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MR. SMITH: I'm going to call the hearing back to order after we went into recess last evening. Where we ended was at the conclusion of Mr. Kollen's testimony and a Motion by Mr. Magnuson.

And to begin with, $I$ don't know, do
Commissioners want to weigh in at all on the Motion before I make a ruling that I'm going to make, or should I just make it and then you can react to it?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I say make it.
MR. SMITH: I am going to deny the Motion. I read through everything, and $I$ do not see anything in there that, in my opinion, rises to the level of offering legal testimony, a legal opinion.

He offers an interpretation of that rule. He's a rate analyst. To me, rate analysts have to look at the rule and attempt to comply with it. And I think that's what $I$ see in there. And is his interpretation maybe different than some other people's? So be it.

But that's my ruling, and you Commissioners can either accept it or reject it.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I would support the ruling and your conclusions.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: If I don't accept it, then I'll voice that when you make it. So without voicing it means that $I$ support it.

MR. SMITH: Hearing nothing, I think the ruling stands.

And, Mr. Magnuson -- wait a minute.
Mr. Moratzka, are we on your next witness? I think we are.

MR. MORATZKA: I believe we are. Black
Hills Industrial Interveners would like to call
Mr. Steve Baron.
(The witness is sworn by the court reporter.)
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. MORATZKA:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Baron.
A. Good morning.
Q. Could you please state your full name and spell it for the record.
A. Yes. My name is Stephen, S-T-E-P-H-E-N, J. Baron. And my business address? It's J. Kennedy \& Associates, Inc., 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Roswell, Georgia 30075 .
Q. Thank you, Mr. Baron.

Did you offer direct testimony in this proceeding?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Do you have what's been premarked as exhibits Black Hills Industrial Exhibits 3 and 4 before you?
A. Yes.
Q. And the document that is Exhibit 3, is that the public version?
A. Yes.
Q. Is Exhibit 4 the trade secret version of your direct testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any corrections to make?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Thank you. Do you have a brief opening statement at this point?
A. Yes, I do.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Baron, I'm going to give you an admonition here.

Our rule is here because we have prefiled
testimony to keep it brief, please, and then let your attorney -- if you've got material that's related to follow up to after-filed testimony of the other party, of Black Hills, why don't we do that via attorney question and answering.

Okay.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SMITH: Okay.
A. Good morning, Commissioners. I'm presenting testimony pertaining to the Black Hills Class Cost of Service Study and the overall apportionment of the
revenue increase approved by the Commission in this case.

I'm addressing both the Cost of Service Study, as originally filed by the company, and the proposed, which is associated with their 14.6 million dollar increase and their proposed apportionment of the Settlement increase to rate classes of the 6.89 million dollar increase.

As part of my testimony, $I$ present an analysis of the company's Cost of Service Study and identify what I believe to be a number of errors in the company's study. I present an alternative Cost of Service Study where I correct these errors, for the purpose of providing a reasonable valuation of Black Hills Power Company's current rates and the reasonable apportionment of any improved increases to the rate classes.

The general thrust of my testimony is that the modifications that $I$ have made to the study coupled with the policy considerations for mitigation that the company has addressed in its testimony provide proper and reasonable support for the increases to each customer class set forth in the company's proposed Rate Mitigation Plan.

BHII supports the apportionment of the rate increase to rate classes that is proposed in the Staff-BHP Settlement.

My specific conclusions are that the Cost of Service Study should be modified to correct a number of errors, some of which are numerical, some are conceptual, that, in my opinion, result in an inaccurate measure of cost of service to each rate class.

These errors when corrected show that the company is earning a higher rate of return than system average on the combined general service large industrial contract rate class. This is in contrast to what the company study, as filed, showed.

Not withstanding the problems with the company's Class Cost of Service Study, the company's proposed apportionment of the revenue increase to rate classes is reasonable and should be accepted. And this is due to the mitigation proposal that the company made.

The company's originally filed rate class revenue increases reflect a level of mitigation to each rate class that produces results that are reasonably consistent with the results of the BHII corrected Cost of Service Study that $I$ present.

In other words, the BHII corrected cost study provides support for the class rate increases in the Proposed Settlement, which we accept. The revenue apportionment in the Proposed Settlement is based on the company's originally proposed revenue apportionment.

