline
1-800-332-1782

Email
puc@state.sd.us

January 27, 2015

Mike and Debra Parmley
[REDACTED]

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Parmley:

This is in response to your letter in today's mail regarding the Black Hills Power rate case increase request application currently being reviewed by the commission.

It is important to remember that the BHP rates which went into effect on October 1, 2014 are interim rates. By law, public utilities are allowed to implement their proposed increased rates once the required 180-day suspension ends. If the commission ultimately approves rates lower than the interim rates, BHP will refund its customers the difference in rates plus interest for the interim period.

You relayed your last few months' BHP's bill totals. Since energy usage typically changes month-to-month, we cannot accurately compare one month's bill against the next and arrive at an increase amount or percentage without factoring in the energy usage component.

You pointed out the Cost Adjustment Charge. The Cost Adjustment Summary charges consist of: 1) Environmental Improvement Adjustment (EIA), 2) Energy Efficiency Solutions Adjustment (EESA), 3) Transmission Cost Adjustment (TCA), 4) Fuel and Purchased Power Adjustment (FPPA), and 5) Transmission Facility Adjustment (TFA). All these charges are per kWh charges and require commission approval. An explanation of these charges with current rates can be found under Section 3C, pages 12 through 22 of BHP's tariff at the following link: <http://puc.sd.gov/Tariffs/electrictariff.aspx>

You mentioned the purchase of a new furnace last spring which is more energy efficient than the original furnace and that should reduce your winter heating energy needs. If you are interested in learning about other possible energy-saving tools, I encourage you to contact BHP's Melanie Toney at (605) 721-1709. You may be a candidate for the utility's onsite assessment and whole home energy audit, seeking the most cost effective energy savings for your home.

When a utility files a rate case with the commission, the commission is obligated by law to thoroughly process the case. We cannot simply say no and reject it since we are required to investigate it and make a just and reasonable decision. This process can take almost a year to complete. Each commissioner, the commission's staff and expert consultants hired by staff will review the entire case – referred to as a docket – separately, along with any intervenors in the case. We request and review additional data and information from the utility before a decision is rendered.

003757

You mention your frustration with the financial gain by the owners of BHP. BHP is one entity owned by Black Hills Corporation's shareholders, along with several other entities. Since BHP is a public utility, federal and state laws govern how it must operate and how the commission must regulate it. However, the commission does not regulate BHC. The laws include what is commonly known as "ring-fencing" and this prevents an investor-owned utility of being stripped of its profits by shareholders. The purpose is to retain sufficient funds to operate the utility and reinvest in the system in order to provide safe, reliable service to the utility's customers.

The cost of electricity is on the rise not only for you and me, but for other investor-owned, rural cooperative and municipal electric systems' customers throughout South Dakota and the U.S. as we are learning in news reports daily. South Dakota has six investor-owned electric utilities, and of these, four currently have open rate case request dockets before the commission. The most-cited reason for these increased rates is new federal mandates, particularly those from the Environmental Protection Agency. American Electric Power reports that 65,000 MW of electric capacity are being retired largely because of EPA regulations. That is nearly 30 times the amount of electricity the state of South Dakota uses at peak demand. EPA mandates were one of the four reasons cited by BHP in filing this rate increase request. You can read BHP official Vance Crocker's testimony about this in the docket, EL14-026, at <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/dockets/electric/2014/EL14-026/crocker.pdf>

I appreciate your distaste for increased energy costs. None of us wishes to see our rates increase including my fellow commissioners and me. However, the law requires the commission to allow utility rates that are proven reasonable and justifiable.

Thank you for contacting the commission with your concerns. All discussion involving commissioners on the case must be available to the public. Therefore, your comments and my response will be filed in the docket.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Chris Nelson".

Chris Nelson

From: kelly cape[S [REDACTED]]
Sent: Sunday, January 25, 2015 3:36:00 PM
To: PUC
Subject: Black Hills Power
Auto forwarded by a Rule

I am concerned on the proposed rate increase that BHP is discussing.
I am an existing BHP customer on what they call their Demand Service-customers that use a demand controller. My rate increases that took place in mid-Oct of 2014 are as follows:

Customer Charge was \$12.25, now is \$14.00, a 14.3% increase Demand Charge was \$7.61074 now is \$9.75, a 28.1% increase Energy Charge was .01878 now is .0232, a 23.5% increase

For the recent bill the above 3 accounted for 66.6% of the total electrical cost, excluding taxes. This reflected a 25% increase on the bill for the above 3 compared to the previous rates. When the cost adjustment summary charge is added in (balance of charge for electricity), then the electrical increase is 16.6% overall. It appears they have already raised their rates considerably. I am sure you have received other information on this issue.

