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CHAIRMAN NELSON: Good morning, everyone.
Welcome.
We will begin the hearing in Docket EL14-026, In the Matter of the Application of Black Hills Power, Inc. For Authority to Increase its Electric Rates.

The time is approximately 9:00 a.m. The date is January 27, 2015, and the location of the hearing is the Matthews Training Center at the Joe Foss Building, 523 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota.

I'm Chris Nelson, Commission Chairman. Commissioners Kristie Fiegen and Gary Hanson are also present.

I'd also like to welcome those of you who are in attendance here at the hearing and thank you for your interest in the matter.

I am presiding over the hearing. The hearing was noticed pursuant to the Commission's Order for and Notice of Hearing issued on December 30, 2014.

The issues at this hearing are, one, shall the Commission grant the Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement Stipulation and approve the Settlement Stipulation as just and reasonable and as its decision in this matter, including the approval of the contract with Deviations between Black Hills Power and the South Dakota Science and Technology Association, or, two, what rates,
terms, and conditions shall the Commission approve as just and reasonable and in accordance with the standards set forth in SDCL 49-34A-8.4.

If the Applicant -- it is the Applicant that has the burden of proof, and under 49-34A-8.4 that burden of proof is to establish that the underlying costs of the rates approved in the Stipulation are prudent, efficient, and economical and are reasonable and necessary to provide service to the public utilities customers in this state.

All parties have the right to be present and to be represented by an attorney. All persons testifying will be sworn in and subject to cross-examination by the parties. The Commission's final decision may be appealed by the parties to the State Circuit Court and State Supreme Court.

John Smith, the Commission's counsel, will act as Hearing Examiner and will conduct the hearing subject to the Commission's oversight. He may provide recommended rulings on procedural and evidentiary matters. The Commission may overrule its counsel's preliminary rulings throughout the hearing. If not overruled, Mr. Smith's rulings will become final rulings.

One housekeeping matter that's been passed on to
me. There will be several folks testifying via telephone. I'm told when those folks are speaking all of us must have our microphones off or there gets to be an echo and a feedback that just doesn't work.

And that will be a little bit awkward when we go through questions and answers, but we're going to have to make it work and accommodate those folks.

With that, one matter of housekeeping. I will turn the gavel over to Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Cheri, just one quick question on the telephone. I know in the past you have not been able to do the swearing in.

Is that still the case?
THE COURT REPORTER: Right.
MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, you will have to do the swearing in.

With that, let's begin by taking the appearances of the parties.

Mr. Magnuson, we'll start with you on behalf of Black Hills Power. Please introduce the folks you have with you.

MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you, Mr. Smith.
Lee Magnuson with Lindquist \& Vennum Law Firm in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. I'm here with my co-counsel today, Amy Koenig, in-house counsel for Black Hills

Power.
Would you like me to introduce the remainder of the people?

MR. SMITH: Not unless you feel the need to.
MR. MAGNUSON: Will there be an opening statement?

MR. SMITH: We'll discuss that. I'll take that up with you guys in a second.

MR. MAGNUSON: Okay. I'll go ahead and introduce everybody in the event there's not an opening statement.

With us at counsel table today -- first is Kyle White, who is the Vice President of Regulatory Affairs for Black Hills Corporation. He's on my immediate left.

To my far right is Jon Thurber, Manager of Regulatory Affairs for Black Hills Power.

We have several people in the hearing room today that if it's okay, we'll go ahead and introduce. First we have Chris Kilpatrick, Director of Regulatory. We have Vance Crocker, Vice President of Electric Operations for Black Hills Power. We have Mark Lux, who is the Vice President and General Manager of Regulated and Nonregulated Generation for Black Hills Corporation.

We have Todd Brink who is Senior Managing

Counsel for Black Hills Corporation. And we have Marnie Miller Jones, Director of Revenue Requirement.

Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Thank you.
Mr. Moreno.
MR. MORENO: Thank you, Mr. Smith.
I'm Mark Moreno. I'm local counsel for the
Black Hills Industrial Interveners. I practice in the law firm here in Pierre of Moreno, Lee \& Bachand.

Next to me is Drew Moratzka, and next to him is Chad Marriott. They're with the Stoel Rives Law Firm, and they will be taking the laboring oar here during the course of this hearing over the next two or three days.

As a housekeeping matter, I should say both
Mr. Moratzka and Mr. Marriott have been admitted pro hac vice. They also have a sales tax license with the State so those preliminary matters incident to their ability to appear here today and practice in this state have been taken care of.

As a housekeeping matter, as some of you know, some may not, I also have another job besides the practice of law. I'm a United States Magistrate Judge. And, as such, I have certain judicial duties that I have to perform typically on a daily basis.

Now in taking on the role as local counsel, I
take that very seriously. And I have told Mr. Marriott and Mr. Moratzka that $I$ will be here as long as I can. I have set aside at least a half a day to be here because I take that role seriously.

But I ask the Commission and counsel's
indulgence if $I$ have to leave from time to time. If I do, rest assured I'll be handling judicial business and being a public servant like all of us are here today. And I would appreciate that indulgence.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.
Is there any objection, Mr. Magnuson?
MR. MAGNUSON: No objection. Thank you.
MS. COLLIER: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Cremer.
MS. CREMER: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Thank you. I think that's just fine here.

MR. MORENO: One last matter. And I know counsel just mentioned that you will take up the opening statement matter, but there is a Motion that we have filed for briefing that may very well be mentioned during the course of the opening statement, if allowed. But that's something that we would like to have ruled on ultimately during the course of this hearing.

And we recognize that briefing is a
discretionary matter with the Commission, but we just wanted to raise that and preserve that matter and make sure that it's not overlooked.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.
And I was going to discuss motions here in just a second and how we should handle those.

Ms. Collier.
MS. COLLIER: Caitlin Collier, attorney at law appearing for Dakota Rural Action, Intervener.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.
Ms. Cremer.
MS. CREMER: Thank you.
Good morning. This is Karen Cremer of Staff.
And with me today are Staff Analysts Pat Steffensen and Eric Paulson, and our consultant Dave Peterson is on the phone.

Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Let's proceed on to the motions now.

At least logically to me at least -- definitely, two of the motions to me can really not be heard until the evidence has been heard. And I'm talking about the two Settlement Stipulation motions. They certainly can't.

And it occurs to me that with respect to your

Motion to do some posthearing scheduling, Mr. Moreno, that we might as well see how things go there too, I would say, so we know how things have gone and what we're looking like. And then we'll take that up following the hearing. Because at that point we'll kind of know where we stand here in terms of how things have gone.

Does that make sense?
MR. MORENO: Very well. That will be acceptable.

MR. SMITH: So don't let me forget at the end of the hearing to remember to do that. You guys remember to slap me upside the face, if need be. I might need it.

Okay. Well, we'll do that.
One thing here too. Just a word or two about the way we deal with things because $I$ think there's a couple of people in the room that haven't really dealt with one of our hearings before.

When we deal with hearings involving cases in which we've had prefiled testimony and in this case we just had massive quantities of it, generally what we try to do, I try to encourage people to keep the direct case relatively brief and relatively in a summary form to the extent possible.

Because I think with all the prefiled, to go over an extremely arduous direct -- that's one of the
reasons we do prefiled, frankly, is to try to shorten the amount of time we have to deal with on direct testimony. Any thoughts on that, counsel?

MR. MAGNUSON: Absolutely agree. Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Okay.
Mr. Moreno? Mr. Moratzka.
MR. MORENO: Likewise.
MR. SMITH: Okay.
Ms. Collier.
MS. COLLIER: Agree.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Cremer.
MS. CREMER: Staff is in agreement.
MR. SMITH: Okay.
Why don't we move on now to do we have any prehearing stipulations, et cetera, anything of that nature concerning admissibility of exhibits?

MR. MAGNUSON: If I might, I think I can speak on behalf of the parties. We've had general discussions, perhaps not all as a group but individually.

I believe that the parties are prepared to stipulate to the admission of all of the exhibits that were prefiled.

And so, for example, that would be Joint Exhibit 1 through 6, and for Black Hills Power that would be Black Hills Power Exhibit No. 1 through 73.

Now we have actually indicated that there are four additional exhibits, but those were not part of the prefileds so we'll wait to move for the admission of those documents if and when we use them.

Otherwise, I believe the parties have stipulated that prefiled exhibits can be admitted into evidence.

MR. SMITH: And does that -- that includes also Black Hills Industrial Interveners and Staff.

MR. MAGNUSON: Yes. That is correct. I don't believe that Dakota Rural Action has any exhibits, but per the exhibits of Staff and Black Hills Industrial Interveners, those were all prefiled exhibits, and we would stipulate to the admission of those.

MR. SMITH: Are you in agreement to that?
MR. MORENO: I am. There's no objection from the Interveners as to the prefiled exhibits.

MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier.
MS. COLLIER: Yes. It was discussed ahead of time, and we are in agreement.

MR. SMITH: Okay.
Ms. Cremer.
MS. CREMER: Yes. That's accurate from Staff's point of view.

MR. SMITH: Okay. We will admit all of the prefiled exhibits, and those on the exhibit list is what
that is, that you've sent in. We will admit all of those exhibits into the record.

I think we'll turn to opening statements. And generally $I$ offer parties the option. And, first of all, do you want to do opening statements? And --

MR. MAGNUSON: Mr. Smith, I'm sorry to
interrupt. Just a couple more housekeeping matters, perhaps, before we get to that.

I think $I$ would like to clarify also in our witness list we identified certain witnesses that are going to adopt the testimony of other witnesses. And per the agreement of the other parties, it's my understanding that they have stipulated that the adoption of testimony as set forth in our witness list is acceptable.

MR. SMITH: Do you agree with that Mr. Moratzka, Mr. Moreno?

MR. MORENO: We do.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier.
MS. COLLIER: I do.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Cremer.
MS. CREMER: Yes.
MR. SMITH: Okay. We will permit that testimony to be adopted then.

MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you, Mr. Smith.
One more housekeeping matter. The parties have
stipulated that individuals may testify by telephone. For example, we do have some witnesses that will be available if there are questions, but principally that comes down to two witnesses. We will have John Spanos, our depreciation expert, testifying by telephone. And $I$ understand that Staff will have Dave Peterson testifying by telephone.

The parties have stipulated too that they may testify by telephone.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Is that --
MR. MORENO: That's correct.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier.
MS. COLLIER: Yes.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Ms. Cremer.
MS. CREMER: Yes. That's true.
MR. SMITH: The Chairman here will have to do the swearing in because whatever the court reporter's association doesn't permit that yet.

So, with that, are we ready to move into discussing opening statements, whether you want to do them and then the order you want to do them in?

MR. MAGNUSON: We would request a very, very brief opening statement. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Okay. And then for the other parties $I$ usually give people the option of either doing
yours right up front or doing them at the introduction of your -- at the commencement of your direct case.

MR. MORENO: We'll reserve on that, with
counsel's permission.
MR. SMITH: Okay.
MR. MAGNUSON: That's acceptable.
MR. SMITH: Other attorneys, is that okay?
MS. COLLIER: Yes.
MS. CREMER: And that's fine with Staff.
MR. SMITH: Okay. And so with that -- and I don't know, Ms. Collier, you're not putting on a direct case?

MS. COLLIER: That is correct.
MR. SMITH: Do you still want to do an opening statement?

MS. COLLIER: I would like to reserve time and do it later.

MR. SMITH: At that time. Okay.
Ms. Cremer, what's your thought?
MS. CREMER: I think I don't like this mic.
I will reserve and do my opening before we put on Mr. Peterson.

Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Well, I think then we'll turn to Mr. Magnuson, and please proceed with your opening statement.

MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you, Chairman Nelson, Commissioner Hanson, Vice Chair Fiegen, Staff, Counsel. I appreciate the opportunity to be here today.

As $I$ mentioned earlier, my name is Lee Magnuson. I'm appearing here with co-counsel, Amy Koenig, who's in-house counsel with Black Hills Corporation. Both of us will be taking various witnesses throughout this hearing. I've already introduced the people that are here in the hearing room representing Black Hills Power.

The main purpose of this opening statement is to just advise the Commission of what we expect for our order of witnesses and who we expect to adopt what testimony. So I'm going to go through that very quickly.

Before $I$ do $I$ just want to indicate that Chairman Nelson went through what we're here for today, and, in fact, Black Hills Power is here to request approval of the Settlement Stipulation between Black Hills Power and Staff of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission. Black Hills Industrial Interveners and Dakota Rural Action chose not to be a part of that Settlement.

We believe that the record and our testimony will show that the requested rates today are just and
reasonable.
In support of the Settlement Stipulation today we intend to call five witnesses to provide testimony in support of the adoption and approval of the Settlement Stipulation.

Those five witnesses are, number one, Kyle White. Mr. White will also adopt the testimony of Laura Patterson, Charles Gray, Jill Tietjen, and Brian Iverson.

Our second witness today will be Chris Kilpatrick. Mr. Kilpatrick's going to testify as to corporate cost allocations. The remainder of his testimony, because he did prefile testimony, will be adopted by Jon Thurber. And Mr. Kilpatrick likely will be leaving sometime today before the conclusion of the hearing because of time and schedule commitments back in Rapid City.

Jon Thurber will testify as our third witness. And as $I$ noted earlier, he will be adopting the testimony of Chris Kilpatrick, except as to corporate cost allocation matters.

Our fourth witness will be John Spanos, who is our depreciation expert. Mr. Spanos will be testifying by telephone.

Our fifth and final witness, unless we have
rebuttal witnesses, will be Robert Hollibaugh, who is the Director of Tax for Black Hills Corporation, and he will be testifying today on tax matters. He's not presently in the hearing room. He will be arriving at approximately noon today and will be available to testify today or tomorrow, as appropriate, given our order of witnesses.

> With regard to the availability of our other witnesses that prefiled testimony in this matter, I would refer you to our witness list that sets forth who those other witnesses are and that, if necessary, and if there are questions, we can make them available by telephone.

The one person that $I$ would note is Bill Avera. In the event there are questions for Bill Avera who is our cap structure and ROE witness, he's only going to be available later in the afternoon today. He's in Washington, D.C. and will be testifying tomorrow. So if there are any questions for him, we would need to ask that the Commission get those questions to him later this afternoon.

We've already been through the stipulation of the exhibits so we won't be laying foundation. We've already talked about the adoption of testimony.

So with that, thanks for the opportunity today to present testimony in support of the Settlement

Stipulation.
MR. SMITH: Thank you.
And as $I$ understand it, Mr. Moreno, you're not
going to do your opening now.
MR. MORENO: We're going to reserve it and do it
prior to the commencement of our case.
Thank you.
MR. SMITH: And the same thing with Ms. Collier
and Ms. Cremer.
MS. COLLIER: Yes.
MR. SMITH: Please proceed with your case.
MR. MAGNUSON: One last note. Mr. White
reminded me he also will be adopting the testimony of
Jen Landis. So I apologize for that.
Thank you.
MS. KOENIG: Good morning. Black Hills Power
calls Kyle White.
(The witness is sworn by the court reporter.)
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. KOENIG:
Q. Please state your name for the record.
A. Kyle D. White.
Q. Who's your employer?
A. I'm employed by Black Hills Service Company, a wholly owned subsidiary of Black Hills Corporation.
Q. How long have you been employed by Black Hills Corporation?
A. 32 years.
Q. What's your professional title?
A. I'm Corporate Vice President of Regulatory Affairs.
Q. Throughout the course of your employment how many years have you worked in the regulatory arena?
A. I've had a consistent regulatory role during my entire career.
Q. Have you testified before this Commission before today?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Were you involved in the preparation of the rate case that is presently before the Commission?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Please briefly summarize your involvement.
A. I provided strategy and support to the team that was preparing the Application.
Q. Did you file direct testimony in this docket?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did you also file rebuttal testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Are there any changes that you would like to make to your rebuttal testimony?
A. Yes. On page 14 I would need to correct one of the
questions that relates to an answer I provided.
And which exhibit?
MR. MORATZKA: Excuse me, counsel. Page 14 of direct or rebuttal?

THE WITNESS: Rebuttal.
MS. KOENIG: It's Exhibit 65 .
A. On page 14 of my rebuttal testimony $I$ filed on January 15 I say "If Mr." -- or I did not say.

The question is "If Mr. Baron does not oppose the class cost of service, then what actions has he recommended that the Commission take on this subject?"

Mr. Baron, in fact, did reject the class cost of service. What he, in fact, supported was the apportionment of revenues that was provided for in the Settlement Agreement.

There are a series of questions that relate to this. So to the extent that the question addresses the class cost of service provided for in the settlement, there is not one. There's only an apportionment of revenue.

So this series of questions should address not the class cost of service in the Settlement but, in fact, the apportionment of revenues agreed to by the parties. Q. Are you indeed adopting the testimony of the other witnesses that Mr. Magnuson indicated you would adopt just a few moments ago?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Are you also prepared to answer questions that relate to testimony that was filed by any of the other Black Hills Power sponsored witnesses?
A. I will attempt to do so for the convenience of the hearing.
Q. Is there a Settlement Agreement presently pending for approval before the Commission?
A. Yes, there is. There is a Settlement Agreement between the Commission Staff and Black Hills Power. Q. Were you involved in the efforts that culminated in the Settlement Agreement that is before the Commission for approval?
A. Yes. I functioned as the lead negotiator.
Q. Does Black Hills Power fully support the Settlement Agreement?
A. Yes, we do.
Q. Are there terms in the Settlement Agreement that are beneficial for the Industrial Interveners?
A. Yes. We believe so.
Q. With respect to the Settlement Agreement, what action are you asking the Commission to take?
A. We're asking the Commission to approve the Settlement Agreement and all of its provisions as provided.
Q. In your opinion, if the Commission were to approve the terms of the settlement Agreement, do those terms result in just and reasonable rates?
A. Yes, they do.

MS. KOENIG: At this time I'll tender Mr. White for questions.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.
Mr. Moreno, Mr. Moratzka, Mr. Marriott?
MR. MORENO: Mr. Moratzka will be handling the examination, counsel.

Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Please, proceed.
CROSS - EXAMINATION

BY MR. MORATZKA:
Q. Good morning, Mr. White.
A. Good morning, Mr. Moratzka.
Q. I have a few questions today.