It's patterned after that. Therefore, the Proposed Settlement rate class increases are reasonable with respect to the apportionment of the 6.89 million. If the Commission approves the overall base rate increase of 6.89 million in the Proposed Settlement, then I would recommend accepting the increases shown in Exhibit 2 of the company's filing.

However, if the Commission approves an overall base rate increase that is lower than 6.89 million as BHII witness Mr. Kollen recommends, then the increases in Exhibit 2 should be scaled back proportionately. In other words, the apportionment percentages should stay the same.

Going forward in the company's next base rate case, I'm recommending that the Commission require the company to file a Class Cost of Service Study that reflects all of the corrections that $I$ recommend in my testimony as an alternative so that the Commission and the parties to the case can have an opportunity to consider these corrections.

The company has already acknowledged that a number of the corrections that $I$ 'm recommending should be incorporated in its own study.

MR. MORATZKA: Thank you. Mr. Baron.
Q. Mr. Baron, have you had the opportunity to review
the rebuttal testimony of Kyle White?
A. Yes.
Q. What is your response?
A. With regard to Mr. White's testimony, first I appreciate his willingness to accept a portion of my recommendations for corrections to the cost study. Namely, that it is more appropriate to determine the annual system load factor using a single coincident peak demand, that BHP errs by failing to include excess demand for total electric customers, that account 369 services -- these are the service drops to the customer's premise -- should be assigned to classes based on the number of customers, and that it is appropriate to recognize that customers who take service at the 69,000 volt, 69 kV voltage, should not be allocated distribution costs associated with lower voltage distribution facilities that are designed to serve other customers.

I am troubled, however, by what appears to be Mr. White's suggestion regarding industrial customer participation in this case. As I read it, Mr. White's rebuttal testimony, he is claiming that it would be appropriate and that the company would support a Commission adjustment to the Proposed Settlement, the company's own Settlement, to specifically increase the
rates of large industrial customers by an amount over and above the increases agreed to in the Settlement. And it appears that this is based solely on BHII's involvement in this proceeding.
Q. Mr. Baron, how many years have you been testifying as an expert?
A. I've been working in this industry testifying as a consultant for close to 40 years.
Q. And have you ever seen such a proposal?
A. I have not, in my experience, seen a situation where a utility is party to a settlement, is filing the settlement, and then subsequently recommends that one particular set of customers should receive increases higher than the settlement and that money go to other classes.

I think this kind of action on the part of the company really creates a chill with respect to customers such as BHII participating in rate proceedings. There's --

Really, I mean, when you read Mr. White's testimony in this regard, $I$ certainly would interpret it as a representative of Industrial customers as saying that you guys have caused us a lot of problems, and as a result we think now that you should pay full cost of service based on our newest study without any mitigation. And,
whereas, for our customer classes, such as the residential class, mitigation is fine.
Q. Mr. Baron, do you have any specific references from Mr. White's testimony that supports this interpretation that you referred to?
A. Yes. On page 23 of his rebuttal testimony that relates to the rates to one Industrial contract customer he states "this customer's rates 'could be increased to benefit other customers and reduce the subsidiary the ICS customer is receiving.'"
Q. Thank you.

Mr. Baron, do you have any other concerns with
Mr. White's testimony?
A. Yes. Mr. White's calculation, his recommendation to, for example, increase the rates for the ICS 69 kV contract customer, is based entirely on his revised Cost of Service Study that $I$ just received a copy of the study, the work papers, $I$ think, on Friday. And I don't accept the adjustments.

Some of the adjustments he made $I$ agree with. As he said in his testimony he agreed with the adjustments that I recommended. But I don't agree with a number of the adjustments in that study for -- and I'm not even certain 100 percent of everything that was actually done in that study.

So it would be entirely inappropriate, in my opinion, at this stage in the case to rely on that analysis to make a decision as to what particular rate class should receive in terms of an increase.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Baron.

Are there aspects of Mr. White's testimony that would benefit from clarification?
A. Yes. One of the objections or issues that Mr. White discusses in his rebuttal testimony is his rejection of the adjustment that $I$ made to reflect the interruptible nature of $2,300 \mathrm{~kW}$ of general service large and industrial contract load.