Thank you,

Kelly Cape, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

003759

From: PUC
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 11:18 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: BHP Rate Case, EL14-026

Kelly:

Thank you for your comment. It will be added to the Black Hills Power rate case docket, <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2014/EL14-026.aspx>, along with this response. Because commissioners have a decision-making role in docket matters, any discussion with a commissioner about an open docket must take place in an open, public forum. By placing your comments in the docket file, other commissioners and interested parties will have access to your comments for consideration.

Here is a document which explains the processing of electric utility rate case requests which may be helpful to you. It references the South Dakota Codified Laws governing utilities and the commission regarding electric rate requests: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/electricratecasehandout.pdf>

Chris Nelson, Chairman
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

003760

From: Jolene Ryan[S [REDACTED]]
Sent: Saturday, January 24, 2015 3:53:11 PM
To: PUC
Subject: Rate increase
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Due to the fact that BHP has received 6 increases since 2008, we strongly feel that the PUC needs to start standing up for the people of SD, & not let BHP stock holders be so greedy, storm Altas should not have been a permanent raise increase on our bill. The PUC is also suppose the represent the people, not just BHP. The power in Wyoming (which is also BHP) is a lot cheaper then SD, that's because the PUC regulates them & doesn't give them every increase they want. SD is the 2nd highest state for electricity, but we are NOT the 2nd highest state for income, are they planning on everybody getting government help to pay for their electric bill, because that is what its coming to. I guess we all need to start looking into solar panels & wind turbans & get off the grid. Thank You the Ryans

003761

From: PUC

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 11:16 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: BHP RATE CASE, EL14-026

Ms. Ryan:

Thank you for your comment. It will be added to the Black Hills Power rate case docket, <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2014/EL14-026.aspx>, along with this response. Because commissioners have a decision-making role in docket matters, any discussion with a commissioner about an open docket must take place in an open, public forum. By placing your comments in the docket file, other commissioners and interested parties will have access to your comments for consideration.

Here is a document which explains the processing of electric utility rate case requests which may be helpful to you. It references the South Dakota Codified Laws governing utilities and the commission regarding electric rate requests: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/electricratecasehandout.pdf>

Chris Nelson, Chairman
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

003762

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Saturday, January 24, 2015 3:35:51 PM

To: PUC

Subject: Black Hills Power

Auto forwarded by a Rule

As retired, fixed income consumers, enough is enough. We cannot afford to have another increase in our electric bill. Please vote this down. Give us a break. This would be the 7th increase for them in 6 years. Social security does not go up to cover these increases.

Doug and Bobi Legner

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

003763

From: PUC

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 11:21 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: BHP RATE CASE, EL14-026

Mr. and Mrs. Legner:

Thank you for your comment. It will be added to the Black Hills Power rate case docket, <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2014/EL14-026.aspx>, along with this response. Because commissioners have a decision-making role in docket matters, any discussion with a commissioner about an open docket must take place in an open, public forum. By placing your comments in the docket file, other commissioners and interested parties will have access to your comments for consideration.

Here is a document which explains the processing of electric utility rate case requests which may be helpful to you. It references the South Dakota Codified Laws governing utilities and the commission regarding electric rate requests: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/electricratecasehandout.pdf>

Chris Nelson, Chairman
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

003764

-----Original Message-----

From: Rick Grosek [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 12:13 PM

To: Fiegen, Kristie

Subject: Reject the Black Hills Power rate request

Commissioner

Chair Hanson and Commissioners Nelson and Fiegen:

I strongly oppose the rate increase by Black Hills Power, and I urge you to deny their request. It is not in the public interest and it is not good for South Dakota. Black Hills Power tried to use this rate increase to make it harder for us to invest in our own electricity generation; it seems they are not making choices in the best interest of South Dakotans.

Black Hills Power should be investing in local energy and creating a more stable future for South Dakota's citizens and rate payers. The company knew coal was going to get more expensive, and now they're risking our future by investing in natural gas, another fossil fuel subject to price increases and further regulation.

Please deny Black Hills Power's rate increase request.

Rick Grosek
[REDACTED]

003765

-----Original Message-----

From: Rick Grosek

To: Gary Hanson

ReplyTo: [REDACTED]

Subject: Reject the Black Hills Power rate request

Sent: Jan 26, 2015 12:13 PM

Chair

Chair Hanson and Commissioners Nelson and Fiegen:

I strongly oppose the rate increase by Black Hills Power, and I urge you to deny their request. It is not in the public interest and it is not good for South Dakota. Black Hills Power tried to use this rate increase to make it harder for us to invest in our own electricity generation; it seems they are not making choices in the best interest of South Dakotans.