I'd like to start, if we could, by pointing you to
page 2 of your rebuttal testimony.
A. So we're looking at Exhibit 65?
Q. Correct.

And if $I$ look at lines 19 to 20 on page 2 , it's correct, is it not, that your assertion is that the Industrial Interveners are the primary beneficiaries of the Rate Mitigation Plan reflected in the Settlement?
A. I believe in comparison to the other classes, they were consistently beneficial. As we did our rate mitigation, the Black Hills Industrial consumers had some significant benefits.
Q. And I guess the question is are they the primary beneficiary?
A. I think they were equally beneficial to the residential clients.
Q. I'm going to ask, Mr. White, if you could -- I don't know if your counsel has the initial filing available, but I'd turn your attention to Schedule o-1. I believe that's exhibit --
A. It might be easier to get.

MR. MAGNUSON: It's Exhibit 5.
A. It's going to be more efficient to just look in here.

Okay. Yes. I'm now looking at it.
Q. Would you please turn to page 35 of 35 of Schedule O-1.
A. I now have it.
Q. And, for the record, could you confirm for me that the Schedule $0-1$ is the Black Hills Power Pro Forma Class Cost of Service Study?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. If I look at line 20 on page 35 of 35 ,
the description is the percent increase required; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And so if $I$ go -- and look further to the right under the columns Residential, General Service, General Service Large, et cetera, the percentages that I'm looking at are increases that would be required under Black Hills Power's Class Cost of Service Study; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So, Mr. White, then for the residential customers, the rate increase that would be required under Black Hills Power's Class Cost of Service Study is 19.26 percent; is that correct?
A. We're looking at line 20?
Q. Correct.
A. Statement 0, page 35 of 35?
Q. Correct.
A. This exhibit says 9.51 percent.
Q. Schedule O-1.
A. O-1. No.

All right. I'm not sure. I don't believe O-1 is in
the binder, but $I$ can address it from the actual filing. So if I look at Schedule O-1, page 35 of 35 , it's 19.26 percent.
Q. Thank you, Mr. White.

Now shifting down in the description to line 29, line 29 is the percent increase proposed by Black Hills Power in its filing; correct?
A. Yes. And we have provided mitigation to the residential and general service large classes.
Q. Thank you, Mr. White.

And so the rate mitigation proposed by the company for the residential class is close to 9 percent. Would you agree?
A. It's short of 9 percent. About 8 and a half.
Q. Thank you.

Now if $I$ look, going back up to line 20 of the percent increase required for the general service large industrial contract classes, according to Black Hills Power the increase required would be 15.44 percent; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then looking down to line 29 under the rate mitigation proposed by Black Hills Power, the increase would be 9.71 percent; is that correct?
A. That's correct. About a percent less than asked for from the residential class.
Q. And the difference, Mr. White, between the
15.44 percent and 9.71 percent is a little less than

6 percent.
A. That's correct.
Q. So just to be clear then, the rate mitigation proposed by Black Hills Power in tits initial filing for the residential customers was greater than that proposed for general service large?
A. It is greater based upon our Application, yes.
Q. And if $I$ understand the Settlement correctly, Mr. White, the Settlement makes a pro rata adjustment from the proposed increases to account for the reduced Settlement requirement?
A. Yes. The Rate Mitigation Plan is no class receives less than 75 percent of the average increase, and no class receives more than 120 percent of the average base rate increase.

And my rebuttal testimony actually addresses allocations beyond these classes. And then my statement that primary beneficiaries would relate to my rebuttal testimony as well.
Q. Mr. White, on your rebuttal testimony, Exhibit 65, page 4.
A. I'm there.
Q. Line 5, it's my understanding that your testimony with the Settlement Agreement will result in just and reasonable rates.
A. Yes. I believe so.
Q. Later in your testimony you are suggesting, are you not, that some changes to customer rates would be accepted by Black Hills Power?
A. Yes. I believe the Commission has discretion, and there's a range of just and reasonable rates that are possible when you allocate the total revenue requirement.
Q. And, Mr. White, wouldn't the flip side also be true? In other words, if there's a range of rates that could be considered just and reasonable by the Commission for customers, then there is a range of revenue requirements that could also be considered just and reasonable for the company.
A. That's why we're here.
Q. Thank you, Mr. White.

Looking a little bit further down on lines 13 to 16 of page 4, Exhibit 65, I understand that you are agreeing that the approval of -- if the Commission were to approve the Settlement Agreement, that would not set precedent for future rate cases; is that correct?
A. That's correct. As provided for in the Settlement Agreement.
Q. Correct. Could $I$ have you turn to page 8 of your rebuttal testimony.
A. I'm there.
Q. And lines 20 to 22 it appears that you're referring to prior rate case settlements as support for including certain incentive compensation expense?
A. I'm indicating that there is no precedence and that the parties can agree to include incentive comp and have done so previously.
Q. But just to confirm, Mr. White, you're not saying that prior case settlements have precedential value in this proceeding?
A. I am not.
Q. Could I have you turn to page 12. Between lines 14 through 19 I understand your testimony to be that the Wyoming Public Service Commission has approved settlements that include 100 percent of the requested incentive compensation?
A. Yes. And we have also had a recent decision from the Colorado Commission where it was litigated, and the Commission accepted 100 percent that the incentive comp paid by our Colorado utility.
Q. And is that the decision provided for in the record in this case?
A. It is not.
Q. In your testimony are you implying that the Wyoming Public Service Commission has precedential value in this
proceeding?
A. I'm implying that other commissions have reviewed the company's compensation practices and found them to be acceptable and to be prudent.
Q. Have you included a copy of the Settlement referred
to on page 12 in the record?
A. I have not.
Q. So we have no evidence in the record to know why the Office of Consumer Advocate agreed to 100 percent of incentive compensation?

MS. KOENIG: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

MR. SMITH: I'm going to overrule it.
A. No. We have not provided the opinion of the Office of Consumer Advocate, which was the party to the Black Hills Power rate case or the Cheyenne Light rate case. Nor have we provided the opinion of the industrial customers that also were signatory to the Cheyenne Light rate case.
Q. Thank you, Mr. White.

And just to circle back and talk about settlements, the reason that settlements generally don't have precedential value is because there is a give and a take between the parties.

Is that fair?
A. Each party comes to the negotiation with their own objectives, and generally in this kind of situation each party has to have some compromise. And we were able to reach those compromises with the Staff but not with your clients in this case.
Q. And you would agree that parties' full or partial
resolution in one case may not be similarly resolved in another case?
A. That's been my experience.
Q. Thank you, Mr. White.

If $I$ could have you turn to page 7 of your rebuttal testimony.

Are you there, Mr. White?
A. I am.
Q. Thank you.

On line 1 -- and $I$ understand this is testimony
that's responsive to the Industrial Interveners' witness Lane Kollen.

On line 1 my understanding of your testimony is that you are stating that Mr. Kollen -- Mr. Kollen's testimony is false.
A. I believe his statement that the request is inappropriately open ended is false, and that's what my testimony says.
Q. Under the -- and this is in regards to the

FutureTrack expense. Under the program as proposed you would agree, wouldn't you, that the Black Hills Power can defer amounts in excess of the amount allowed in this case for recovery in future proceedings?
A. For requested recovery in future proceedings, yes. There's no blank check that's provided for under this proposal. It's an indicative amount looking at an eight-year program looking at an expected retirement of nearly 31 percent of our work force, 62 of them in critical positions for reliable service.

The program costs have been defined as to what might be available. Training, support.

The key element of this program is that because of the nature of the positions, there is a learning period for them. We do not believe the market will provide for adequate people, and so we're being more aggressive in our approach.

The Settlement does not provide for the recovery of this program. But we believe that it was specifically identified, specifically trackable, and we had the ability to identify specific people in the program and their related costs for future consideration by this Commission.
Q. Thank you, Mr. White. And I appreciate the background.

I guess what I'm focused on is the allegation that the testimony's false.
A. He made the impression in his testimony that the program was not defined in what positions would be covered, what costs would be covered, and how those costs would be recovered in rates in the future.

There's an annual report to the Commission. There's an opportunity for a five-year review. The program has a defined period of time of eight years. I cannot see that the request is inappropriately open ended. It is well-defined, and the Commission has the ability to look at all elements of it and determine what would be recovered in rates.
Q. Thank you, Mr. White. But the fact of the matter is that we aren't -- Black Hills Power wasn't proposing to set a defined amount. Black Hills Power is setting an amount and asking for a deferral of costs above that amount; correct?
A. Well, and also there would be a refund of any cost below that amount. It was symmetrical because the program costs are not predictable at this point with true definition, but they certainly are identifiable in a way that would recognize that the company's likely to have challenges in hiring positions like this and that we should address the retiring employees through a program
that would essentially hire people in advance to give them training and experience prior to those people's retirement.
Q. Thank you, Mr. White. But going back to the words "open ended," we are not in this proceeding setting a certain value on which Black Hills Power must manage its expenses around; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And so, Mr. White, it seems to me that what we're getting at here is that you and Mr. Kollen simply disagree on what open ended means.

Is that fair?
A. I think that the program is well-defined, that the Commission has full authority to decide what's allowed and recoverable in rates in the future, and that his statement that it's open ended and not within the control of the Commission is false.
Q. I'd like to continue on, Mr. White, to your next allegation that's covered through lines 6 to 11, same page, page 7, in which you are again claiming that Mr. Kollen's testimony is false.
A. Yes.
Q. Looking at your testimony here, it appears that you are claiming that Mr. Kollen's testimony that the company hasn't proposed a measurement baseline is false.

Could you point me to the place in Ms. Landis's testimony that establishes the baseline?

MS. KOENIG: It's Exhibit 19.
A. So the question on line 18, How does Black Hills Power plan to track costs associated with the FutureTrack Work Force Development Program?"

Identifying the positions and the nature of the cost we believe sets the baseline. There are 62 retirement positions that are anticipated to be part of this program. That is the baseline. And then there would be program costs associated with each of those positions.

In her Exhibit JC-1 she identifies specifically positions that would be covered by this program: Line mechanics, electricians, construction representatives, energy service technicians, computer technicians, et cetera.

We also have provided a forecast of the program. In order to be eligible for the FutureTrack program a supervisor will need to identify a position on this list and identify them as be essentially a hire ahead for the FutureTrack program.

As we go to the second page of her exhibit we talk about participant criteria and selection. We talk about program length. We talk about program components. And then we also talk about the tracking and reporting. And
there will be an annual report. So we have a very solid baseline of what the positions are and what the costs are.

What we do not know is when those retirements will happen. We know with some certainty that in our corporation employees retire at approximately age 62.1 because that's when they're fully eligible for their benefits under our defined benefit pension plan.

So as he says there is no baseline, I would agree that there is not a dollar baseline. There is an estimate of $\$ 761,000$, but there are definitely program base lines that the company has identified how it will identify these positions and track the related costs and report them to the Commission.
Q. Thank you, Mr. White.

And if you could help me out a little bit on the estimate that you've provided, is there anything in the record that defines how the payroll and expenses, expenses associated with this program, are going to be differentiated from any other payroll and related expenses?
A. There is. It's in Ms. Landis's testimony on page 13. "Each FutureTrack employee in training will be tracked using a custom field in our human resources management system. FutureTrack has accounts created to
allow our financial system to capture and report all expenses associated with the labor, benefits, relocation, scholarship, and training of FutureTrack employees."
Q. Thank you, Mr. White.

And, as $I$ understand Mr. Kollen's testimony -- and perhaps you'd like a copy.

MR. MORATZKA: Counsel, do you have a copy of
Mr. Kollen's testimony?
MR. MAGNUSON: We can get one for him.
MR. MORATZKA: Please do.
A. Okay. I have the confidential document of Mr. Kollen.
Q. Could I have you turn to page 29.

MR. SMITH: We'll have to make sure to be cognizant of where the confidential chunks are in there.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I don't believe there was anything in FutureTrack that was addressed confidentially.
Q. And, as $I$ understand the testimony here on

Mr. Kollen's direct, on lines 8 through 12 Mr. Kollen is acknowledging the fact that there is tracking. But the fundamental problem is that the costs that are tracked in this manner aren't subject to a defined measurement baseline.
A. That's not what his testimony says.
"Second, the company has not proposed a measurement baseline that defines how the payroll and related expenses associated with the program can and will be differentiated from any other payroll and related expenses." Page 13 of Ms. Landis's testimony specifically identifies how the company will measure those costs to the baseline.
Q. Please continue reading, Mr. White, lines 8 through $12 ?$
A. "The company's proposal to track the cost in a regulatory asset," which we're tracking in much more than a regulatory asset, "does not address or cure this fundamental problem because the costs that will be identified and tracked in this manner still will not be subject to any defined or objective measurement baseline."

I find that also to be false based upon her exhibit and her testimony.
Q. So, Mr. White, as I understand your testimony, the estimate that you've provided for this case, that estimate is the baseline.
A. I believe the program and the positions are the baseline and the related costs of the program. And what we have done is looked at the eight-year period of time, normalized the cost recovery, and in the future because
of the regulatory asset we will provide for either refunds, if the program does not cost as much and there actually are adequate employees to be hired for these retirees, or if it costs more, then we'll have the opportunity to come before the Commission and recover those costs.

But it is essentially an indicative cost if the Commission were to believe that it would be good policy for the company to initiate more aggressive measures for hiring people in the future.

The Settlement does not provide for this program. Q. Mr. White, you would not disagree, would you, that there could be alternative, different views on how to define measurement baseline?
A. I believe the company provided for measurements and standards for the Commission to judge the success and cost of the program, and I don't believe that he characterized our program or our testimony properly. Q. Mr. White, let's move on.

Incentive compensation. Please turn to page 10 of your Rebuttal.

Are you there, Mr. White?
A. I am.
Q. Is it your testimony that a utility's profitability
is primarily influenced by the level of its expenses?
A. Well, my testimony addresses the fact that profitability is driven by revenues, expenses, and sales growth. And expenses are a key contributor in the company's profitability, given the difficulty of filing rate cases and the infrequency that they occur.
Q. You're not disagreeing, are you, Mr. White, that growing rate base has -- can have a dramatic effect on the utility's profitability?
A. Yes. I've been a party of several rate cases where new generation's been added, and when the investors make additional investment they earn an additional return which increases the earnings of the corporation.
Q. And would you agree, Mr. White, that Black Hills Power's currently in an expansion mode?
A. Black Hills Power is, $I$ believe, at the completion of an expansion mode. Because we've had significant capital infrastructure investments to make to meet our obligation to serve.

We provide in the Settlement a two-year rate freeze. That's not possible if we're continuing with significant expansion.
Q. Mr. White, I'd like to draw your attention to page 13 of your testimony.

Are you there?
A. I am.
Q. On lines 7 and 8 I understand your testimony to be that you believe Mr. Kollen is recommending disallowance of all of Black Hills Power's incentive compensation.
A. I struggled with what he was asking to have happen.

And so as look at page 35 of his answer testimony, he says "The company seeks recovery of 1.554 million in incentive compensation, expense tied to operating performance and financial performance."

That was the only number that $I$ could identify. He generally has said incentive compensation is not appropriate for recovery in rates.
Q. Thank you, Mr. White.

I'd like to walk through what $I$ understand the figures to be.

MR. MORATZKA: And with the indulgence of the
Commission, I have a few discovery responses that Black Hills Power provided, if I could approach the witness and show those to Mr. White and potentially offer them into the record.

MR. SMITH: Ms. Koenig, do you have an opinion on that?

MS. KOENIG: No objection.
MS. COLLIER: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Yes, you may.
MR. MORATZKA: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Are these docs. currently exhibits or not at this point?

MR. MORATZKA: They are not.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.
(Exhibit BHII 5 is marked for identification)
MR. MORATZKA: Mr. Smith, the next chunk of my cross-examination will refer to confidential exhibits.

MR. SMITH: Okay. If that's the case, we're going to have to go into confidential session then.

I guess enlighten me as to who in the room is bound by a confidentiality agreement at this point in time.

MS. KOENIG: The Black Hills Power attorneys and representatives in the room are bound by the agreement, as are the Industrial Interveners' attorneys. Ms. Collier for DRA as well.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

And so $I$ guess we're down to the folks in the audience who are not among the groups that are bound.

Any folks that are in the room that are not subject to a confidentiality covenant, I think we're going to have to have you leave the room during the confidential part.

Are there people on the phone out there?
MR. PETERSON: Yes. Dave Peterson's here.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Well, you're okay.
Anybody else?
MS. CREMER: I don't know. I don't think we did a phone rollcall at all. I don't know who else would be on the phone at this point, though.

MR. SMITH: Okay. We're going to have Katlyn do a check so we know.

Should we take a short break while we're doing
that?
Apparently we checked the phone lines, and we're okay. We have only people that are us.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Moratzka?
MR. MORATZKA: I am. Thank you.
MR. MORENO: Just one comment, counsel.
The record should indicate that the members of
the public and those who are not subject to the
confidentiality provisions are no longer in the room.
MR. SMITH: Okay. The record will so reflect.
Thank you.
(Beginning of confidential portion of the transcript.)

























(End of confidential portion of transcript.) MR. SMITH: Okay. Please, proceed. MS. COLLIER: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. COLLIER:
Q. Mr. White, I believe that you began -- some of your
testimony there was some explanation about your position with Black Hills Power and your past experience.

Have you been with Black Hills Power in a regulatory capacity since 2008?
A. Yes.
Q. And as part of that regulatory capacity with the corporation have you regularly participated as you testified you did in this rate request in providing strategy and support for the Application?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know how many times there has been a rate increase request by Black Hills Power between 2008 and 2013?
A. There have been three requests to raise base rates.
Q. And have those been successful?
A. Largely.
Q. Do you know for residential customers what that increase has been since 2008?
A. I have not calculated it, no.
Q. Do you believe that it is over 15 percent?
A. I suspect that it is over 15 percent.

MS. COLLIER: That is all the questions I have.
MR. SMITH: Commission Staff.
MS. CREMER: Staff does not have any questions.
Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Ms. Koenig, do you have redirect?

MS. KOENIG: I do. Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. KOENIG:
Q. Mr. White, would you please pull out Black Hills Industrial Interveners Exhibit 7.