Mr. White is simply incorrect when he testifies at page 20 of his testimony that interruptible load requires the utility to have complete control over when the electric load is served.

I've been involved in developing and evaluating interruptible rates for almost 40 years, and this is not the basis for defining interruptible load.

I do a lot of work involving utilities on the PJM Regional Transmission Organization System. PJM has 10 million $k W$ of interruptible load. That's compared to $2,300 \mathrm{~kW}$ in this case. They have $10 \mathrm{million}$. of that load is under PJM's control with respect to their system operators actually curtailing the load.

Interruptible load is a commitment by customers to curtail loads subject to requirements in the tariff, and those customers must fulfill that obligation or face significant penalties. And it's the penalties that provide the assurance to a utility that they can rely on interruptible load for planning purposes.

During the test year in this case which ended September 30, 2013, BHP in my view had 2,300 kW of interruptible load, most of which was associated with the GCC Dacotah Cement contract.

At the time the company filed the case the GCC contract still reflected $2,000 \mathrm{~kW}$ of interruptible load. And that was the interruptible load that was in the test year, and that was the interruptible load that the customer was obligated to provide to the company.

The interruptible load that $I$ made is reasonable and appropriate. I've been doing, as I said, these types of studies for many years, and this is the methodology to reflect a credit for interruptible load in the form of an alternative supply to supply side resources.

In other words, utilities have to build combustion turbines to meet peak demand, or they can use interruptible load to provide that same type of peak load liability. And it's inappropriate not to recognize that in the cost study. The company completely ignored
that.
Finally, even if the GCC interruptible load is removed as Mr. White suggests, it can't be removed in a vacuum because the customer, pursuant to the contract provisions that Mr. White cited, would end up paying higher revenues. And those revenues aren't reflected in the company's Cost of Service Study.

I'm not advocating that they should be, but if you're going to completely revise the cost study from what the test year was, you have to reflect all of the elements.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Baron.

MR. MORATZKA: I suppose we should ask. We're kind of borderline confidential.

Do we have folks here that have not signed the confidentiality agreement?

MR. SMITH: There's three gentlemen. You're behind the other guy. I couldn't see you. There's three gentlemen there that are not subject.

So we're going to go into confidential?
MR. MORATZKA: Yeah. Just for a couple of minutes to wrap up. I don't want to cross any lines.
(Beginning of confidential portion of transcript.)
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(End of confidential portion of transcript.)
MR. SMITH: I think it's good to go.
MS. COLLIER: Thank you.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. COLLIER:
Q. Mr. Baron, in the time that witnesses have testified this week the term "test year" has been used over and over again and just most recently in questions by the BHII attorneys and the company attorneys. And, in fact, in the last questions the end of the test year as opposed to the times for various other things like contracts became important.

In your 40 years of working in the industry and doing analysis how important is the rigidity of the concept of a test year in doing these analyses?
A. Well, it's very important because it -- to the extent that if you're using an historic test year, it is reasonable to set a period of time, 12 months, where you can capture the relationships, as I indicated, between investment, revenues, expenses, and load behavior with respect to a class cost of service analysis.

It is appropriate when a utility files a rate case. In this case the company filed in -- I think around April or so or May. I guess April of 2014. It is appropriate when a filing is made to reflect some known and
measurable changes that have occurred to the test year in the company -- in a study.

Because the test year, as $I$ have said, is not dynamic. It's static. And so to the extent that there are certain changes at that time when the company files its case, if they're legitimate and they properly reflect all of the elements, some types of adjustments like that are reasonable.

Usually those are considered known and measurable changes, pro forma adjustments.

For example, let's say -- I mean, some of these include things like annualizations. Let's say the last month of the test year there was some increase in postage stamps. And so it's reasonable at that point when your company files its case to say, well, let's assume that that occurred all 12 months during the test year.

There are other adjustments that might occur after the test year. It depends on the jurisdiction, the extent to which those can be accepted. Because, again, the whole idea of a test year is to pick a static period when you can consider -- excuse me. Pick a fixed period when all of the costs are related to each other.