Black Hills Power should be investing in local energy and creating a more stable future for South Dakota's citizens and rate payers. The company knew coal was going to get more expensive, and now they're risking our future by investing in natural gas, another fossil fuel subject to price increases and further regulation.

Please deny Black Hills Power's rate increase request.

Rick Grosek
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Rick Grosek [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 12:13 PM

To: Nelson, Chris

Subject: Reject the Black Hills Power rate request

Commissioner

Chair Hanson and Commissioners Nelson and Fiegen:

I strongly oppose the rate increase by Black Hills Power, and I urge you to deny their request. It is not in the public interest and it is not good for South Dakota. Black Hills Power tried to use this rate increase to make it harder for us to invest in our own electricity generation; it seems they are not making choices in the best interest of South Dakotans.

Black Hills Power should be investing in local energy and creating a more stable future for South Dakota's citizens and rate payers. The company knew coal was going to get more expensive, and now they're risking our future by investing in natural gas, another fossil fuel subject to price increases and further regulation.

Please deny Black Hills Power's rate increase request.

Rick Grosek
[REDACTED]

003767

From: PUC

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 6:34 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: BHP Rate Case, EL14-026

Mr. Grosek:

Thank you for your comment. It will be added to the Black Hills Power rate case docket, <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2014/EL14-026.aspx>, along with this response. Because commissioners have a decision-making role in docket matters, any discussion with a commissioner about an open docket must take place in an open, public forum. By placing your comments in the docket file, other commissioners and interested parties will have access to your comments for consideration.

Here is a document which explains the processing of electric utility rate case requests which may be helpful to you. It references the South Dakota Codified Laws governing utilities and the commission regarding electric rate requests: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/electricratecasehandout.pdf>

Chris Nelson, Chairman
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

003768

From: den son [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 11:46:22 AM
To: PUC
Subject: Comments on BH POWER rate increase
Auto forwarded by a Rule

As/per the quoted paragraph from the SD PUC website; SD PUC information, i am sending my comments on the proposed BH Power rate increase to state my opposition to:

1) any further BH Power rate increase.

2) BH Power refusal to allow Net Metering for small residential customers who need to reduce their monthly electric bill and do believe in community distribution of locally produced energy.

•"Submit comments. Members of the public are encouraged to relay written comments or questions about a rate case to the PUC. These informal public comments are filed in the docket and reviewed and considered by the PUC commissioners and staff. Public comments should include the docket number or name of the company proposing the rate increase, commenter's full name and mailing address as well as e-mail address and phone number, if available. These comments should be sent to puc@state.sd.us or PUC, 500 E. Capitol Ave., Pierre, SD 57501. "

BH Power presently charges residential customers about \$.03/KWH "cost adjustment summary" plus the "advertised" charge of \$.079>.107/KWH for electric usage. The total of \$0.1089 to \$13.71 is CONSIDERABLE higher than next door neighbor Wyoming BH Power rates at \$0.0830 to \$.0805. Any further rate increase will be a economic hardship for thousands of middle class working families and fixed income retired folks.

\$ Figures from <http://www.blackhillspower.com/rates>

BH Power contends that the small cost to implement Net Metering and sustain local energy production thru wind and solar residential systems would not be economically feasible yet they spend MILLIONS of their patrons dollars to build a distant natural gas power plant PLUS a new land acquisition and power line construction project. What is wrong with this picture? South Dakota is one of only 4 states that oppose net metering, no surprise with the attitude of MANY SD state and federal legislators who push continued use of coal for energy use, legislate against scientific facts, and deny any need for correction or concern about our changing environment and climate.

Thank you in advance for considering and logging my comments.

denny henrikson



From: den son [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 11:46:22 AM
To: PUC
Subject: Comments on BH POWER rate increase
Auto forwarded by a Rule

As/per the quoted paragraph from the SD PUC website; SD PUC information, i am sending my comments on the proposed BH Power rate increase to state my opposition to:

1) any further BH Power rate increase.

2) BH Power refusal to allow Net Metering for small residential customers who need to reduce their monthly electric bill and do believe in community distribution of locally produced energy.

•"Submit comments. Members of the public are encouraged to relay written comments or questions about a rate case to the PUC. These informal public comments are filed in the docket and reviewed and considered by the PUC commissioners and staff. Public comments should include the docket number or name of the company proposing the rate increase, commenter's full name and mailing address as well as e-mail address and phone number, if available. These comments should be sent to puc@state.sd.us or PUC, 500 E. Capitol Ave., Pierre, SD 57501. "

BH Power presently charges residential customers about \$.03/KWH "cost adjustment summary" plus the "advertised" charge of \$.079>.107/KWH for electric usage. The total of \$0.1089 to \$13.71 is CONSIDERABLE higher than next door neighbor Wyoming BH Power rates at \$0.0830 to \$.0805. Any further rate increase will be a economic hardship for thousands of middle class working families and fixed income retired folks.