Do you have it in front of you?
A. I do.
Q. Would you please turn to page 83 on the definition of restricted stock and read that definition, please. A. Yes. "Item 2.40. Restricted stock means an award granted to a participant pursuant to Article 8."
Q. Have you had an opportunity to review Article 8
since the questioning regarding this exhibit earlier this morning?
A. Yes. The rate was helpful in me getting familiar with this document.

MR. SMITH: I note we're back into a
confidential document here. Thank you, Katlyn.
I mean, this thing hits me as borderline, but I
suppose you don't want industry or -- disclosure to
industry folks.
Should we go back into confidential?
MS. KOENIG: Yes, please.
MR. SMITH: Okay.
(Beginning of confidential portion of transcript.)




(End of confidential portion of transcript.)
MR. SMITH: I think we're good to go,
Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.
Are you the appropriate witness to talk about
Atlas storm damage?
THE WITNESS: I can talk about it generally, but Mr. Thurber is also qualified.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that will get me where we need to go.

My recollection at the time, and it may or may not be accurate, is there were some media discussions, some statements made that Black Hills Power incurred 9 to 10 million dollars worth of storm damage.

Does that figure ring a bell at all of what might have been thrown out at that time?

THE WITNESS: It's possible. There's always estimates as to the work that's being done.

Mr. Thurber, I think, could probably specify what's in the rate case.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, my question was what might have been thrown around at that particular time. In the Settlement, as $I$ understand, we're down to about 2.5 million.

Can you help me understand how we go from a
figure of 9 or 10 million at the time and now we're down to 2.5?

That's a significant difference. Help me understand that.

THE WITNESS: I think Mr. Thurber would be better prepared to answer that for you, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I will save then those questions for him.

We've spent quite a bit of time this morning talking about incentive compensation. I want to talk about salary just a little bit more generally.

A lot of the public comments that have come in to us on this particular case from folks that are your customers, there have been a lot of comments alleging that Black Hills Power employees are paid too much.

And I can understand that, that some of that may simply be jealousy, folks that maybe wish they had Black Hills Power as their employer, as certainly a good company.

The flip side of that might be it may be that, you know, within the community these folks say, you know, hey, maybe those salaries are too high.

And then this morning we spent a lot of time talking about incentive compensation that goes on top of that.

And so my first question is have you in any of your discovery requests filed with us a list of your salaries, perhaps by classification, job type, anything in detail that would help us analyze really where you're at with salaries?

THE WITNESS: I'm not recalling any, but Mr. Thurber may be able to answer that question.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay.
THE WITNESS: We have provided testimony that talks about the documents that we use, the studies that we use, the compensation philosophy of the corporation, the fact that we target our compensation and benefits at about the median for the industry. And so we do a substantial amount of benchmarking. And the challenge is many of those documents are confidential and proprietary.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: So how do you assure the Commission then that your salaries are commensurate with the industry? Is there anything in the record that would help us be assured of that?

THE WITNESS: Well, there's our testimony. We also make comparisons to other industries. But as far as benchmarking in the record, nothing at this point.

What you'll see is a company that targets its annual merit increases to the industry. We view our compensation annually at the board. We maintain budgets.

We have to attract, hire, and motivate employees, and we're successful largely in doing that but not on all instances. We have difficult service territories to attract people to, as I talked about in my rebuttal testimony as well.

So our philosophy and our approach is to meet our obligation to serve at basically a median compensation level, which has worked successfully for us in our service territory.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: There are several instances where apparently in the Settlement there's been some normalization of Worker's Comp cost and pension normalization.

Are those questions for Mr. Thurber?
THE WITNESS: I could talk to the pension normalization.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, let me ask perhaps maybe a more general question.

I mean, we take the test year pretty seriously.
I mean, that's what this is all based on. And yet as we go through, we find these particular areas that seem to be maybe cherry picked out of the expenses, a particular account, and for those we decide, okay, those we're going to normalize.

How do you decide which of those get picked
out as opposed to the one with the strict test year number?

And I'll tell you I'm concerned about that because $I$ don't have a good understanding of how do we decide what we cherry pick out and what we go with a strict number.

THE WITNESS: Well, I wouldn't characterize it as cherry picking.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, explain to me why I'm wrong on that characterization.

THE WITNESS: Yes. Businesses have certain costs that are variable, depending upon the circumstances that you're operating within. And so normalization addresses those more variable areas.

And what you would do is you would look at the history and look at several years and say, is there volatility within this account? Is there volatility within this rate base item? For example, materials and supplies.

And then you would look to that and say we should normalize this for common practice because there's too much volatility within that particular expense, within that particular part of the rate base.

For the purposes of the pension expense, it's one that we see pretty high volatility. High volatility
driven in this case recently by two things:
First, we have a new actuary study. Our employees are actually living longer. That increases the expenses associated with the plan.

The second is there is an investment assumption associated with the plan funds and what they're likely to earn over the plan duration. Those change with changes in the stock market, changes in interest rate, all affected by inflation.

And so that's why you see quite a bit of variability in the pension expense and why we saw more than a million dollar increase from one year to the next.

And Mr. Thurber can talk about the numbers more specifically than $I$. But we agreed with Staff that because of that variability, it would be appropriate to normalize it on a five-year basis today, and we accepted that for a five-year period all future rate cases filed by the company would also recognize the five-year normalization, thereby eliminating this idea of cherry picking that you get it one time but you don't commit to it next time.

We believe that's an account that has a high enough volatility in it that's appropriate to normalize.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: So how does that suggestion that we're going to pick a particular account to normalize come about? Is there a particular deviation range that you look at or that our Staff looks at? Who suggests that? Are these things that --

I'm assuming this happened in your settlement
negotiations. Is this something we can talk about in public, or do we need to go into confidential?

Help me understand how that comes about, how that comes into the settlement. And is it something you propose or Staff proposes?

THE WITNESS: It happens both ways. And it's based upon comfort level with whether or not the expense represents a fair cost for inclusion in the revenue requirement.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: So is there a particular deviation level that would be your flag to let's look at this, or how does that come about?

THE WITNESS: It's a materiality standard. So it would largely depend on probably being a few hundred thousand dollars difference of variability. You would also look at trend lines.

Some of it is whether you can explain that the volatility actually is recurring volatility. There's some systematic situation that's happening, rather than
just, well, we contained expenses one year and the next year they're up.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: This is a question $I$ could probably ask for any of the witnesses, and it's in regard to a statement in the Settlement Stipulation, but I'm going to ask you since you're here.

On page 15 under the category of Energy Cost Adjustment it talks about -- it says the company proposed the following change to the fuel and purchase power, which is a component of the ECA.

Number 3, to eliminate the power marketing credit minimum. What is that?

THE WITNESS: Okay. So Black Hills Power has a generation dispatch and power marketing group. They're responsible for dispatching our power generation, buying purchase power to meet our load, and then also marketing any excess power that might be available because the company has generation. Because the loads vary seasonally, and we have capacity built to meet our peak demands.

What we have provided for in the past is essentially a guarantee that we would reduce the fuel and purchase power expenses by essentially a profitability level. It was 2 million dollars.

We have seen changes in our resource portfolio
with the closing of coal-fired generation, with the loss of reserve capacity integration agreement, and the related 28 megawatts of capacity that went with that.

We're seeing power markets that are softer than they used to be, particularly with lower natural gas prices.

And so we felt uncomfortable with the returns that are agreed to with Staff of guaranteeing that level of commitment, and so we proposed to remove it. The Settlement actually drops that number to a million dollar guarantee, essentially.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.
And $I$ followed the amounts, but $I$ wasn't following exactly what it was for so I appreciate that explanation.

I think the last question that I've got for you, and this relates to your rebuttal testimony, page 23, and the simple question is what's the company's view regarding possible Commission modification to its settlement of all rate case issues with the Commission Staff?

And I think it's been acknowledged that there's at least one cost factor in there that is acknowledged to be too high, adding too much to the revenue. But I'm understanding from this that you would not propose to
remove that; is that correct?
THE WITNESS: No. We believe the Settlement revenue requirement will result in just and reasonable rates, and it's a very strong number as to what the company's costs to meet its obligation to serve are. And I believe Staff's also supportive of the Settlement being approved as it's been filed with the Commission.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think that's all the questions I have.

Thank you, Mr. White.
THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
MR. SMITH: Other Commissioner questions.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I'll have a question of
Mr. Thurber during his pension presentation.
And then you were incentive compensation, Mr. White.

Are you also the salary package, or is that going to be another witness?

THE WITNESS: I think it's me.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. So my question is Commissioner Nelson already talked about how you view salaries and that you hire, I believe, a national firm or look at national studies.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: In national studies
usually there is a cost of living adjustment for where you live so South Dakota has a cost of living adjustment for the rest of the country.

Do you know if you looked at that, number one, and what percentage is that?

THE WITNESS: I don't know what the percentage is, but we do adjust for local markets and local conditions.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So you do or your national organization -- or the study that you --

THE WITNESS: It's probably both.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Because usually
South Dakota's right around 88 percent. I just saw that previously in my previous life, but I also saw it in the paper the other day that it looked like it was about 88 percent.

THE WITNESS: And then it also is conditioned upon where you're attracting the employees. Are you attracting them more from a national market or a local market. And we factor that into our compensation practices as well.

But, for example, to attract executives to the company you're not likely to find those down the street in Rapid City. You're going to have to attract them from a national market. So you look to where the employees
are likely to come from and then benchmark your compensation practices to that.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Any additional Commissioner
questions?
I'm not seeing any.
I think with that then, you know, how are you guys fixed for lunch here? We should be just about done with Kyle, I think. Should we forge ahead and get him over with?

Okay. Well, I'm going to let you follow on, Ms. Koenig, and -- maybe I'll do it the opposite. I'll let you go, Andrew. Because -- and then I'll give Ms. Koenig the final bite at the apple as her final rebuttal. But I like to give you guys a chance to respond to Commissioner questions.

MR. MORATZKA: Thank you very much.
$\underline{\text { RECROSS-EXAMINATION }}$
BY MR. MORATZKA:
Q. Mr. White, just a very few brief follow-up questions. They are going to touch briefly on Confidential Exhibit Black Hills Industrial Interveners No. 7.

MR. SMITH: Okay. We're going to have to go into confidential again.



(End of confidential portion of transcript.)
MR. SMITH: Okay. We're off confidential now.
Q. (BY MR. MORATZKA) Thank you.

And, Mr. White, it appears that you may have cleared up a question for me, but $I$ may have another on the average rate issue so hopefully we can get to the bottom of this.

If $I$ could have you turn to Schedule $0-1$, page 35 of 35.
A. Okay. I have it.
Q. Thank you, Mr. White.

And if $I$ look at the proposed sales revenues, which is -- as $I$ read it, is line 27, are you there?
A. Yes.
Q. And if $I$ look over at Column $H$, which is the General Large Industrial Contract, it appears as though the proposed sales revenues are about 33.9 million dollars.

Is that fair?
A. Yes.
Q. And so if I took that figure in Column $H$ and divided it by the total proposed sales revenue in Column C, would you agree with me that the average cost is right around 6.4 cents per kWh?
A. That's the average cost for the base rates, I believe.
Q. Right. Okay. And that's, I guess, what I'm getting at, Mr. White, is that just so I'm clear, the proposed sales revenues here in line 27 under total South Dakota, that's exclusive of fuel and purchased energy?
A. That's correct.
Q. Thank you for the clarification, Mr. White.

Final question. There was some -- a bit of questioning from the Commissioners on the energy cost adjustment. I don't believe that's confidential.
A. No.
Q. Okay. There was a reference to the Settlement Agreement from the last -- or at least from EL12-062.

Is that Settlement in the record of this case?
A. I'm not aware that it is.
Q. Would there be any objection to reference to it since it's been filed with the Commission, if we want to in briefing?

MS. CREMER: Just to clarify, I think 062 was the phase-in, wasn't it? And 061 was the rate case.

Is that the one you want?
MR. MORATZKA: Well, it's my recollection or at least as referred to here in the document, the credit, I think, was from the phase-in.

MS. CREMER: Okay. I would think they could take judicial notice if it's not in the record. I mean,

I'm not sure where you're going.
MR. MORATZKA: I just wanted to preserve my
right to be able to cite to it in briefing if we choose to.

MS. CREMER: Okay.
MR. SMITH: Any objection?
MS. KOENIG: No objection of the Commission
taking judicial notice.
MS. COLLIER: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Okay. We'll take judicial notice of that as an official document.

MR. MORATZKA: Thank you. That's all my -- I
have no further questions.
MR. SMITH: Okay.
Ms. Collier, do you have any follow-on
questions?
MS. COLLIER: No, I do not.
MR. SMITH: Staff?
MS. CREMER: No. Staff does not have any.
Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Okay, Ms. Koenig. I think we're to the last segment here.

MS. KOENIG: I have no further questions for Mr. White.

MR. SMITH: Okay. You may step down, Mr. White.

Thank you.
(The witness is excused.)
MR. SMITH: We are at 11:53. Should we take a break before the next witness is called, everybody? Are you ready?

Okay. I'm seeing the Chairman say yes so I think we do. We'll be in recess until what should we say, about -- should we reconvene, say 1:10, 1:15?

How about 1:15.
(A lunch recess is taken)
MR. SMITH: I'll call the hearing back to order in Docket ELI4-026, Black Hills rate increase request.

We were in Black Hills's direct testimony here, and $I$ will look to Mr. Magnuson and Ms. Koenig to take the next step.

MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you, Mr. Smith.
With the Commission's permission, there are two brief procedural matters that $I$ would like to cover before we go on to our next witness, if that's acceptable.

MR. SMITH: Sure. Unless -- you know, we'll see. Why don't you explain them, and we'll see if anybody objects.

MR. MAGNUSON: Okay.
The first item has to do with Exhibit 64. And
you will note in Exhibit 64 it was a letter to the Commission dated September 24, 2014, signed by Jon Thurber. And basically what we did was we updated some tariff sheets with regard to the proposed applicability provisions in the residential demand service tariff.

And as part of that letter we indicated that the company will move to strike the associated testimony of Kyle D. White beginning on page 10, line 15 through page 12, line 7 from the record. And we had failed to move to do that.

And so we would make that motion now. And that is with regard to prefiled direct testimony to strike the associated testimony of Kyle D. White beginning on page 10, line 15 through page 12, line 7. And for all practical purposes, it's no longer applicable to this hearing.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Moratzka, any objection? Do you
want to find it first or --
MR. MORATZKA: That would be helpful.
I'm sorry, counsel. What exhibit were you
referring to?
MR. MAGNUSON: 64.
MR. SMITH: Is that Kyle's direct in the
Application?

MR. MAGNUSON: That's correct.
MR. SMITH: The original direct.
MR. MAGNUSON: That is correct.
MR. MORATZKA: Mr. Magnuson, I have Exhibit 64.
I guess what I'm -- all right. It's set out in the letter.

MR. MAGNUSON: Yes, it is.
MR. SMITH: It's the net metering stuff.
MR. MORATZKA: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier.
MS. COLLIER: I understand that that portion was voluntarily -- that issue was voluntarily taken off the table as far as an additional cost to those who want to use solar panels. But net metering was not addressed.

I'm not clear why they're requesting to have this other than is it just because it's not an issue at this point in time?

MR. SMITH: It's because they've withdrawn it, is my understanding. Right? It's been withdrawn from the filing.

So, well, the issue of metering, you know, if you want to have one of the witnesses here take it up with somebody, subject to whatever objections, I think that's fine.

But I think here it's just to make the exhibits
reflect what really exists at this point in terms of request for approval by the Commission, that they're no longer requesting that be a part of the filing.

MS. COLLIER: May I ask another question just
for clarification of the terminology?
We're not really talking about net metering per se. We're talking about the additional amount that would have been charged to those -- to those who were putting solar energy back into that.

MR. MAGNUSON: Right.
MS. COLLIER: It's not really --
MR. SMITH: No. It's behind the meter
generation, yes. I'm sorry.
MS. COLLIER: I have no objection.
MR. SMITH: Okay. I had my glasses down, and when $I$ looked over there $I$ couldn't read what it said. My apologies.

Staff.
MS. CREMER: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Your Motion is granted.
MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you. And with the Commission's indulgence, $I$ would like to bring up one more procedural matter.

MR. SMITH: Any objection, Commissioner?
Yes, sir.

MR. MAGNUSON: Well, it certainly pains me so say this, but as might have been noted during Kyle White's testimony, apparently some of the schedules that were supposed to be in exhibit binder were not there.

And so what we will do with the Commission's permission is that we will make sure that that exhibit binder exactly matches the prefiled documents, and we'll do that before the end of the hearing.

In the meantime we have one of our binders up there that does have all of the schedules and statements so that the witness can refer to that. And we'll make sure to correct our court reporter's exhibit binder prior to the end of the hearing, if that's acceptable.

MR. SMITH: You're talking the actual exhibit. MR. MAGNUSON: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Because mine has it in there.
MR. MAGNUSON: Yes. It's not in the exhibit binder that will be the official record for the court reporter.

MR. SMITH: Okay.
Any objection, Mr. Moratzka?
MR. MORATZKA: No.
MR. SMITH: I think we want those in there.
MR. MAGNUSON: Yes.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier.

MS. COLLIER: No.
MS. CREMER: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Okay. That Motion is granted as
well.
And who is next? Is it Ms. Koenig or
Mr. Magnuson?
MS. KOENIG: It's me. And Black Hills Power would like to call Chris Kilpatrick.
(The witness is sworn by the court reporter.) DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. KOENIG:
Q. Good afternoon. Please state your name for the record.
A. My name is Chris Kilpatrick.
Q. Who is your employer?
A. I'm employed by Black Hills Utility Holdings, Inc.
Q. How long have you been employed by the company?
A. I've been employed now for 15 years.
Q. What is your professional title?
A. I am the Director of Regulatory.
Q. Please provide a brief summary of your professional background.
A. I was in public accounting for about five years. I've been a CPA for a little over 17 years. And I've held various positions in Black Hills Corporation from
internal audit to a controller to a director of accounting. And my current role in regulatory since 2008.
Q. Approximately how many rate cases have you worked on through the your career?
A. I've worked on just over 15 rate cases now.
Q. Have you testified before this Commission prior to today?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Were you involved in the preparation of the rate case that is presently before the Commission?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Please summarize your involvement.
A. I helped provide guidance on developing the schedules and statements for the revenue requirement and the overall testimony as well.
Q. Did you file direct testimony in this Docket?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did you also file rebuttal testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. What issues are you prepared to address today?
A. I will be focusing on the Black Hills Utility

Holdings and Black Hills Service Company allocated costs as represented in the settlement.
Q. Were there other topics covered in your direct
testimony?
A. Yes, there were.
Q. For the purposes of this hearing is another witness adopting the balance of your testimony?
A. Yes. Jon Thurber will be adopting the rest of my direct testimony.