I think that's what you're asking. So there is some flexibility, but it's not unlimited, and it can't keep going on forever as the case proceeds.
Q. And to follow up on that, based upon some of the prior testimony that you've given here today, those adjustments or changes that might affect test year, which would be you said reasonable and appropriate, would not necessarily then include actions by the company such as cancellation or nonrenewal of contracts that normally would continue?
A. Well, that's correct. And certainly let's focus on a contract that might have been in place in February of 2014. That was a known and measurable change because we know now that that contract was going to be going forward at the time the company filed its case.

So there's a reasonable basis to make an adjustment in like a test year Cost of Service Study, for example.

I'm trying to be -- not discuss any confidential
information.
MS. COLLIER: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Staff.
MS. CREMER: Thank you.
Staff does not have any questions. MR. SMITH: Okay.

Commissioners.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Mr. Baron, very early in your opening statement and probably the first sentence or two I thought I heard you use the phrase in reference to one
of the issues, and the phrase $I$ thought $I$ heard was "approved by the Commission."

Do you recall that?
THE WITNESS: Yes. I recall putting those words in.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: And would you agree with me, and this is very important for the public that's listening, that this Commission has not approved anything in this case yet?

THE WITNESS: Yes. That's my understanding, that whether it's a settlement or a contested case, the rates have to be approved by the Commission before --

CHAIRMAN NELSON: And we have not done that yet; correct?

THE WITNESS: That's correct. That's my understanding.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Other -- Mr. Rislov.
MR. RISLOV: Mr. Baron, I'm on page 13 of your
filed testimony --
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. RISLOV: -- I believe.
Page 14. Excuse me.
And beginning on line 6 to the end of the page.
You're discussing the avoided capacity cost. Is this the
basis for PJM's determination of a market rate for interruptible load?

THE WITNESS: No. In the PJM system there's a very complicated process that's evolved over time called a Reliability Pricing Model. It's known as RPM.

And the Reliability Pricing Model actually uses a market-based mechanism to determine the cost of capacity and the charges for capacity for all capacity. Not just interruptible or demand side resources but all capacity.

So if a utility like Black Hills Power were a member of PJM, generally speaking, the utility would bid its capacity into the market. And there's an annual base -- what's called a base residual auction that takes place. Would bid that capacity in and say we have so many megawatts of combustion turbines, so many megawatts of combined cycle and we're bidding it at this price. And all the other utilities in $P$ JM do the same, and through a process of basically looking at supply and demand there's a market price established.

But with that said, there are a lot of administrative aspects to that. It's not a pure -- like it's not like the stock market where the price can be anything.

And so in PJM there's basically a demand curve
that they artificially set up, and that demand curve -- I don't want to get into too much detail, but it's called the variable resource requirement. And that curve is set by the cost of new combustion turbine capacity similar to the calculation $I$ did.

MR. RISLOV: I'm roughly familiar with PJM, what they're going through. And $I$ guess that was my question.

Is there a similarity toward what you're doing here and at least valuing interruptible load in the PJM market?

THE WITNESS: Yes. To the extent that this VRR curve is first set at basically the cost -- it's called the cost of new entry. It's always referred to as CONE, which is the cost of a new combustion turbine, which is the same calculation that $I$ did.

That is the starting point. But depending on how much supply is bid in versus the load, the actual market price can vary. And, again, this is the same price paid to generators.

And that finally is evolving. That's the last thing $I$ was going to say.

MR. RISLOV: How does that compare to what's happening within MISO and SPP?

THE WITNESS: MISO is -- SPP hasn't really gotten going on that, that $I$ 'm familiar with in terms of
a market-based determination. SPP I think still uses a reserved margin criterion, which is what PJM used to use.

MISO is starting -- does have a capacity auction market now.

MR. RISLOV: Yes. I'm familiar with that too.
I guess my question is this. Do you see any difference between PJM, which is primarily a competitive type atmosphere within the state's PJM service, versus the vertically integrated nature of MISO when it comes to valuing interruptible load within a market?

THE WITNESS: Do I see differences?
MR. RISLOV: Yes. Between MISO and PJM in the way they value interruptible load.

THE WITNESS: I think there are -- the
constructs are different, but basically now that PJM has moved to a market-based capacity protocol, I would think that they will eventually produce similar results.

MR. RISLOV: Thank you.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I just have a quick yes or no question. You talked certainly about PJM on your interruptible service and that you certainly question Mr. White and his definition of interruptible.