\$ Figures from <http://www.blackhillspower.com/rates>

BH Power contends that the small cost to implement Net Metering and sustain local energy production thru wind and solar residential systems would not be economically feasible yet they spend MILLIONS of their patrons dollars to build a distant natural gas power plant PLUS a new land acquisition and power line construction project. What is wrong with this picture? South Dakota is one of only 4 states that oppose net metering, no surprise with the attitude of MANY SD state and federal legislators who push continued use of coal for energy use, legislate against scientific facts, and deny any need for correction or concern about our changing environment and climate.

Thank you in advance for considering and logging my comments.

denny henrikson



From: PUC

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 1:29 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: BHP RATE CASE, EL14-026

Mr. Henrikson:

Thank you for your comment. It will be added to the Black Hills Power rate case docket, <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2014/EL14-026.aspx>, along with this response. Because commissioners have a decision-making role in docket matters, any discussion with a commissioner about an open docket must take place in an open, public forum. By placing your comments in the docket file, other commissioners and interested parties will have access to your comments for consideration.

Here is a document which explains the processing of electric utility rate case requests which may be helpful to you. It references the South Dakota Codified Laws governing utilities and the commission regarding electric rate requests: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/electricratecasehandout.pdf>

Chris Nelson, Chairman
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

www.puc.sd.gov

003773

From: Elizabeth Campbell [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 4:58:31 PM
To: PUC
Subject: Fwd: BHP request for rate raise
Auto forwarded by a Rule

I do want my comments considered - just heard about this today - will keep trying until I get this in. Elizabeth Campbell (a SD citizen)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Elizabeth Campbell [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, Jan 26, 2015 at 4:46 PM
Subject: BHP request for rate raise
To: puc@state.sd.usa

To the Utilities Commission:

I am very, very, unhappy about this request for Black Hills power to raise rates again. More salary for bonuses for BHP executives and board members and investors? - while energy rates should be going down!

I am also very unhappy about the Commission letting utilities like internet expand with companies like WOW (whoever they are now) - while raising rates and then dropping the TV Guide directory - making us pay another fee just to find out what program schedules are - and the internet is so feeble that if someone else in my part of town decides to watch a movie on their computer I often have to wait 25 seconds just to get to delete a letter or two - or 2 minutes just to get in or out of a program. I have given up calling your office to complain - the person I talked to sounded like he was marketing for WOW, telling me how expensive it is for them to provide service and what wonderful people they are!

Please get this to the Commissioners and tell them to exhibit a little back-bone with BHP - 6 raises in 9 years? Please! And now they want to raise our bills again between 10-13%? Maybe your salaries go up that much every year, but I can tell you that my retirement does not!

There is very little "public" left in the Public Utilities Commission - for all I know, you all probably have stock in the company! Is that the answer? Buy stock in the company?

Please take note that those of us out here depend on you to do what is rational and right!

Elizabeth Campbell

--

Elizabeth Campbell

[REDACTED]

--

Elizabeth Campbell

[REDACTED]

From: Thomas Campbell [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 4:44:26 PM

To: PUC

Subject: Proposed rate increase by Black Hills Power

Auto forwarded by a Rule

I vehemently oppose BHP's request for a rate increase. As someone on fixed income, I could no more handle a 13% rate increase than I could fly. We in Spearfish do not have a choice about who would supply us electricity, and now is the time the PUC stood up for us consumers. It has been a long time since BHP and the Corporation gave two hoots about the consumers. I missed the meeting Dakota Rural Action had in Spearfish this past Saturday, or else I would have added my name to protest BHP's request.

Thank you.

--

Father Tom Campbell
[REDACTED]

003776

From: PUC
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2015 5:33 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: BHP RATE CASE, EL14-026

Father Campbell:

Thank you for your comment. It will be added to the Black Hills Power rate case docket, <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2014/EL14-026.aspx>, along with this response. Because commissioners have a decision-making role in docket matters, any discussion with a commissioner about an open docket must take place in an open, public forum. By placing your comments in the docket file, other commissioners and interested parties will have access to your comments for consideration.

Here is a document which explains the processing of electric utility rate case requests which may be helpful to you. It references the South Dakota Codified Laws governing utilities and the commission regarding electric rate requests: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/electricratecasehandout.pdf>

Chris Nelson, Chairman
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

003777