MS. KOENIG: At this time Mr. Kilpatrick is available to answer questions regarding corporate cost allocations.

MR. SMITH: Black Hills Industrial.
MR. MORATZKA: No questions. Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Questions, Ms. Collier?
MS. COLLIER: No questions.
MR. SMITH: Staff.
MS. CREMER: Staff has no questions. Thank you.
MR. SMITH: I think you may step down.
Unless -- oh, Commissioners. Commissioner questions.
Any Commissioner questions?
There are none so $I$ think that's it. You may step down.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
(The witness is excused.)
MR. SMITH: Black Hills, please call your next witness.

MS. KOENIG: Jon Thurber.
(The witness is sworn by the court reporter.)
DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. KOENIG:
Q. Please state your name for the record.
A. My name is Jon Thurber.
Q. Who is your employer?
A. I'm employed by Black Hills Utility Holdings, a wholly own subsidiary of Black Hills Corporation.
Q. How long have you been employed by Utility Holdings?
A. Almost two years now.
Q. Please provide a summary of your professional background.
A. Prior to my employment at Black Hills Utility Holdings $I$ was employed at the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission as a utility analyst. In that role I analyzed and testified on rate making matters regarding electric and natural gas utility companies.
Q. Approximately how many rate cases have you worked on throughout your career?
A. Over 10 now.
Q. Were you involved in the preparation of the rate case that is presently before the Commission?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Please summarize your involvement.
A. I supervised the preparation of the revenue
requirement in this proceeding.
Q. Did you file direct testimony in this Docket?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did you also file rebuttal testimony?
A. Yes, I did. And there's one correction I would like to make.

Do you have the exhibit number of my rebuttal
testimony?
Q. Exhibit 70 .
A. On page 6, line 2 of my rebuttal testimony, the
figure should be $\$ 100,000$ instead of $\$ 300,000$.
Q. Are there any other changes that you would like to make to your rebuttal testimony?
A. No, there is not.
Q. Are you adopting the testimony of any other witnesses who filed testimony in this Docket?
A. Yes. I'm adopting the testimony of Chris Kilpatrick except regarding corporate cost allocations.
Q. Are you familiar with the Settlement Agreement that
is presently pending for approval before the Commission?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Were you involved in the efforts that culminated in
the Settlement Agreement?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Please describe your involvement.
A. I reviewed the settlement revenue requirement. I also assisted in the rate design and preparation of the settlement documents.
Q. In your opinion, do the terms of the Settlement

Agreement result in just and reasonable rates?
A. Yes. I believe the Settlement Agreement results in just and reasonable rates.

MS. KOENIG: At this time Mr. Thurber is available for questions.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Black Hills Industrial
Interveners.
MR. MORATZKA: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MORATZKA:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Thurber.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Sorry we have to be inside on this beautiful day.

I would like to start with a couple of questions on your rebuttal testimony, Exhibit 70. If I could have you turn to page 3.

Are you there?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Thank you. As I understand your testimony on pages 19 and 20, you are asserting that Mr. Kollen is ignoring the plain language of $\operatorname{ARSD} 20: 10: 13: 44 ;$ is that
correct?
A. Yes, that is.
Q. And so is it fair to read into that statement that you, Mr. Thurber, believe that the plain language of that Administrative Rule should control?
A. Could you please repeat the question.

MR. MORATZKA: Could the court reporter, please. (Reporter reads back the last question.)
A. I believe that the plain language states 24 months in the Administrative Rule and not 12 months.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Thurber.

But I guess to answer my question, do you believe the plain language of the Administrative Rule should govern the present dispute regarding adjustments to the test year?
A. I believe the language in the Administrative Rule should be followed by the Commission in determining what adjustment should be included in this rate case.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Thurber.

MR. MORATZKA: I have a line of questioning that relies on a few exhibits, if I may approach.

MR. SMITH: Pardon me now? I'm sorry.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: He wants to approach.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Yeah. You may. Unless, is there objection from anybody?

Yes.
(Exhibit BHII 8 is marked for identification)
Q. Mr. Thurber, do you have in front of you what's been marked as exhibit Black Hills Industrial Intervener Exhibit No. 8?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And could you identify the document for me, please.
A. Yes. This was provided in response to Black Hills Industrial Intervener Request No. 62.
Q. Thank you. And just to perhaps walk through the pages here because what we have is somewhat abbreviated version of the lengthy response, if we turn to the page number which has been marked BHP-BHII-001152, which is page 2 of the document, would you agree, Mr. Thurber, that this is the first page of Attachment 62-A referenced in the response to Industrial Request No. 62?
A. Subject to check, yes.
Q. Thank you. And then starting on the next page, which is marked Bates stamp BHP-BHII-001411, and looking at the page numbers that appear to be sequential for the next four pages, does that appear to be Exhibits 6 and 7 to the decommissioning construction agreement referenced in the response?
A. Subject to check, yes.
Q. Thank you.

Moving on to the page which has been labeled service agreement at the top and Bates stamped BHP-BHII-001451, is that the service agreement -- first page of the service agreement referenced as Attachment 62-B to the information request?
A. Subject to check, yes.

MR. MORATZKA: And I would note that I think we're getting into some confidential information.

MR. SMITH: It appears that some of it's labeled that way. The data request response isn't, but the rest of it is.

MR. MORATZKA: I'll defer to the company.
MR. SMITH: It's marked confidential.
MS. KOENIG: Yeah. Contracts are considered by the company to be confidential so if we're going to get into questioning about the substance of the contracts, then the company would consider that information to be confidential.

MR. SMITH: Okay. We're going to go into confidential session then.

Sorry, folks.
(Beginning of confidential portion of transcript.)










(End of confidential portion of transcript.)
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Mr. Thurber, you heard my earlier question for Mr. White that he so deftly threw your direction regarding the Atlas storm.

And in the back of my mind it seems I remember hearing this 9 to 10 million dollar figure thrown out as being the cost to the company to repair some of those damages. And in this we're seeing only about 2.5 million. So help me understand how we went from a very high figure to what some might consider a more reasonable figure.

THE WITNESS: I'm not exactly sure where the 9 to 10 million dollar amount is coming from, but I'll give you a little bit of background on what's included in Winter Storm Atlas. O\&M adjustment, and then there's also capital costs too that aren't included in that $O \& M$ adjustment.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: And if you would just explain all of that, $I$ think certainly from my perspective and also the public's perspective, $I$ think an explanation would be helpful.

THE WITNESS: Sure.
So Winter Storm Atlas storm damage costs that are asked to be recovered in this case are the incremental $O \& M$ costs. So if you use internal labor, we
only included what was deemed to be incremental. So that could be one part of the difference.

Another part is the 2 and a half million -- we had almost 2 million dollars worth of capital costs that were included on Statement $D$ as a pro forma adjustment. So based on this case we have about 2.3 million dollars in the Settlement related to Winter Storm Atlas amortized over 10 years. And then we also have approximately 1.7, 1.8 million dollars worth of capital costs.

So I'm aware of closer to 4 million versus the 10 million. And $I$ don't know where the 10 million dollar figure is coming from, whether it was -- included co-op costs or what, but that's what's actually reflected in the Settlement.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. That helps.
Again, going back to a lot of the public comments that we got, a lot of the public were saying, well, don't you have insurance to cover this type of thing?

So, I mean, two questions. Was there insurance coverage for any of this, and if not, can you explain to us and the public why not.

THE WITNESS: There was no insurance coverage for this storm. Generally speaking, there's not a liquid insurance market for storm damage costs. You would have
to go to a specialized -- have it specifically underwritten for property damage related to storms. So it's not a liquid market, which means that there would be high deductibles.

Our property insurance is currently set at a million dollar deductible. So if you look at the past 20 years' worth of storms, we have not had a storm that would even have triggered that amount over the deductible.

So from an insurance standpoint it's really not feasible. It's not cost effective for customers. When you're dealing with a one-in-100-year storm the lower cost, long-term solution is just to pay for those expenses when they're incurred.

Because you don't want to include an allowance in your base rates, assuming a one-in-100-year storm. I mean, that wouldn't be reflective of our cost going forward so it's better just to pay for those costs when they incur.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so you can assure us we won't be facing these kinds of expenses for another 100 years?

THE WITNESS: I'm going to rely on the weatherman for that. But $I$ certainly hope not.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think the Commission would
agree with you on that point. I appreciate that.
In the aftermath of that storm a lot of people incurred a lot of different expense. Obviously, homeowners to clean up some of their mess. We're all familiar with the ranchers that had their catastrophe. A lot of people put a lot of money in a fund to help ranchers and folks recover as best they could from that tremendous storm.

And so the question I've got in relation to the Atlas expenses that your company incurred, have the shareholders picked up any of that expense, or is 100 percent of that being placed on ratepayers?

THE WITNESS: Our employees worked very, very hard to restore service to our customers. We've never had that level of outage before in our service territory. As a result, there were bonuses paid for people working 13- to 16-hour days for multiple weeks, sleeping inside our buildings, not going home to see their family over that weekend. Very pleased with our safety results. We didn't have one reported incident.

As a result of their efforts, there were bonuses paid to employees. Commission Staff reviewed those costs, determined that they couldn't support it as included in the Settlement, and the company agreed that shareholders should have to pay for bonuses associated
with that event.
Otherwise, you know, we used a lot of contractors. We didn't just rely on internal resources. We pulled people from multiple states from different utilities to get our system up and running as fast as we could, and for those costs we determined that those incremental costs are reasonable for recovery in rates.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: And so if I'm understanding correctly, the only portion of the cost the shareholders might have picked up would be for those bonuses; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Well, we only recovered the incremental costs. So we took a look and saw if folks -our employees, they only got -- we only got recovery for that as that was above normal operations. Our normal operations, we figured that those were recovered through our base rates, and we didn't need to request that.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: So, again, the only portion of that entire storm damage cost the shareholders are picking up would be those bonuses; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: And is that a number that you can quantify? And, if so, can it be done in open session, or do we have to do that in confidential?

THE WITNESS: I believe it was included in -- I
believe it was included in Staff's memo. I don't recall if that specific dollar amount -- otherwise, we can go to confidential.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I'm looking at Staff to see if they recall. I don't recall seeing that figure but --

THE WITNESS: Perhaps it was in Ms. Mehlhaff's exhibit to the revenue requirement.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, in any case, if it was there, it would be --

MS. COLLIER: I believe it's page 11. Page 11 of the Staff memorandum.

MS. CREMER: It would be on Staff's memo that's BAM-3, Schedule 10. It is not labeled as confidential. Line 4.

Would everyone agree that that's not confidential?

MS. KOENIG: Can I come look at your copy, Karen?

MS. CREMER: Sure.
MS. KOENIG: I agree the amount is in an exhibit that's not marked as confidential.

MS. CREMER: Okay. That amount, did you want me to give that amount, or did you find it?

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Can you give me the exhibit number again? BAM?

MS. CREMER: -3, Schedule 10. It's 1 of 1 . And the caption on it is Storm Atlas Regulatory Asset In System Inspection Cost.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Which page?
MS. CREMER: Under -- if you looked on the web page under Staff's memo, it's Schedule 10, following Schedule 9.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I'm sorry. I was on
Schedule 1. That doesn't work.
MS. CREMER: Okay.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: I see the figure.
Mr. Thurber, I have no further questions.
MR. SMITH: Other Commissioner questions?
CHAIRMAN NELSON: I'd just like to make a statement. I don't want anyone in this proceeding to construe that $I$ disapprove in any way of how your company handled that storm recovery. That is not a question in my mind whatsoever.

I think you all did a fine job in that. Simply looking at some of the dollar figures.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Mr. Thurber, in your rebuttal testimony on page 16 you address an error in the allocation to South Dakota for transmission load dispatch cost.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So do you believe that the Commission should correct that in the Settlement?

THE WITNESS: No, I do not. The reason that I don't believe the Commission should correct that in the Settlement is because we agreed to an overall revenue requirement figure. And we came to that figure, each party, with our own unique analysis.

During the process when errors were found the company had an opportunity to negotiate differently or to propose other adjustments as part of the process.

I think I've shown through testimony that there were other costs that went up from the test year that weren't adjusted that more than cover the error that has been identified. So $I$ would request that the Commission not adjust the Settlement.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So, Mr. Thurber, are you talking about Wyodak?

MR. THURBER: Yes, I am.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So what is the difference between the Wyodak adjustment that you would possibly propose if we looked at the transmission adjustment? What would be the difference in that?

THE WITNESS: I'm just going to look to find the exhibit. One moment.

So according to JTR-1, the South Dakota
pro forma adjustment would be $\$ 412,000$ to adjust the Wyodak O\&M costs to the most recent 12 months. Whereas the transmission allocation error was approximately $\$ 280,000$.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you. Just to review your pension expense on page 21, you gave us five years. And it certainly shows that a defined benefit is a volatile type of expense. I continue to ask this question of why utilities -- and I understand defined benefit is a standard in utilities, but it certainly isn't in the business world, why you would not go to a defined contribution, which is more of a reliable or a more forebudgetable expense, if that's a word -- probably not -- so the ratepayers aren't always stuck if the market goes down?

THE WITNESS: As we have -- new employees are no longer eligible for the defined benefit plan, defined pension plan.

You know, when $I$ joined the company I'm only eligible for the $401(k)$ plan so it's a defined contribution rather than a defined benefit plan.

So we're taking measures to normalize that expense so that it isn't as volatile in the future. So new employees are no longer eligible for the pension plan.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you. I did not
realize that or didn't read that properly. So thank you for taking steps to make sure ratepayers are paying a cost but not always taking the risk. I appreciate that.

MR. SMITH: Additional Commissioner questions?
Chairman Nelson.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: I want to follow up on
Commissioner Fiegen's question regarding the transmission adjustment error. And $I$ think we all understand that that was an error to the tune of 280,000 .

In my mind something that's an admitted error is different than a Wyodak situation where you're looking at using a different time period, not necessarily an error but just using a different time period.

Can you understand why it would be difficult for Commissioners that has a known error in it?

THE WITNESS: I certainly can understand. This information wasn't available to us during the settlement discussions. We first found out on December 30 .

Generally speaking, when you have a settlement you have a firm revenue requirement that everybody agrees to that any material modifications to the settlement, you know, either party can back away from the settlement.

I would just ask the Commission to consider that if you open up the Settlement to consider an error or new
information, that you also consider other new information that's presented to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Additional Commissioner questions?
I'm not seeing any.
So with that, $I$ think I'll turn to Mr. Moratzka so we can wind up with Black Hills on proper redirect here.

MR. MORATZKA: Thank you. Just a moment. RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MORATZKA:
Q. Thank you. Mr. Thurber, just a quick clarification for my own understanding of the settlement.

I heard you just testify in response to one of the Commissioner's questions that you and Commission Staff agreed to an overall revenue requirement figure. Is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And so am I reading into that statement correctly that this settlement is more akin to a black box than it is to a line item by line item revenue adjustment?
A. No. It's not a black box settlement. Commission Staff has a very detailed Staff memorandum that outlines how they calculated the revenue requirement. The company in its Settlement Stipulation that we signed said that
both parties may have had differing views on how we came to the total revenue requirement.

You know, Commission Staff justifies it by line item by line item, but the company's not in exact agreement in how we justified getting to that number.
Q. And just to put a finer point on it, the line item by line item adjustment that the Commission Staff has contains the error regarding -- yeah. The BH Utility Holdings Company allocation; correct?
A. That's correct.

MR. MORATZKA: Thank you. No further questions.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier?
MS. COLLIER: No questions.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Staff.
MS. CREMER: Thank you. I do have a question. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. CREMER:
Q. Mr. Thurber, earlier Commissioner Nelson had asked Mr. White about salary studies or possibly what Black Hills had provided Staff.

Could you summarize that for us, please.
A. Sure. Commission Staff submitted multiple data requests requesting information regarding our salaries. For example, we provided union contracts, which specifically identify wage rates by employee position.

We also provided over 50 salary studies provided by outside consulting firms to help justify and form our salary compensation practices. There was also another data request that compared Black Hills Power's salaries to local cooperatives in the area.

So Commission Staff did inquire and we produced information to support our current salaries. If the Commission decides necessary, we could submit those responses to those data requests in this proceeding, if it would like.

MS. CREMER: Thank you. That's all I have.
So I didn't know if you wanted us to put
something like that in. That data request and response is not in the record. It is -- the one I'm looking at is 2-6. I'm not sure of the second one you're referring to. But we could find all of that if you wanted it, but that is not in the exhibits as they currently exist.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I would like that. I'm
assuming that would be confidential or -- it would be confidential, but $I$ would have access to that to consider. I would appreciate that, yes.

MS. CREMER: Certainly. So that will just go in as Staff Exhibit 2. I can put it in. And we'll get that filed by the end of the hearing -- or not today maybe but by Thursday.

That work?
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.
MS. CREMER: Yes.
MR. SMITH: Okay. We'll turn to Black Hills for redirect.

MS. KOENIG: Just briefly.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. KOENIG:
Q. Mr. Thurber, you were asked whether the Settlement requires customers to prepay decommissioning cost. Do you remember that line of questioning?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What is the status of the work on the decommissioning of the Osage plant?
A. The Osage plant has been completely dismantled at this point in time. I believe, from my recollection, the engineers have indicated that it's 90 percent complete.
Q. Has the company already spent more than the first
year amortization to the planned decommissioning for the three power plants?
A. I believe if you take a look at the unrecovered plant balance and the obsolete inventory, there's probably 40 years worth of -- subject to check, there's multiple years of amortization.

In terms of the actual expenses incurred, I'm not
aware of how much is incurred related to that specific decommission contract.
Q. And then switching gears to the line of questioning related to modifications to the revenue requirements under the Settlement Agreement, did the company agree to a two-year rate moratorium as part of the revenue requirement?
A. Yes, we did.