Do you believe that $P$ JM and all utilities across the country have the same definition of interruptible and
they treat them in their contract the same all across the country? Yes or no?

Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Contracts, no.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Following Commissioner questions.
Mr. Magnuson, do you have any follow on?
MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you, Mr. Smith. I have no
further questions.
MS. SMITH: Ms. Collier.
MS. COLLIER: No. Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Staff.
MS. CREMER: Staff does not.
MR. SMITH: Okay. We'll turn back to
Mr. Moratzka then for redirect.
MR. MORATZKA: Very briefly. It will be
confidential.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: They have chairs now,
though.

> (Beginning of confidential portion of transcript.)


(End of confidential portion of transcript.)
MR. MORATZKA: Thank you.
No further questions.
MR. SMITH: I think you're done then.
THE WITNESS: Thank you, Commissioners. Thank
you, your Honor.
MR. SMITH: You may step down.
(The witness is excused.)
MR. SMITH: Are you set to go on rebuttal,
Mr. Magnuson, or do you want a break for a little while?
MR. MAGNUSON: We would still need Staff.
MS. CREMER: Thanks.
MR. SMITH: I'm sorry.
Staff, do you want to proceed immediately?
Okay. I guess you can proceed, Karen.
MS. CREMER: Thank you. This is Karen Cremer of
Staff. I'm just going to do a brief opening.
And first $I$ want to confirm, Dave Peterson, are you on the phone?

MR. PETERSON: Yes, I am.
MS. CREMER: Okay. Thank you. Pursuant to
ARSD 20:10:01:19, Staff and Black Hills Power have filed a Joint Exhibit 1, which is a Motion For Approval of a Settlement Stipulation.

The Settlement reflects the efforts of many
individuals from both parties. We were able to work through the many issues that we encountered, and Staff conducted extensive discovery, including more than 500 formal data requests.

Staff believes we have reached an appropriate balance of all the various parties' interests, and the result of that is the Settlement Stipulation that is before you today.

We believe this settlement is in the public interest and approval of the Settlement will permit Black Hills Power's customers to continue to receive safe, adequate, and reliable service at just and reasonable rates.

The Settlement resolves all of the issues in this proceeding based on sound regulatory principles and is consistent with South Dakota Law, in particular, SDCL 49-34A-6, 49-34A-8, and 49-34-A-11.

The record before you supports the granting of the Joint Motion, and Staff respectfully requests the Commission adopt the attached Stipulation without modification for resolution of all issues subject to this proceeding.

As already noted, Staff will be calling one witness, which is Mr. Dave Peterson, and he will speak on behalf of Staff advocating our support of the Settlement

Stipulation.
He will answer the questions he feels qualified to speak to and will refer other questions to the appropriate Staff witnesses.

Staff analyst Pat Steffensen and Eric Paulson are present in the hearing room, and one of Staff's other consultants, Basil Copeland, is available by phone should you have any questions of him.

All of the aforementioned are available for questions, and if needed, those witnesses can be sworn in at that time, if Dave can't answer your question.

Along with Mr. Peterson's testimony, the Staff memo pretty much sets out our position on all of the issues.

At this time Staff would call Mr. Peterson and ask that he be sworn in.
(The witness is sworn by Chairman Nelson.) DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. CREMER:
Q. Good morning, Dave.

Would you please state your name and address for the record.
A. Yes. My name is David Peterson, and my business address is 10351 Southern Maryland Boulevard, Suite 202, Dunkirk, D-U-N-K-I-R-K, Maryland 20754.
Q. By whom are you employed?
A. I am a rate consultant with the firm of Chesapeake Regulatory Consultants, Inc. of Annapolis, Maryland.
Q. And could you briefly explain who Chesapeake Regulatory Consultants are and how CRC came to be associated with this Docket?
A. Yes. CRC is a group of -- it's a small group of consultants. There are only three of us, that we devote our time to assisting mostly state commissions or consumer advocates in rate proceedings such as this, as well as at times large industrial interveners.

But our work involves regulatory work, accounting, finance, and other rate making aspects of utility operations.