MS. KOENIG: Thank you. I have no further questions.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Barring something extraordinary, $I$ think you may step down, Mr. Thurber.
(The witness is excused.)
MR. SMITH: I note that the next witness appears to be on the telephone; is that correct?

MR. MAGNUSON: That is correct, Mr. Smith. And in case anybody's been noticing, I've been on my phone e-mailing Mr. Spanos because we've gone much more quickly than $I$ expected this afternoon as compared to this morning. So I believe he will be available now, and if not now, very shortly.

MR. SMITH: Should we take a short break?
Because I wasn't sure if we needed to do something to set this up.

Why don't we take a 10-minute break, something
like that. What time is it?
Okay. At 2:30, 2:35 we'll begin.
(A short recess is taken)
MR. SMITH: We'll call the hearing back to order after a short recess here. The next witness is going to be on the phone.

Tina or somebody, do you want to explain to us briefly what special things might need to be done here?

MS. DOUGLAS: The only thing you need to
remember is to turn off your mics. after you've talked to John on the phone because he'll get feedback, and he won't hear it.

And, John, we do have a court reporter here so you need to make sure you speak clearly for her.

MR. SMITH: With that, Black Hills please call your next witness.

MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you, Mr. Smith.
We would call John J. Spanos, please.
Mr. Spanos, would you please state your name for the record.

MR. SMITH: We need to swear him in, and that's got to be done by Chairman Nelson.
(The witness is sworn by Chairman Nelson.)
MR. SMITH: Please proceed.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MAGNUSON:
Q. Thank you. Would you please state your name for the record.
A. John J. Spanos, S-P, as in Paul, A-N-O-S.
Q. And would you please state your business address.
A. 207 Senate Avenue, Camp Hill, Pennsylvania 17011.
Q. Mr. Spanos, who is your employer?
A. Gannett Fleming, Incorporated.
Q. And what is the business of your employer?
A. The firm is an engineering consulting firm out of Camp Hill, Pennsylvania. That's our headquarters. And my particular division, which is the valuation rate consultants group, does work for utility companies in the area of depreciation.
Q. How long have you been with the employer?
A. I've been with the firm since June of 1986. Almost 29 years.
Q. Would you please provide us with an overview of your qualifications to give this testimony today.
A. Yes. I've been conducting depreciation studies as my primary duties since June of 1986. I've been the project manager on the majority of those projects since the mid-1990s.

The duties include depreciation studies, original
cost and valuation studies for many different utilities in the electric, gas, water, waste water, railroads, some telephone, pipelines, all those industries.

And the studies include testifying where necessary, which I have testified or submitted testimony in over 190 cases.
Q. Mr. Spanos, so do I understand that you have over 29 years of experience in the specialized area of depreciation?
A. Yes. Almost 29 years. This June.
Q. Did you prefile testimony in this matter?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. What was the purpose of your prefiled testimony?
A. The purpose of the testimony was to develop the appropriate depreciation rates for Black Hills Power. The study was done as of December 31, 2012, plant in service and accumulated depreciation levels.
Q. Did you prepare a Depreciation Study?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And has that Depreciation Study been marked as Exhibit 45 in this matter?
A. Well, I'm not there, but, yes, it has been included in the exhibits as part of the case.
Q. Mr. Spanos, as part of your work with regard to this matter, did you physically observe Black Hills Power's
plant and equipment as part of your depreciation study?
A. Yes. A major component of doing depreciation
studies is to look at the facilities to get an understanding of all of the assets that are in service and also to get an understanding of the type of asset and the layout, particularly of the power plants to get an understanding on not only physically what's there but also to get an opportunity to talk to those in operation of these facilities to understand their light characteristics.
Q. Mr. Spanos, did the Settlement Agreement between Staff and Black Hills Power include an agreement on a 40 -year lifespan for Cheyenne Prairie Generating Station rather than a 35-year lifespan?
A. Yes. That was the primary component for the Cheyenne Prairie Generating Station is the lifespan date, and that was agreed to be 40 years.
Q. And, in your opinion, is 40 years considered reasonable?
A. Yes. I consider 40 years still to be reasonable.
Q. You also prepared a document that was attached to your rebuttal testimony; is that correct?
A. Yes. That document includes the calculation of the Cheyenne Prairie facility with the 40 -year lifespan and the interim light parameter and the net salary
parameter.
Q. Based on your calculations what is the composite rate for the Settlement Agreement as regards
depreciation?
A. 2.98 percent.
Q. And what is the annual depreciation expense for Black Hills Power South Dakota?
A. The annual amount is listed in my rebuttal
testimony. And based on those parameters and a 40 -year
lifespan, the appropriate amount -- just identifying that number. I believe it's 2 million and $\$ 97,000$.
Q. Thank you. Have you had an opportunity to review the testimony of Mr. Kollen?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And you filed rebuttal testimony in response to Mr. Kollen's testimony on depreciation?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Mr. Kollen used a 2.88 percent composite rate; is that correct?
A. Based on his LT-16, that is the percentage that is reflected in his work papers.
Q. And, in your opinion, is that the correct composite rate to use?
A. No. I believe the 2.98 percent is what should be used.
Q. Mr. Kollen challenged the inclusion of terminal net salvage and depreciation rates. Is that your understanding?
A. Yes. Based on his testimony, that is my understanding.
Q. Why are the arguments of Mr. Kollen flawed?
A. Well, $I$ think the primary concern that $I$ have with his presentation is, one, it doesn't match the uniform system of accounts or authoritative text on the proper full recovery of the service value of the assets. The dismantlement is a component of the cost of removal, which should be included in rates based on the uniform system of accounts and current practices for utility companies.

And the other component that is concerning to me was his proposal to wait until the facilities are actually retired causes an intergenerational inequity circumstance where customers are paying for costs that they do not get the benefit of.

And those are the two primary concerns that I have if we do not include terminal net salvage in rates.
Q. Are there any other key elements that you believe
are lacking in Mr. Kollen's analysis?
A. Well, the other components in what has been put together is, one, I don't believe he's gone to visit the
facilities. But more importantly, it looks as though the information that he bases on does not include up-to-date historical data on the net salvage -- interim net salvage components that are part of the rates. That seems to be lacking.

And there also seems to be within his calculations remaining lives that are utilized that don't match the expectation of the parameters that are in place that do not seem to be challenged outside of the net salvage percent.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Spanos. Do you stand by your prefiled and rebuttal testimony?
A. Yes, I do.

MR. MAGNUSON: At this time we will tender
Mr. Spanos for questioning by opposing counsel and the Commission.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Moratzka.
MR. MORATZKA: No questions. Thank you.
MR. SMITH: No questions.
Ms. Collier.
MS. COLLIER: No questions.
MR. SMITH: Staff.
MS. CREMER: Staff has no questions. Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Commissioners.
I guess none of them have any questions either.

So I guess that's it, Mr. Spanos.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, thank you very much.
I appreciate the time.
MR. SMITH: You may be excused. Thank you. (The witness is excused.)

MR. MAGNUSON: May we proceed?
MR. SMITH: We may proceed. Do you need to make any changes?

MR. MAGNUSON: Black Hills Power would call to the stand Robert Hollibaugh.
(The witness is sworn by the court reporter.) DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. KOENIG:
Q. Would you please state your name for the record.
A. Robert Hollibaugh. $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{U}-\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{H}$.
Q. And what is your business address?
A. 625 Ninth Street, Rapid City, South Dakota.
Q. And who is your employer?
A. I am employed by Black Hills Service Company, which
is a wholly owned subsidiary of Black Hills Corporation.
Q. You're testifying today on behalf of Black Hills

Power?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you please review for us your employment history and particularly with regard to matters regarding
accounting?
A. I am -- I've been with Black Hills Service Company just short of 10 years. Prior to that $I$ was with two national public accounting firms, KPMG and Arthur Anderson. And prior to that was about 15 years with Northwestern Public Service Company at that time.
Q. In your work with the accounting firms did that work include preparation of tax returns for investor-owned utilities?
A. It did. It included not only compliance tax return related work, tax consulting, tax controversy, it included issues before the IRS, State, and those types of matters.
Q. Do I assume that that also includes what I would call tax controversy matters?
A. That is correct.
Q. Was that a substantial part of your work at those accounting firms?
A. It was a -- it was a key component.
Q. And $I$ understand that you're a CPA; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. How long have you been a CPA?
A. About 26 years.
Q. Hollibaugh, would you please describe for the Commission your current duties and responsibilities on
behalf of Black Hills Corporation.
A. I am responsible for all tax-related matters for the entire Black Hills Corporation group. And that includes supporting regulatory cases, matters such as this, for
all our regulated businesses including Black Hills Power.
Q. And just to clarify, when you say that you do the -all tax-related matters for Black Hills Corporation, does that include all of the subsidiaries of Black Hills Corporation?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Now you filed rebuttal testimony in this matter; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. But you did not file direct testimony; correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony to respond
to arguments and positions taken by Mr. Kollen?
A. It is.
Q. So I assume you've read the testimony of Mr. Kollen?
A. I have.
Q. And you have filed rebuttal testimony regarding

Mr. Kollen's testimony on net operating losses and accumulated deferred income taxes?
A. I have.
Q. Can $I$ refer to those as NOL and ADIT?
A. Yes.
Q. That's common in the industry, isn't it?
A. Correct.
Q. Now I understand that Kollen has recommended to the Commission that it not allow an adjustment to rate base for ADIT associated with net operating losses generated for income tax purposes.

Do you agree with Mr. Kollen's position?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Why not?
A. For the reasons that $I$ have described or delineated in my rebuttal testimony.
Q. Now is the inclusion of an appropriate amount of NOL and ADIT in rate base, which is reflected in the Settlement Agreement, is that in accordance with the normalization rules of the Internal Revenue Code and applicable regulations?
A. It is.
Q. And have you analyzed the normalization rules of the Internal Revenue Code in your rebuttal testimony?
A. I did.
Q. And do the normalization rules apply to Black Hills Power?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. What are the consequences if a utility violates the tax normalization rules?
A. If a company is found in violation by IRS, they are relegated then to use book life and method for tax depreciation purposes, which means a much longer life and a much slower method.
Q. Would the violation of the normalization rules have a substantial adverse effect on Black Hills Power?
A. Yes, they would. The company -- well, the deferred taxes as provided through accelerated depreciation or the use of this accelerated depreciation including bonus depreciation provides a critical element of capital for the company that otherwise would have to be financed by other means if we're found in violation.
Q. And just as importantly, would the violation of the normalization rules have a substantial adverse effect on ratepayers of Black Hills Power?
A. It would.
Q. If the Commission adopted the position Mr. Kollen, in your opinion, would the result be a violation of the normalization rules?
A. It would.

MS. KOENIG: That is all of the questions that $I$ have for this witness at this time, and $I$ would tender him for examination.
MR. SMITH: Please proceed when ready,
Black Hills Industrial.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MORATZKA:
Q. Good afternoon, Hollibaugh.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I'd like to just ask a couple of very brief
questions on your testimony surrounding NOL and ADIT.
Could I have you refer to page 19 of your rebuttal
testimony.
A. Okay.
Q. And as $I$ understand it, Mr. Hollibaugh, you're citing four private letter rulings or PLRs to support your position stated in your rebuttal testimony; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And are you aware of any private letter rulings from the IRS that are contrary or state an alternative position to the PLR cited in your rebuttal testimony?
A. There is a -- there is one other -- there is a private letter ruling that is not on -- a little bit different in how the service came to a much -- a conclusion that was conflicting and contradictory not only to this PLR from 1988 but has basically been somewhat -- I think of it as superseded by the subsequent
rulings of 2014 , the three rulings.
Q. PLRs aren't precedential, are they?
A. They are not.
Q. Thank you. Are you aware of any instance in which the IRS has issued a notice of violation to a utility?
A. I am not.
Q. You would agree, Mr. -- let me restate the prior question. I didn't quite finish.

Are you aware of an instance which the IRS has issued a notice of violation to a utility for violating the normalization rules related to the NOL ADIT issue that you raise in your rebuttal testimony?
A. I am not.
Q. Thank you. And if such a notice of violation were issued, you would agree, wouldn't you, that there would be an opportunity for a utility to cure that violation? A. That is correct. MR. MORATZKA: Thank you. No further questions. MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier, any questions? MS. COLLIER: No. MR. SMITH: Staff.

MS. CREMER: Staff does not have any. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Commissioners.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: I do.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Please proceed, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN NELSON: Am I correct that the use of accelerated or bonus depreciation was a significant factor in creating the net operating losses?

THE WITNESS: That is correct. Without accelerated depreciation including the bonus depreciation Black Hills Power would have not been in a net operating loss position.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: So why would the company choose to use the accelerator bonus depreciation to a point that would create the net operating losses? I can understand it using it up to the point of zeroing out income but why use it to go into the NOL situation which ultimately caused you to have to role that forward.

THE WITNESS: The net effect actually to
customers as a result we've increased the deferred tax liabilities. But we also have -- there is somewhat of a mitigating offset by the deferred tax asset created by the NOL.

But the net result is a net increase to deferred tax liabilities, net reduction to rate base. And which is to the benefit of customers.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: This helps me.
Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Other Commissioner questions?

I'm not seeing any. Advisor or --
Any follow-on, Mr. Moratzka, following
Commissioner Nelson's question?
MR. MORATZKA: Nothing.
MR. SMITH: Anything, Ms. Collier?
Wait a minute. Oh, you have one? Oh, Greg does.

MR. RISLOV: This is Greg Rislov for the Commission. I did have a question following on Mr. Moratzka's question.

Are you aware of any utility that has attempted to -- any utility or Commission that has attempted to depreciate in opposition to that private letter ruling and if there's been any follow up to that?

In other words, has there been a violation that you're aware of?

THE WITNESS: None that I'm aware of. I mean, the issue of this potential violation of this normalization rules is a self-reporting issue to the Internal Revenue Service. But the fact that I think in that particular ruling -- private letter ruling Mr. Moratzka referred to where the service reached a conclusion that was contradictory to their longstanding practice but then somewhat was reversed by these three subsequent rulings in 2014, a lot of practitioners and
people in the industry including myself think that PLR was an anomaly.

MR. RISLOV: But you have not heard of anyone test that conclusion?

THE WITNESS: Not test that conclusion. Because
this was a decision that was reached by IRS based on those particular set of facts and circumstances.

MR. RISLOV: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Any additional Commissioner, advisor questions?

Okay. Any follow on, Mr. Moratzka?
MR. MORATZKA: Nothing. Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier, nothing.
MS. COLLIER: No.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Ms. Cremer.
MS. CREMER: No. Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Mr. Magnuson.
MR. MAGNUSON: I have no additional questions for this witness.

Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Okay. You may be excused. You may step down.
(The witness is excused.)
MR. SMITH: Are you ready to call your next
witness?

MR. MAGNUSON: Well, $I$ believe at this point we've called all five of the witnesses that we intended to call.

So unless the Commission or others have questions for any of those witnesses that we indicated that we would have available by phone, we are in a position where we are going to rest at this time, this being the end of our direct testimony, with the right to recall rebuttal witnesses and testimony and exhibits.

MR. SMITH: Commissioners, do you have anything you want to follow up on in response to Mr. Magnuson's offer to allow questioning of other people?

No. Okay. With that, should we proceed immediately with your case, Mr. Moratzka, or do you want to take a break to get organized or --

MR. MORATZKA: Mr. Smith, it might be helpful to just take a short five-minute break to get documents in order, but $I$ think we're ready to go.
(A short recess is taken)
MR. SMITH: Okay. We're calling the hearing back to order in October EL14-026, Black Hills rate case. And we're ready to --

I wanted to remind everybody on the phone to please hit your mute button when you're not actually speaking because we are getting a little feedback in here
every once in awhile. So please think of that, if you would.

With that, we'll turn to Mr. Moratzka for your direct case.

MR. MORATZKA: Thank you. Before we get to Mr. Kollen, I guess I'd like the opportunity to make the opening statement.

MR. SMITH: Please, do.
MR. MORATZKA: The Black Hills Industrial
Interveners had hopes of being able to reach a settlement in this proceeding with Black Hills Power, Commission Staff, and any other Intervener that elected to get involved. We have been successful in this endeavor since the 1990 s, to my knowledge.

But after reviewing the record here and participating in the settlement discussions, we could not sign on to the Proposed Settlement because unlike those prior cases, the Proposed Settlement is not supported by the record, and it's not supported by South Dakota Law.

And before I proceed to that discussion, I want to emphasize what this case is not about. This case is not about how much each class should contribute to the revenue requirement.

The Industrial Interveners support the proposed revenue allocations set forth in the Proposed Settlement.

We are, therefore, not seeking to push on costs to other customer classes in order to diminish the amount that the Industrials pay.

Instead, the Industrial Interveners have
submitted testimony and are here today to question the revenue requirement set forth in the Proposed Settlement. In other words, we are making arguments that we believe benefit all ratepayers. Ratepayers who have been subject to rate increases in 2006, 2009, 2012, and now potentially 2014.

We respectfully request the Commission to send a signal now that Black Hills Power needs to curb it's aggressive increases.

Now on to the revenue requirement, we believe that the Proposed Settlement is not supported by the record because, by admission of Black Hills Power and Commission Staff, there is an error in the underlying calculation. The Proposed Settlement also allows for recovery of an unjust, unreasonable, and, indeed, unjustified amount of incentive compensation.

The Proposed Settlement is not supported by South Dakota Law because it provides for numerous adjustments that were known with reasonable -- were not known with reasonable certainty or measurable with reasonable accuracy at the time Black Hills Power filed
this case.
Furthermore, and in direct contravention to South Dakota Law, the proposed adjustments were not accompanied by expected changes in revenue. The result of including adjustments is a dynamic test year, one in which costs allegedly incurred by Black Hills Power well after the test year are presumed prudent and incorporated into Black Hills Power's revenue requirement.

Such adjustments run contrary to the
longstanding regulatory precedent of focusing the analysis on the historic test year. Deviating from this practice can only be allowed in limited circumstances after compliance with South Dakota Law.

Based on our review of the record before you, Black Hills Power has not met its burden to include these adjustments.

Furthermore, there are aspects of the Proposed Settlement that could be modified for the benefit of ratepayers without harming Black Hills Power. For example, as we discussed with Mr. Thurber today, certain costs could be deferred and reviewed in a subsequent rate case when the actual costs are known.
Taking all of Industrial Interveners'
adjustments into account, we believe that Black Hills Power should receive a rate decrease. We greatly
appreciate the Commission's time and careful
consideration of our arguments. We look forward to
continuing today's thoughtful dialogue over the next what appears to be maybe only one day and presenting our rebuttal case.

Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Please call your first witness.

MR. MORATZKA: Thank you.
The Black Hills Industrial Interveners call
Mr. Lane Kollen to the stand.
(The witness is sworn by the court reporter.)
THE WITNESS: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I
have an opening statement. Some of it will overlap. Some won't.

MR. MORATZKA: Mr. Kollen.

MR. SMITH: Is the button on?

THE WITNESS: It's on, but Mr. Moratzka wanted
to introduce me. I'm sorry. I was ready to go.
Go ahead.

MR. MORATZKA: I understand. You're chomping at the bit.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MORATZKA:
Q. Mr. Kollen, could you state and spell your name if you haven't already done so. Caught me off guard a
little bit.
A. My name is Lane Kollen, $\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{N}$.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Kollen.

Did you, Mr. Kollen, file direct testimony in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you, Mr. Kollen, file both a public version and a trade secret version?
A. That's correct.
Q. And, Mr. Kollen, are those documents marked as Exhibit 1 for the public and Exhibit 2 for the trade secret?
A. Yes.
Q. And, Mr. Kollen, if you were asked the questions
that are contained in that testimony today, would your answers largely be the same?
A. They would, with one exception.
Q. And could you provide some more information on that?
A. Yes. On page 43 of my testimony this would --

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Is your mic. on?
THE WITNESS: It is now.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.
A. Page 43 of both versions of my testimony the answer needs to be corrected. Instead of no the answer should be yes. And the rest of the answer can be stricken.
Q. Could you please make that change on the record copy before you.
A. Yes.
Q. And, Mr. Kollen, just so that the other members of the audience are clear where you are, you are on line 1 of page 43?
A. That's correct.
Q. Thank you. And have you made the changes to the record version?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Kollen.

Do you have any other changes, modifications --
A. I do.
Q. -- to your testimony you'd like to address at this time?
A. I do. The table on page 6 of my testimony, I've prepared a replacement for that table that --
Q. Do you mind if $I$ hand out the replacement,

Mr. Kollen. Thanks.
(Exhibit BHII 9 is marked for identification)
Q. Mr. Kollen, do you have before you what's been marked as Black Hills Industrial Interveners Exhibit 9? A. I do.
Q. Thank you. And you were about to describe this table. Could you please continue that discussion.
A. Yes. I made a number of changes under the Proposed Settlement column to further disaggregate the Proposed Settlement numbers.

You'll see that none of the bottom line amounts, for example, the net rate increase or reduction recommendations change. What I've done is reposition some of the Proposed Settlement quantifications so they more closely adhere to the line items describing the issues or the adjustments that you see under Rate Base and then Operating Income and Rate of Return.

As we saw the Staff and the company's rebuttal testimony, we were able to disaggregate some of those adjustments a little bit more cleanly. And so that's primarily what the changes are in the Proposed Settlement column.
Q. And so, Mr. Kollen, just so we can make sure that everyone is clear, what you're trying to do here is make sure that the Proposed Settlement column most closely matches what we're seeing in the Proposed Settlement? A. Yes. That's correct. I can give one example of that.

If you look at the line item under operating income, and if you look at removed Pro Forma Increased Affiliate Allocations From BHUH, you see that under the Proposed Settlement there's an increase in the revenue requirement
of $\$ 527,000$.
We can see on the revised table that that increase is $\$ 241,000$. And the reason for that is that we broke out the error in the Proposed Settlement as a separate line item, the second from the bottom under the Operating Income Adjustments.

So you'll see that that $\$ 527,000$ on the original table now is disaggregated into 241,000 and 286,000 . That just clarifies, puts the right numbers with the right labels with more specificity.
Q. And, Mr. Kollen, just to be absolutely sure, the bottom line number -- the bottom line number does not change in either table?
A. That's correct. None of the numbers in the first column change, which are the recommendations based upon the company's filing. Those are the adjustments that we recommend you make if you want to start with the company's filing.

The second column are the adjustments that are reflected in the Proposed Settlement. The third column is if you want to start with the Proposed Settlement, those are the adjustments that will bring you to the recommendations that $I$ make.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Kollen. And did you prepare an opening statement --
A. I did.
Q. -- to offer today?

MR. MORATZKA: At this point I'd like to move the admission of Black Hills Industrial Interveners Exhibit No. 9.

MR. SMITH: Is there an objection?
MR. MAGNUSON: We have no objection, with the understanding we just saw this for the first time.

Thank you.
MS. COLLIER: No objection.
MS. CREMER: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Okay. BHII 9 is admitted.
Q. Mr. Kollen, I understand you've prepared an opening statement. Could you provide that for us today.
A. Yes. Second try at a start here.

Good afternoon, Commissioners. There will be some overlap as I introduce the general areas that $I$ would like to talk about, but I'll try to keep that to a minimum.

As you know, I'm appearing here today on behalf of the Black Hills Industrial Interveners. This is a group of large commercial and industrial customers that take service from Black Hills Power. The companies that make up Black Hills Industrial Interveners include GCC Dacotah Inc., Pete Lien \& Sons, Inc., Rushmore Forest Products,

Inc., Spearfish Forest Products, Inc., Rapid City Regional Hospital, Inc., and Wharf Resources, USA, Inc.

These customers, as well as other customers, have been subjected to significant increases in the cost that they pay for electricity over the last several years. It is because of these increases that the BHII group has been an active participant in Black Hills Power rate cases.

It is unfortunate that BHII could not join in the Commission Staff's Settlement or reach one directly with the company. That is because we believe that the increase proposed in this case is not supported by the record or by South Dakota Law.

And my comments here today $I$ will provide a brief overview of the company's recent history of rate increases and a brief overview of the process in this proceeding that started with the company's file, led to the Proposed Settlement between the company and Staff and resulted in BHII's opposition to both the company's initial filing and the Proposed Settlement.

And then, finally, I will describe why the company's rates should actually be reduced, not increased, and why the Commission should modify the Proposed Settlement to incorporate the effects of additional adjustments.

The pending case is the fourth general rate case
since 2006 for, on average --
MR. MAGNUSON: Mr. Smith, I'm sorry to interrupt. I'm going to object on the basis of relevancy. I'm not sure what the purpose is of going back to 2006 .

MR. SMITH: Do you have a response, Mr. Moratzka?

MR. MORATZKA: I don't see why this series of rate increases isn't relevant to the current rate case.

MR. SMITH: I'm going to overrule. It's close, but $I$ think it deals with the history of the rate -rates of Black Hills, and $I$ think that's relevant.
A. In 2006 Black Hills Power sought an increase of 9 and a half percent, received an increase of 7.9 percent. In 2009 the company sought an increase of 26.6 percent, and received an increase of 12.7 percent. In 2012 the company sought an increase of 9.9 percent and received an increase of 6.4 percent. In this case the company seeks yet another significant increase of 14.6 million dollars, an overall increase of 9.3 percent and an increase to the general service large industrial contract class of 9.7 percent.

Our firm was retained by BHII to review the company's filing and determine two things: Whether the increase was justified and whether the resulting rates
would be just and reasonable. After a careful and extensive analysis of the company's initial application, we concluded that the company's positions were extremely aggressive and not in the interest of any of its ratepayers, not just the BHII group.

We determined that the requested increase was not supported by sufficient evidence and that certain adjustments were inappropriate or excessive. Once the inappropriate and excessive adjustments are removed and errors are corrected, we believe that a rate reduction of 5.3 million dollars compared to present rates is appropriate.

After filing its case, the company responded to formal discovery from the Staff and from Black Hills Industrial Interveners, which was shared with all parties. In addition, the company responded to informal discovery in the form of e-mails from the Staff. However, that informal discovery was not shared with all parties.

Nevertheless, that informal discovery found its way into the Proposed Settlement as support for the company and the Commission Staff's position. While both BHP and Staff witnesses down play the nature of that discovery in their rebuttal testimony, the fact remains that significant e-mail communications between the company and

Staff occurred during the September, October time frame that were not shared with the other Interveners until January of 2015. In other words, after BHII filed its testimony.

The parties began discussing potential settlement in October of 2014. BHII provided the parties with its initial revenue requirement analysis and class cost of service analysis. In other words, we provided the company and the other parties including the Staff with our analysis, revenue requirements, and class cost of service.

Later the Staff provided the parties with its revenue requirement analysis. Although BHII was included in some of the initial settlement discussions with the company and Staff, BHII was sidelined when the company and Staff held private discussions.

BHII was subsequently provided a copy of the Staff revenue requirement model used to quantify the 6.9 million dollar rate increase reflected in the Proposed Settlement. However, BHII was left to attempt to decipher the Commission Staff's revenue requirement model and the adjustments reflected in it that were negotiated between the company and Staff without the benefit of testimony from either one of them. In some respects this was a difficult undertaking.

BHP has continually modified its revenue requirements since filing its case in March 2014 , both in response to discovery and as the company and Staff converged on the Proposed Settlement. In some cases BHP even proposed new adjustments. In other cases BHP adjusted its original proposed cost based on presumably actual costs incurred after the end of the historic test year and based on revisions in its projected costs.

In other words, the company continually revised its filing throughout the discovery and settlement process, effectively abandoning many of the adjustments or changing calculations reflected in its actual March 2014 filing.

Many of the costs that were adjusted in the filing based on projected changes were replaced with what the company now asserts are actual costs, almost in the form of a true-up. This process resulted in a continually changing and evolving test year and culminated in the Proposed Settlement.

Moreover, it appears that the alleged actual costs reflected in Proposed Settlement were accepted by the staff without conducting the critical analysis to validate them. It's as if the Staff relied on the fact that the costs were incurred -- just the fact that they were incurred to conclude that they were just and
reasonable and that they should have been incurred at that level.

In every jurisdiction in which $I$ have appeared the utility's burden of proving its proposed rates are just and reasonable requires more than a showing that it just spent the money. The utility must show that the amounts spent were reasonable and that spending the money was a prudent decision.

BHII believes that the company's process of constantly revising the costs in its filing, except for the correction of errors, creates a dynamic test year that is contrary to the law that governs the utility's filing requirements and the basis upon which the Commission is required to make its decisions.

South Dakota Law states the utility is to use a historic test year, that the actual costs incurred in that test year is the starting point. You have to have something to measure what the costs are in order to determine the revenue requirement.

South Dakota has an Administrative Rule that specifies you start with the historic test year. That law allows adjustments to the historic costs in the utility's filing when it makes its filing but requires that any proposed -- and this is a quote from the law, "Proposed adjustments to book costs shall be shown
separately and shall be fully supported, including schedules showing the derivation where appropriate."

And this is a very critical issue throughout several of these adjustments. And Mr. Moratzka briefly mentioned that.

But in my assessment many of the proposed adjustments that the company included in the per books costs or to the per books costs reflected in the company's filing while shown separately, as required by the law, were not fully supported in its filing and, in fact, were not justified.

These include adjustments to increased operating expenses for the so-called FutureTrack Workforce Program, increases in Black Hills Power employee positions in addition to the FutureTrack Workforce Program, and increases in charges from Black Hills Utility Holdings, one of two affiliate service companies. I'll return to these and discuss them further.

Returning to South Dakota Law governing utility rate filings, I'd emphasize that it specifically states that no adjustments shall be permitted unless they are based on changes in facilities, operations, or costs which are known with reasonable certainty and measurable with reasonable accuracy at the time of the filing -- that's what the law says -- and which will become effective
within 24 months of the last month of the test period used for this section and unless expected changes in revenue are also shown for the same period.

Many of the adjustments that Black Hills Industrial Interveners proposes in addition to those that are reflected in the Proposed Settlement are because the company did not comply with these very specific revisions of the law.

Based upon my reading of what appears to be a fairly straightforward Commission rule, the initial presumption is that no changes to the test year are allowed. In other words, you start with the historic cost. The presumption is no changes are allowed.

But if such adjustments are even to be considered, the utility must first determine that they are known and measurable at the time of the filing, not at some later date when actual costs come in and who knows what they are. The utility must first demonstrate that they're known and measurable at the time of the filing, which would be March 31, 2014 . And, second, the utility must include any expected changes in revenue, which it did not.

In its filing the company appears to have ignored the presumption and requested numerous adjustments that were not known with reasonable certainty or measurable
with reasonable accuracy as of March 31, 2014 , but also won't even be incurred until 12 months after the end of the test year. These are some of the costs for the decommissioning, the LIDAR survey, things like that.

For these costs I recommend that the Commission simply remove them from the revenue requirement in this proceeding, allow the company to defer these costs if and when they are incurred, and then request the ratemaking recovery in the company's next case.

I want to emphasize three points regarding this proposal. First, even if the rule did not exist, there's no compelifing policy reason for the Commission to require ratepayers effectively to prepay for the decommissioning and LIDAR survey costs.

Second, I'm not recommending that the company be precluded from seeking recovery at some future date. I'm suggesting a mechanism for the utility to have the opportunity to be made whole.

And, third, if the Commission determines that such adjustments can be made, then it should abide by its own rule and include changes in revenue and changes in various ADIT amounts -- hopefully everybody knows what that acronym is by now -- the NOL ADIT, and decommissioning ADIT.

Furthermore, the company proposed other adjustments
that are not just and reasonable or other otherwise justified and that should be rejected or modified or failed to make adjustments that are necessary to ensure that costs are adjusted reasonable.

In the first category are adjustments, one, to reflect a five-year average of pension expense rather than using the expense that, in fact, was known and measurable at the time of the filing for the period 12 months after the end of the historic test year. And that's what $I$ recommend.

Number two, to increase the depreciation rates expense for net negative salvage on production plant that isn't justified at this time.

And, three, using unduly short amortization periods for regulatory assets.

In my testimony $I$ provide this table that we looked at previously that summarizes our recommendations in that first column. In the second column similar quantifications on those issues in the Proposed Settlement. And the third column would be the adjustments that would be necessary if you start with the Proposed Settlement.

And I'd like to briefly review the largest of the issues reflected on this table and to respond to the company and Staff rebuttal testimony on some of the
larger dollar issues, where $I$ believe they have either mischaracterized BHII's position or where they have made claims that are not correct.

I'd like to start with the NOL ADIT.
MR. MAGNUSON: Mr. Smith, would it be possible
for us to just get a copy of the opening statement that he's reading?

As a witness, anything that he brings to the stand we have the opportunity to review. He's reading his statement. Can $I$ get a copy of it?

MR. SMITH: I think you probably should be able to get a copy of it.

MR. MORATZKA: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Is that okay?
MR. MORATZKA: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Do you have one with you?
MR. MORATZKA: Yeah. Certainly. I would note, though, that Mr. Kollen, although he is reading from this stack of -- his draft opening statement, he's not reading it verbatim.

MR. SMITH: Okay.
MR. MAGNUSON: May I ask what page you're on now?

MR. MARRIOTT: Top of 7 in the copy that you have.

MR. MAGNUSON: And my final note was $I$ thought it was going to be brief, a brief opening statement.

Thank you.
MR. SMITH: I understand.
MR. MORATZKA: I apologize if there was any confusion. I talked to the parties beforehand, and I understood that the opening statements were going to be permitted. I talked to Ms. Cremer and understood that parties were generally allowed 10 to 15 minutes to respond, especially in an instance where their credibility was attacked in rebuttal and --

MR. SMITH: We usually afford some time. We don't like it to go on too long because we've already seen the prefiled and all of that and just the redundancy part of it. But as long as it isn't too lengthy, we allow introductory testimony, right, so that we start out at the direct point.

MR. MORATZKA: Right. And just to be clear, we're done with the direct portion.

What Mr. Kollen is going to focus on now is what would, $I$ guess, be deemed surrebuttal, rebuttal to the companies and Commission Staff witnesses.

MR. SMITH: Right. That's one of the anomalies of having prefiled testimony. Otherwise, it doesn't work that way. Here you can't ignore what's been filed since.

So I understand.
MR. MORATZKA: Thank you.
A. The rest of my comments really now are on the larger dollar issues where we still have significant disagreements with the Staff and Black Hills Power. And I'll start with the NOL ADIT.

Briefly, this issue is where ADIT is normally subtracted from rate base. And what the company has proposed is to include an NOL ADIT as an addition to rate base. In other words, this increases the revenue requirement. I oppose that.

The primary reason, it appears, that the company is in disagreement with us on this issue and the Staff is in disagreement with us is that both the company and the Staff believe that this is a normalization violation.

And what that means is that the -- that they believe by reading the Internal Revenue Code, the Internal Revenue regs and regulations and private letter rulings that they can discern that this is something that the IRS would consider to be a flow through of tax benefits. Normally, normalization issues are focused on income tax expense. That is not an issue in this case.

Instead, this issue has to do with rate base. And normally, again, the IRS's inquiry on rate base when it comes to that is whether or not the amount subtracted
from rate base is appropriate.
So we don't have any issue on the expense side. The disagreement is over whether or not the NOL ADIT, if it is not added to rate base, does that constitute normalization violation.

And $I$ want to make it very clear that regardless of anyone's interpretation, whether it's Hollibaugh, Mr. Peterson's or interpretation, the IRS has never ever found a normalization violation. So to the extent that this involves reading the tea leaves of the code or the regs or regulations or private letter rulings, I think you're safe if you conclude that there is no normalization violation, even if you conclude that there is a possibility of it.

And the other reason that you're safe on this is that the utility has the opportunity to cure. You heard Mr. Hollibaugh agree to that earlier. So the question is should you do the right thing and put it into -- not use it to reduce the subtraction from rate base. And I think the answer to that is yes.

And I don't believe that it is a normalization violation. I have a lot of experience in this area. I worked for an electric utility in the tax department as a researcher. I'm a CPA, a CMA, Charter Global Management accountant. I've assisted utilities throughout the
country on tax issues and planning issues.
I've testified before the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service on tax normalization issues and rulemakings. I've actually been -- I've actually talked to Peter Friedman at the IRS who is the examiner who issues these private letter rulings in the exempt organizations section of the IRS. I've actually met with him on a number of occasions. So I'm not without credibility on this issue.

There are several reasons why I don't believe that it is a normalization violation. First of all, there is no definitive guidance from the Treasury Department or from the IRS that's applicable to all taxpayers. The private letter rulings cited by Mr. Hollibaugh are fact specific to individual taxpayers.

The rulings -- there are other rulings that Mr. Hollibaugh did not cite in his testimony that completely exonerate in the sense of there is no normalization violation if you do not include the NOL ADIT and rate base.

And the third reason is that the NOL ADIT is temporary. In other words, it floats, and it's eventually used up. Hopefully, sooner rather than later. And there's no attempt by any party in this case to even argue that there's a flow through of tax benefits that
are inappropriate from an income tax expense perspective.

And, finally, if there remains any NOL ADIT at September 30,2014 , based upon the information in the company's filing it appears that it will be fully utilized in the first year that rates go into effect. So, in other words, that ties in with the fact that it's temporary.

And this one PLR that Mr. Hollibaugh did not mention in his testimony was issued in 2014 and again by the exempt organization section of the IRS, same examiner, Peter Friedman, and he said that it would not be -unequivocally that it would not be a normalization violation if the NOL ADIT was not added into the rate base.

So you have a range of opinions on this, even to some limited extent by the IRS. But, again, the IRS has never ever found that a utility was in a normalization violation.

I want to talk about decommissioning now. This is a different issue. Mr. Thurber, I believe, confused the issue because there are three sets of costs that the company is seeking to recover. One is the net book value of the retired plan, one is the obsolete inventory associated with the retired plan, the other one is
decommissioning expense that it hasn't yet incurred. We don't have an issue with the net book value of the plan or the obsolete inventory. Our focus is only on the decommission expense. And our proposal is that the recovery right now is premature. It doesn't fit within South Dakota Law, the Administrative Rule that I mentioned previously, and it's something that you can authorize the company to defer.

They can come in the next case when it is known and measurable, it's actually been spent, and you can determine the appropriate rate recovery at that time. The company is not harmed by that approach.

The next item is the LIDAR survey. And the company's request for costs that had not been incurred when it filed its case and now the settlement seeks to recover the actual costs that were incurred but not subject to deferral when those costs were incurred. We don't believe that it is appropriate under South Dakota Law, the Administrative Rule.

The next thing is the FutureTrack workforce and other employee additions. These were absolutely not supported in the company's filing, the requirement under the Administrative Rule. And you can't then just move ahead 12 months after the end of the historic test year and say, well, we now have $X$ number of employees and so
we're just going to put those costs in -- into the Settlement. That doesn't comply with the rule.

It has to be known and measurable at the time of the filing. It has to be fully supported. Neither one were true.

And the third thing with respect to that is there's no reason that the company has given that it requires additional employees to do the same work that it was doing in the historic test year.

We have the same point in the next two issues that the Black Hills Utility Holding and Black Hills Service Company affiliate charges. Again, the company just simply put in a schedule in the filing, and these were not known and measurable changes. They came out of the Black Hills Utility Holding Company.

The company did propose adjustments. They were not fully supported. They were not known and measurable with reasonable certainty. And we recommend that the Commission not allow those.

In fact, the company didn't even propose in its filing a Black Hills Service Company adjustment. It came in later in October of 2014 some seven months after it made its filing and proposed a 1.1 million dollar adjustment. There is no way that that could comply with the Administrative Rule. It wasn't even in the filing,
and yet it shows up in the Proposed Settlement.
And the same thing then with the Black Hills Utility Holding Company. The company said, well, our actual costs from the two service companies through September 30, 2014, were $X$ and Y, and then that's what appeared in the Proposed Settlement, including the \$286,000 error. And we don't think any of that complies with South Dakota Law.

And then also incentive compensation. Basically, the Settlement does have some incentive compensation excluded. We believe that there are additional amounts tied to financial performance of the company that should be excluded. And we'll go through all of that but --

And then pension expense, the company proposes a new methodology where it takes a five-year average of the years 2008 through -- I'm sorry. 2010 through 2014, even though it knew what 2014 pension expense was because that comes out of actuarial reports. So that not only was known and measurable, it was actual at the time of the company's filing.

Instead it just came up with a new method. I described it as opportunistic simply because it was lower in 2014. And I don't believe the Commission should adopt the five-year average.

And then, finally, I'd like to talk about
depreciation expense. I'd like to start out by saying with respect to that, that the representations by Mr. Spanos are simply incorrect.

I did not recommend that you not provide terminal net salvage in the depreciation rates. That simply is wrong. I recommended that you use a negative 5 percent net salvage for both interim and terminal salvage. And that is the same net negative salvage rate that is presently included in depreciation rates.

I don't believe that the company has fully supported an increase to as much as a negative 28 percent. And this is really only on production planned. So I first wanted to clarify that Mr. Spanos's understanding of my testimony or his representation of it, either one, are simply incorrect.

And so with that -- oh. And then $I$ have one other -- two other things briefly.

Mr. Thurber addressed the cost of debt. And he stated that $I$ did not use the right cost of debt that reflected the actual issuance of debt in 2014. I simply used what was in the Proposed Settlement.

In other words, what $I$ have in our quantification is the same thing that the Staff or the -- in the Proposed Settlement.

So really if, in fact, it is an error and that the
interest rate should be slightly less, then there's another error in the Proposed Settlement of $\$ 52,000$. So we have the transmission allocation error, \$286,000. The company's criticism of me on the interest expense is also in the Proposed Settlement so that's another error then, according to the company, of 52,000. So both of those should be reflected.

And that completes my opening statement. I'm sorry it was so long, but, you know, there were a lot of witnesses here to address so --
Q. Thank you, Mr. Kollen.

MR. MORATZKA: At this point $I$ would tender Mr. Kollen for cross.

SMITH: Mr. Magnuson.
MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you. There are two things would $I$ like to do at this point. The first thing is $I$ don't think $I$ got the same copy that Mr. Kollen was reading from because he was reading from after this one ends. So I would like an updated copy.

MR. MORATZKA: Just to be clear, Mr. Kollen, this was a draft. This was his own talking points. He read some things verbatim. Some things he added, some things he subtracted on the cost of debt. We don't have a copy of that either.

I think that was something that Mr. Kollen may
have just put in on his own initiative. But perhaps Mr. Kollen could clarify.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Kollen, is the version you have in front of you the same as what Mr. Magnuson was given?

THE WITNESS: I made significant handwritten changes to my copy of this. The one that Mr. Moratzka had -- in addition, I spoke extensively extemporaneously so -- but anyone's welcome to have a copy of this.

MR. MAGNUSON: I would like to have a copy of what he read from.

MR. SMITH: After the hearing today could you stop by the office or give it to one of the staff people here and they can make copies for the other attorneys. How is that?

MR. MORATZKA: That sounds just fine. Thank you.

MR. MAGNUSON: The second, I would request that we take a short break.

MR. SMITH: Okay. We will do that.
(A short recess is taken)
MR. SMITH: Please proceed.
MR. MAGNUSON: Okay. The first thing that I would like to do, and $I$ do want to set the record straight, Mr. Moratzka did ask me whether it was okay with me if witnesses made an opening statement, and I did
say that that was acceptable.
I had no idea it was going to go this long, and I had no idea that it was going to go into the detail with regard to the case. I also had no idea that Mr. Moratzka instead of asking the witness any questions would just use the opening statement.

So with that being said, I would move to strike the opening statement from the point of NOL ADIT discussion, from that on. The first part was an opening statement. So I move to strike the second part of the opening statement.

And, secondly, I would move that the first part of the opening statement is not evidence. It was a true opening statement, probably more like a closing statement. So that's the Motion that $I$ would make.

MR. SMITH: Commissioners?
Oh, yeah. Pardon me.
Mr. Moratzka.
MR. MORATZKA: Thank you.
Just to be clear, I -- again, I had thought that I had some leeway to do an opening statement. And I apologize if it took a little longer than anticipated. That, of course, is in part due to the significant and aggressive attack of Mr. Kollen's testimony in rebuttal.

It may be that Mr. Magnuson and I have different
styles in terms of getting out responses to various witnesses. It's generally been my practice just to allow the witness to speak and not ask leading questions.

I certainly didn't object to Mr. Magnuson's questions, many of which were leading for his witnesses. I was giving him all the leeway he needed to get his opening statements in.

And to say that our witness shouldn't be allowed to respond to attacks of our witness where the attacks are right at -- they're not claiming that here is an issue, here is where there is a disagreement, Commission, this is for you to resolve. They're attacks on Mr. Kollen's credibility: Mr. Kollen's testimony is false. Mr. Kollen has misrepresented the rule.

You know, those things, I think, need -- and I beg the Commission for greater leeway in addressing. So I adamantly oppose every part of Mr. Magnuson's Motion.

MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier.
MS. COLLIER: Thank you. I guess I've been taking copious notes. I have found that as $I$ have gotten older my ability to remember anything that happened more than five minutes ago is pretty much nonexistent, and it's at times like these that it comes in kind of handy for me.

I guess I certainly understood Mr. Moratzka to
be asking his witness to go into his rebuttal of what BHP's rebuttal had been and that that kind of open ended question $I$ didn't believe needed to be divided up into the BHP's various witnesses or the various issues.

So I guess maybe my style is somewhat similar.
I didn't take it as being one where the witness was simply going off on tangents but was responding to a request to respond to rebuttal.

MR. SMITH: Staff.
MS. CREMER: I don't necessarily take a position one way or the other on this, and the Commission can give it the weight it deserves.

MR. SMITH: Commissioners.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: I don't recall that we've had to deal with an issue like this before where we've got a Hearing Officer.

Would it be appropriate for one of us to make a motion on how to rule on this?

Okay. Commissioner Hanson, would you enunciate --

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Generally we just state our opinions, and John would -- excuse me. The Hearing Officer would make his ruling. And if we object to that ruling, then one of us would make a motion at that point.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Okay. With that, I would deny the Motion.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I would also -- well, I do have a question of you, sir, Mr. Kollen.

Will you be here tomorrow?
THE WITNESS: I can be here tomorrow morning.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: I think that's certainly fair because of all of the information that you provided here with your opening statement.

The parties need to have the opportunity to question you on each one of those items. And, granted, with the -- the amount of statements that you made they may feel that they missed some of them, and $I$ would want to afford them the opportunity to review that information this evening and be prepared to ask any further questions tomorrow, if that's possible to do.

MR. MORATZKA: No. We don't have any objection to that. I can't say for certain what Mr. Kollen's flight schedule is, but I'm sure we can make arrangements to make Mr. Kollen available.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: With that understanding, I would support the overruling of the Motion.

MR. SMITH: And, Mr. Kollen, are you going to be here most of the morning?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I could be here perhaps
until 11 o'clock or so. I still have to drive back to Sioux Falls to catch a flight to Washington, D.C. for another hearing.

MR. SMITH: Well, maybe what we ought to do is convene at 8:00 in the morning. Is that doable?

I think that was our original schedule.
Sometimes we shift that back once we get into a hearing. Let's do that.

With that, Lee, I think I will deny the Motion based on the Commissioners' desires.

And what are your thoughts in terms of prep for this now at this point?

MR. MAGNUSON: Well, first let me just comment. I think the question and what my Motion raised is whether or not his opening statement is going to be part of the record in the event of an appeal, and $I$ do not believe that it should be.

MR. SMITH: The evidentiary record?
MR. MAGNUSON: That is correct.
MR. SMITH: I tell you what. Let me give that some thought. And at this point on that part of it I'm not going to take action on that part, and $I$ will think that over overnight and rule on that in the morning.

How is that?
MR. MAGNUSON: Very good.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: John.
MR. SMITH: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm wondering if you should consider on your nightly thought on this -Mr. Kollen, you're not an attorney; correct?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: He did give legal advice in his --

MR. SMITH: There were a number of legal opinions expressed, yes.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: And I certainly think those should not be a part of -- well, I'm not going to give them weight, but $I$ don't know how you would deal with those.

MR. SMITH: Well, and maybe the best thing to do -- and let me get your thoughts on this, Mr. Moratzka. It was an opening statement. Again, it wasn't done with the usual attorney questioning and answering and that kind of thing. And there were a number of legal opinions expressed in there.

And maybe the better course of action is to treat it as not part of the evidentiary record, and then we can -- you know, if you wanted to proceed with either additional direct case or whatever, we could do down that path.

How does that sound?
MR. MORATZKA: Well, I guess I would have a couple of questions then. Would $I$ then be afforded the opportunity to do some direct examination of Mr. Kollen to address some of the issues raised?

And I guess if $I$ go through and elicit the same testimony, aren't we just spending time getting into the record the same thing?

MR. SMITH: Okay. I think Commissioner Hanson, his view is just the portions that we deem to deal with the expression of legal opinions should probably be excised because that isn't really factual evidence.

MR. MORATZKA: Okay.
MR. SMITH: I mean, to me in listening to the opening statement, yes, it was a little longer than we usually have. What we usually ask him, and I don't think he was here at the time $I$ gave my intro this morning, is that we have a brief summary of your testimony. And yours was a little more than that.

However, $I$ honestly didn't hear anything in there -- I don't really recall hearing anything in your testimony other than referencing Black Hills' rebuttal, which admittedly -- prefiled puts you in a weird position because, you know, you're theoretically reacting just to their direct and all of that.

But the fact is in this case you had already submitted testimony, and then you're subjected to rebuttal, which was, you know -- you know, it was contrary to, you know, your testimony. And it does put a witness in an odd position in this situation.

So I'll take Commissioner Hanson's -- I'll take his thoughts as maybe the right way to go, and we will excise those portions of the opening statement that deal with nonfactual assertions but, rather, express legal opinions, et cetera, and we'll proceed from there.

How is that? Is that okay with you, Mr. Moratzka?

MR. MORATZKA: I guess just two points. We'll need to understand exactly what portions were stricken.

But, second, and $I$ know we won't deal with this until the conclusion of the hearing, but $I$ believe this does underscore the need for briefing. Recognizing there is a serious legal issue here, I think it underscores the need for briefing.

MR. SMITH: I didn't hear too much -- I didn't hear a lot in terms of your factual statements in there that departed from your testimony. It just -- other than to address, you know, responsive testimony to your testimony and take some issues with some of the statements made by other witnesses. So we'll go down
that path.
What I thought is we've got a copy of it over there. What $I$ thought is once we get a copy, then $I$ can go through it, and $I$ can produce my opinion of what $I$ think should be stricken at least as evidence. And then you guys can look at it and see if you -- if you think what I've done is okay or give us your thoughts on it.

How is that?
MR. MORATZKA: I guess two questions again.
I know that Mr. Kollen freelanced a little bit from the copy that he had, and he's got some handwritten notes. So I'm a little concerned about saying that that's a -- while I'm fine striking testimony related to the legal opinion, you know, are we going to then with the copy, with the stricken language, are we going to introduce that as an exhibit to say this is what Mr. Kollen -- his opening statement so that every party has a written copy of it?

```
                            Or are we going to rely on the transcript
```

itself?

MR. SMITH: Well, we will have the transcript. Again, some of those statements $I$ think -- some of his statements about interpretation of -- he referred to them as law, as $I$ think we're really talking about a rule; right?

We're talking about 20:10:13:44; am I correct? MR. MORATZKA: That's correct.

MR. SMITH: I think that's what we're talking about. And what parameters does that particular rule impose on parties to one of these cases.

And, again, there was definitely some probable legal opinion in there. Although, in a way it's sort of mixed, in that part of this is -- those rules are meant to govern rate case filings, which are what, normally what, 95 percent accounting related? They really are. There's not a lot of law in there.

But $I$ do agree there is an interpretive issue with respect to that rule and to what extent it blocks certain things in the future.

Mr. Magnuson, any thoughts?
MR. MAGNUSON: I'm comfortable with the way that you are proceeding.

Obviously, if we're going to get into parts of what should be excised from his opening statement, we've got to rely on the transcript. We can't rely on the --

MR. SMITH: We will have to do that, yes. We will have to look at the transcript and ultimately make an ultimate ruling on what is or isn't going to be treated as "evidence" as opposed to "opinion." And not professional opinion.

Although, we'll think about that. Because, again, these guys are the guys that actually look at that rule and use it.

Okay. With that, can we move on then? I don't know. Given where we're at today, I mean, do you guys want to proceed further today for a while --

MR. MAGNUSON: I'll proceed.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. MAGNUSON:
Q. Mr. Kollen, my name is Lee Magnuson. I'm representing Black Hills Power.

Let's start first with you put in your testimony and said there was no NOL on October 1, 2014; is that correct?
A. My estimate based upon the schedules in the company's filing, that's my assessment is that there would not be an NOL.
Q. Okay. Did you consider the additional deductions on Schedule $M-2$ when you reached that decision?
A. I'd refer to the schedule that I cited in my testimony. I don't recall what that was. I can look here just a minute if you'd like me to.
Q. Well, there were additional deductions in

Schedule $M-2$ in the original filing; correct?
MR. MORATZKA: Mr. Magnuson, could you provide
him a copy, or is there a copy up on the counsel table for Schedule $\mathrm{M}-2$ ?

MR. MAGNUSON: Well, it's right there in the binder if he wants to take a look at it.
A. I cite on page 10 of my testimony that the company included 12.373 million jurisdictional and 13.497 million total company and asset NOL ADIT. And I reference Schedule $M-1$ and Schedule $M-2$.
Q. Okay. Is it correct or incorrect that you said in your testimony that there was no NOL at October 1, 2014? A. Based on my analysis, there would be none.
Q. Thank you. You stated in your testimony that there should be no remaining asset NOL ADIT at October 1, 2014 . That's correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Isn't it correct that you failed to recognize the additional deductions, including accelerated and bonus depreciation and 43 million of additional tax deductions?

MR. MORATZKA: Objection. Foundation. MR. SMITH: Overruled.
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Well, you're not aware that the NOL ADIT at October 1, 2014 , should be approximately 14.2 million for total company?
A. I believe one of your witnesses said that, but based upon my analysis, there was about 44 million dollars worth of taxable income in the test year -- or the posttest year period that would have absorbed that carryforward.
Q. Did you review all the responses to DRs?
A. I don't believe I reviewed all of them, but I believe I reviewed the relevant ones.
Q. So if there was something in a response that addressed that topic, you would have seen it?
A. I believe so.
Q. Okay. Now I think when you did your testimony --
let me correct that. Your opening statement with regard
to NOL ADIT you summed up your testimony by saying I think you are safe.

That was your testimony, wasn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. That's not exactly a definitive statement, is it?
A. Well, $I$ think that you --
Q. Yes or no? Is that a definitive statement?
A. It's a definitive statement, yes.
Q. Okay. Now isn't it true that with regard to violations of normalizations, that's a self-reporting mechanism; correct?
A. If the company actually believes that.

But the cases that I've been in where the utilities will advance arguments of that nature they -- I personally have never seen a utility self-report a normalization violation, even if they have advanced an argument to that effect before the state regulatory Commission.
Q. Okay. Now listen to my question. Because you wouldn't know whether ABC utility in Utah would have self-reported with regard to a normalization rule or not.

You would not have known that; correct?
A. Well, I haven't done -- there's no way that anybody outside of the taxpayer itself can go in and look at anybody else's tax returns.
Q. That's correct. So that has to be taken into account when you say there's never been a normalization violation that's been reported to the IRS; right? A. No. That was not my testimony.

My testimony is that the IRS has never found a normalization violation or imposed a sanction. That's my testimony. Your witness agreed with that.
Q. So you wouldn't know, though, if a utility self-reported a normalization violation; correct? MR. MORATZKA: Objection. Asked and answered. MR. MAGNUSON: I don't think he answered it.
Q. Yes or no?
A. The only thing $I$ could say is if a utility self-reported a normalization violation, then without attempting to cure it $I$ would be extremely surprised.

And, in any event, to my knowledge and to your witness's knowledge, the IRS has never found a normalization violation, self-reported or not.
Q. Okay. So I'll repeat the question, and you can answer yes or no.

You wouldn't know if a utility self-reported a normalization violation; correct?
A. I've already answered that.

MR. MORATZKA: Same objection.
MR. SMITH: I'm going to overrule it because I don't think he has actually answered it -A. Well, there's no way to know.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: The witness needs to wait until there's a ruling and then abide by the ruling. Allow your attorney to do his job and our Hearing Officer to do his job.

MR. SMITH: And I am overruling the objection because I don't think there's been just a straightforward answer to his actual question. It's gone down a different path.
A. There's no way to know.
Q. Thank you.
A. The same answer that I indicated before.
Q. Now you understand, don't you, that Mr. Dave

Peterson is the consultant retained by Staff?
A. I do.
Q. And you understand that Mr. Peterson has been
retained by Staff on a number of cases, rate cases here
in South Dakota; correct?
A. I do have that understanding.
Q. And for a number of years also; correct?
A. Number of cases, number of years, yes.
Q. And you read Mr. Peterson's testimony in this matter; correct?
A. I did.
Q. And did you read pages 8 through 9 of Mr. Peterson's
testimony where he reviews your general ratemaking principles?
A. I've read the entirety of Mr. Peterson's testimony.
Q. So you would have read pages 8 and 9 ; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And he references the Commission's longstanding policy regarding South Dakota Administrative Rule 20:10:13:44; correct?

MR. MORATZKA: Counsel, could we take a moment to provide the witness with Mr. Peterson's testimony?
Q. Do you want to look at his testimony?
A. It depends on what questions you're planning to ask. MR. MORATZKA: May I approach the witness?

MR. SMITH: You may.
MR. MAGNUSON: I just asked the question $I$ was
going to ask.
MR. SMITH: Let him give it to him so he can see
it.
A. Page 8 of Mr. Peterson's testimony?
Q. Pages 8 and 9 .
A. Okay. I have that, and $I$ have read it.
Q. Okay. And is it true that Mr. Peterson references
the Commission's longstanding policy regarding
South Dakota Administrative Rule 20:10:13:44?
A. Are you talking about on line 27?
Q. It would be on those two pages.
A. Are you talking about line 27?
Q. It would be contained in lines 22 through line 14 on page 9.
A. I'm sorry. I just don't see it there.
Q. Okay. Well, let me ask you this: Would you defer
to Mr. Peterson on what the Commission's longstanding rule has been with regard to South Dakota Administrative Rule 20:10:13:44?

MR. MORATZKA: I'm going to object. I'm not
sure that there's any record anywhere of a case interpreting 20:10:13:44. So $I$ will object on foundational grounds.

And note that to the extent that any
interpretation has been part of the Settlement, if no one objects, the issue's never been brought before the Commission.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Magnuson, response?
MR. MAGNUSON: Well, number one, there have been litigated cases that have been brought before this Commission where the South Dakota Administrative Rule has been used by this Commission. We believe it's a longstanding rule. I believe that Mr. Peterson knows what the longstanding policy is.

And so all I'm asking this witness is whether he would defer to Mr. Peterson on what the longstanding policy of this Commission has been.

MR. MORATZKA: Objection. It calls for the witness to speculate.

MR. SMITH: Any response, Lee?
MR. MAGNUSON: No. I think that this is his
first time that he's testified in a matter like this in South Dakota. I think I'm just asking him will he defer to Mr. Peterson's interpretation of the Commission's longstanding policy.

MR. MORATZKA: Objection again.
How would -- at this point in time Mr. Kollen wasn't able to find that interpretation that he could defer to. So, again, I'll continue the objection.

MR. SMITH: Okay. I'm going to overrule the objection.

MR. MORATZKA: One final note. It appears to me that we've just struck one nonattorney's reading of 20:10:13:44 from the record. It seems odd procedurally to get another witness to defer to that interpretation. So I will continue my objection.

MR. SMITH: Okay.
A. The answer to the question is, no, I won't defer to it because $I$ have been instructed by counsel as to the interpretation of the law, and my testimony follows that interpretation.

MR. MAGNUSON: I'm going to move to strike all of his answer except for the word "no."

MR. SMITH: I'm going to overrule it.
Q. Mr. Kollen, I'm going to read from line 1 on page 9. And this is from Mr. Peterson's testimony. "Rather it is my understanding that both the Commission Staff and the Commission have previously interpreted this rule to mean that for any posttest year change in expense or investment that has an incremental revenue component,
i.e., expenses or investments made to increase sales and/or to serve new customers, a corresponding revenue adjustment must also be recognized."

Did I read that correctly?
A. I believe you read it verbatim.
Q. Thank you.

Mr. Kollen, would you agree that Mr. Spanos specializes in depreciation?
A. Yes, he does.
Q. You don't specialize in depreciation, do you?
A. I do.
Q. You do?
A. Yes.
Q. Along with all the other areas?
A. Yes. I'm a member of the Society of Depreciation

Professionals. I know John quite well.
Q. So in your testimony where you went through all of these things -- in fact, I have this Exhibit 9 that you presented -- you're a specialist in all of those areas.

Is that fair?
A. Exhibit 9. Are you talking about the revised table?
Q. Yeah. Because, I mean, you went through, and
there's got to be, what, 15 different things in here.
You're a specialist in all 10 or 15 of those items?
A. I believe so.
Q. Did you complete any physical observation of Black Hills Power's plant or equipment?
A. No. Nor do I think one was necessary for the discussion that $I$ addressed.
Q. Okay.

MR. MAGNUSON: I'm going to move to strike his answer after the word "no." It was a simple yes or no question, and he's trying to get more into evidence.

MR. SMITH: I'll sustain that.
Q. You did not do a full depreciation study to justify your rates; correct?
A. I did not. I addressed only specific issues. I addressed the lifespan issue for the Cheyenne Prairie Generating Station, and $I$ addressed net negative salvage on production plant. That did not require a full depreciation study.

MR. MAGNUSON: Move to strike everything after when he said he did not do a full depreciation study. If he would listen to my question and answer the question, I would appreciate it.

MR. SMITH: Okay. I'm going to overrule that.
Q. And, in fact, you agreed with everything in the depreciation study completed by Mr. Spanos except for one component; correct?
A. No.
Q. The one component you disagreed with was terminal net salvage; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you did not complete or submit a net salvage study to support your position on terminal net salvage; correct?
A. That's correct. I don't know how to answer it yes or no. There were a couple of double negatives in there.

What $I$ did was $I$ recommended that the Commission stick with the net negative 5 percent that is reflected in present rates.

MR. MAGNUSON: And, again, I'll move to strike
the last part of his answer. MR. SMITH: And I'm going to overrule. MR. MAGNUSON: No further questions for this witness.

MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier.
MS. COLLIER: I do have a couple of questions, if you'll bear with me, though, with my notes.
CROSS - EXAMINATION

BY MS. COLLIER:
Q. Mr. Kollen, I believe that you testified and were allowed to testify as to a brief history of Black Hills Power rate increases. Did you -- and you laid out ones for 2006, 2009, and 2012 .

Excepting the current rate increase, do you know what those other three totalled?
A. Quite frankly, not sitting here. Somebody else has my opening statement where $I$ had that information.

THE WITNESS: Oh, thanks.
A. It's about 30 percent, just for the three.
Q. And so the rate increase that's at issue would be on top of that?
A. That's right. Bring it up to about 40 percent.
Q. I believe that -- I wanted to ask you a clarification question from your testimony regarding the incentive compensation. And you, if I understood it correctly, referred to BHP -- I believe it was Black Hills Power coming up with a new methodology for expenses in that area; is that correct?
A. That would be pension expense. And the company proposed a five-year average rather than the 2014 actual known and measurable at the time of its filing. It's a new methodology.
Q. So when you say it's a "new methodology" is it one that's simply new to you or new to, I guess, the field in which we're talking about?
A. New to Black Hills Power. And in prior cases my understanding is that the company has used the test year amount rather than a five-year average. There may have
been pro forma adjustments to the test year amount, but the methodology using a five-year average is new. That's a new proposal.

MS. COLLIER: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Staff.
MS. CREMER: Thank you.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. CREMER:
Q. Good afternoon. And $I$ was -- maybe I didn't catch it.

What did you say the total increase was over the rate increases? What was the number you used?
A. I think it was 30 percent. Just looking at these 9 and a half -- oh, I'm sorry. I double counted one.

8 percent on the 2006 case, 12.7. So that would make it 21 . And then another 6. So it was about 27 or 28 percent.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And $I$ want to talk about those for a moment. In 2006 what was Black Hills Industrial Interveners -- what was their increase that year?
A. I don't know.
Q. Would you agree with me that it was considerably
less than everybody else's?
A. I don't know.
Q. And what about 2009? What was Black Hills Industrial Interveners' increase that year?
A. I don't know.
Q. Then I might as well ask you. What about 2012?
A. I don't know that either.
Q. And so subject to check would you agree with me that in each of those rate increases the Black Hills

Industrial Interveners' rate increase was considerably less because they reached settlement with Black Hills Power than everybody else?

MR. MORATZKA: Objection. That actually mischaracterizes the Settlement Agreements. And if we're going to bring those up, then we should, you know -- we have confidential versions.

I don't think they go in through this witness because there's no foundation.

MS. CREMER: Well, he brought them up.
MR. MORATZKA: No. These are the public
settlements. The private settlements with Black Hills Power are not part of the record and not something that Mr. Kollen has.

MS. CREMER: Okay. You know, I guess I
misinterpreted what he was trying to tell us.
I'll move on.
Q. Did you add up all of the data requests that just

Staff had asked in this case?
A. I'm sorry. I didn't -- it kind of cut in and out, the microphone.
Q. Staff asked a number of data requests in this case. Would you acknowledge that?
A. Yes. A lot.
Q. Yes. Did you happen to add up how many questions were asked?
A. I did not.
Q. Subject to check, would you agree with me it was over 500 questions, and that doesn't include all the subparts?
A. I don't know. I know it was at least 100. Because I know that in the third set there were 99 questions. But $I$ don't know beyond that. I did not add them up. Q. Did Black Hills Industrial Interveners and Black Hills Power hold settlement discussions without Staff or DRA present?
A. I believe that we had one -- I was a participant on one conference call. That's the only one that I'm aware of.

MS. CREMER: That's all my questions.
Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Commissioner questions.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: My question relates to the
last issue that Ms. Collier was visiting with you about. It's my understanding in your written testimony that you referred to a normalization adjustment as "opportunistic."

## Is that correct?

THE WITNESS: That had to do with the pension expense. And the fact is that in the 2014 actuarial report, which is the basis for the pension expense, it was significantly less than in prior years. And that's not surprising, given the returns in the market. And you would expect to see that reflected in pension expense.

And that was clearly known and measurable at the time of the company's filing because it used that in the five-year average. And it was one of those situations where the expenses went down.

And normally the customers would get the value of that. Instead, the company came up with a new methodology by using a five-year average.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Were you present this morning for my discussion, I think with Mr. White, where instead of using the word "opportunistic" I used the word "cherry picked"?

THE WITNESS: No, I wasn't here.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: You weren't here. We had a good discussion about that. And $I$ was trying to figure
out, you know, in what circumstances do they attempt to use the normalization adjustment as opposed to strictly use a number from the test year. And he talked about the fact if there were material swings in the dollar figures from year to year.

And so my question for you is in what circumstances would you find a normalization adjustment appropriate? Because, obviously, you don't in this case. But where would it be appropriate?

THE WITNESS: Well, the reason $I$ don't in this case is because, you know, the market continues to go up and because that's a component of the pension expense, the return on those fund assets, then $I$ would anticipate going forward that it would continue at lower levels, perhaps, than what we saw in 2009 and 2010 when the market was crashing.

But in some other cases, for example, normalization adjustments might be appropriate if there are pay raises at the end of a historic test year that weren't fully reflected in that test year. That certainly would be a known and measurable change. You would want to normalize that.

If there was some anomaly, for example, storm costs -- maybe a utility incurred 20 million dollars worth of storm costs -- you would take that out and
probably treat that separately.
There may be some other examples too, but normally what you look for are abnormal and nonrecurring types of expenses, and then you either take them out entirely or you normalize them.

But pension expense is a recurring expense. And the question is what is the appropriate level. And they knew what it was for 2014 based upon the actuarial report so it was certainly known and measurable.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Commissioner questions.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: I just have one.
In Interveners' Exhibit No. 9 that was handed out during your presentation did you address each one of those items either in your prefiled or in your discussion here today?

THE WITNESS: I did.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Each one of them?
THE WITNESS: Yes. The only thing that I -yes. I did. Including the quantification.

I did not address the capital structure as such or the rate of return, but $I$ quantified the effects of it.

In other words, I did not -- I was agnostic on it. In other words, I didn't say yes I support it or
disagree with it. Same thing with return on equity. But I did quantify the effects.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: All right. Thank you.
That's all $I$ have.
MR. SMITH: Additional Commissioner questions?
I'm not seeing any.
Mr. Magnuson, it's 4:53. Should we plow ahead
at least to get the cross-examination done?
MR. MAGNUSON: I have no additional cross for this witness.

MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier?
MS. COLLIER: No. None.
MR. SMITH: Staff.
MS. CREMER: No, I don't.
MR. SMITH: Okay. It's 4:53. I guess the
decision now is should we wait until tomorrow then for your redirect?

MR. MORATZKA: I don't have any redirect.
MR. SMITH: Oh, you don't. Okay. That's it, huh?

MR. MORATZKA: That's it.
MR. SMITH: I guess we're done.
MR. MAGNUSON: Could $I$ have a moment to visit with co-counsel?

MR. SMITH: You certainly may, yes.
(Pause)
MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you, Mr. Smith.
I'm just looking forward to what tomorrow
brings. And $I$ guess the first thing I'd like to clarify
is I believe that -- Mr. Baron's going to be here
approximately noon tomorrow?
MR. MORATZKA: No. Mr. Baron's here first thing
in the morning.
MR. MAGNUSON: First thing in the morning?
okay.
MR. SMITH: Does that end it?
MR. MAGNUSON: Yeah. I didn't understand. I
thought he was going to be here at noon so we can just
proceed with the regular procedure --
MR. SMITH: Regular order of things?
Let's do that. And you'll follow them. You'll follow him, I guess.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: But when does Mr. Kollen
need to leave? Because you need to leave at --
THE WITNESS: I need to leave, I believe, by noon in order to catch the flight out of Sioux Falls.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. So we do have some movement.

MR. SMITH: Well, he already testified. He's done.

MR. MAGNUSON: Mr. Kollen will be done. But then we still have Staff putting on their witness -MR. SMITH: Right. Mr. Peterson.

MR. MAGNUSON: -- following the case of Black
Hills Industrial's. And then would be our rebuttal.
I'm just trying to get a feel for tomorrow.
MR. SMITH: Yep. I forgot about Mr. Peterson. Okay. I think, with that, we'll recess for the evening.

Oh, pardon me.
MR. MORATZKA: One last procedural question. Maybe I misinterpreted your ruling before.

Are we going to have the court reporter do the transcript tonight for striking?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Be up all night.
MR. SMITH: You know, $I$ guess my thought on it is that we can look at it and -- but is that something necessarily that we have to do right here at hearing, or is that something we can do following hearing in terms of a Commission ruling in the future?

MR. MORATZKA: It bears on examination so it needs to be done during the hearing, I think. I don't think we have a choice.

MR. SMITH: What examination would come out of that?

MR. MORATZKA: Well, we've had a portion of our testimony stricken.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. Okay. All right. Okay. Okay. You may have.

MR. MORATZKA: So sorry to ask one more procedural question.

Is there to be more discussion and back and forth on this issue first thing in the morning?

MR. SMITH: I suppose we could. But I don't
know, Cheri, would it be -- you could do a quick draft; right? It's not going to be --

Let's go off.
(Discussion off the record)
MR. SMITH: Commissioners, I'd appreciate your thoughts too maybe but --

Maybe we should take this up first thing in the morning? Do you want to do that?

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I would like to make sure that this issue is resolved in a rock solid manner first thing in the morning so that it's clear on everyone's part how we need to proceed.

MR. SMITH: Okay. All right. I think, with that, we will go into recess overnight, and we will reopen the hearing at 8:00 a.m. And the first item up we'll deal with is that issue with the opening
statement.
(The hearing is in recess at 4:57 p.m.)
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