CRC and its consultants have been associated with the South Dakota Commission and have assisted in working on rate cases in South Dakota essentially since the inception of regulation in South Dakota back in the mid-1970s. And one or all of us have been involved in virtually every major rate case in South Dakota since 1975.
Q. Do you have Staff Exhibit 1 in front of you?
A. If that's my direct testimony in this case, yes, I do.
Q. Thank you. And at the time your testimony was filed was it true and correct to the best of your information and knowledge?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Do you have any corrections to your exhibit?
A. No.
Q. Would you please summarize the content of your testimony.
A. Yes. It will be very brief.

There are really two purposes of my testimony. The first purpose, as you stated in your opening statement, is to support the Settlement Stipulation that was reached between the Commission Staff and Black Hills Power.

The second purpose of my testimony was to address certain issues that were raised by Black Hills Industrial Interveners. They were both revenue requirement issues and cost of service issues.

My testimony describes several issues that were raised by Mr. Kollen for the Industrial Interveners that were addressed in one form or another in the Settlement. It addresses other issues raised by Mr. Kollen with which we disagree with. And it addresses -- on the cost of service and apportionment of increase it acknowledges Black Hills' support for the Settlement in the apportionment of revenues between rate classes.

And $I$ think that's the end of the inquiry as far as cost of service goes.

Mr. Baron pointed out a number of what he called errors in the study. In my opinion, the Commission probably doesn't need to issue a finding on any of those so-called errors in this case because they will not impact the apportionment of revenues. And Mr. Baron just acknowledged that.

But we did want to point out disagreement with Mr. Baron on the largest single what he called error in this study, and that's the use of the minimum distribution system. And $I$ discussed that at length in my testimony.

MR. SMITH: Is he loud enough for you?
THE WITNESS: That concludes my summary.
Q. Based on your education and experience, do you have an opinion as to whether the Settlement Stipulation results in just and reasonable rates?
A. Yes, I do. And not only my education and experience but the -- my involvement in this rate case.

I was involved with the Commission's in-house staff since the beginning of this rate case, since it was filed. And $I$ watched and oversaw, in some instances, the Staff's review of, as you said, over 500 discovery requests and the hundreds of hours that the Staff devoted
to this case in identifying the issues and recommending alternative rate making treatments for some of the items claimed in the company's cost of service and revenue requirement.

Those issues are all identified specifically in the Staff memorandum in support of the Settlement, and I believe there's a high level of transparency. The Commission can see for itself. The extent of the review and the resolution of what the Staff considers each issue, important issue in the case.

And, yes, based on the -- based on the resolution that we've reached with the company, we believe that the resulting rates will be just and reasonable.

MS. CREMER: Thank you.
Mr. Peterson is available for
cross-examination.
MR. SMITH: Mr. Magnuson, please proceed. MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

We have no questions of this witness.
MR. SMITH: Okay. We'll go to Mr. Moratzka then.

MR. MORATZKA: Just a few brief questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MORATZKA:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Peterson.
A. Good morning.
Q. This is Andrew Moratzka. I'm an attorney at Stoel Rives, and $I$ will be asking you a few questions today on behalf of the Black Hills Industrial

Interveners.
A. Okay.
Q. To make sure that we are all on the same page, I want to make sure that we clarify a few dates.

You would agree, wouldn't you, that the test year for the company's Application began on October 1, 2012, and ended on September 30, 2013?
A. Yes.
Q. The company then filed its Application within six months of the conclusion of the test year on March 31, 2014; is that correct?
A. I believe that date is correct. Although the Commission officially noticed the filing on April 3, 2014 .
Q. Thank you for the clarification, Mr. Peterson. And, finally, the date that would be 24 months after the end of the test year would be September 30, 2015; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Your testimony contains your interpretation of a South Dakota Administrative Rule; is that correct?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. That rule is 20:10:13:44; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Sorry, Mr. Peterson. I have to turn the mic. off to allow you to speak; otherwise, we get quite a bit of feedback in here.
A. Okay.
Q. Mr. Peterson, do you have at your -- in front of you or nearby you the ability to pull up that South Dakota rule?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Mr. Peterson, we're going to just take a moment to pass around a copy of the statute for the benefit of all the other parties.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay, Mr. Peterson. We've passed around the rule, and it's a -- just for your benefit, it is a printer-friendly version of what is available on the South Dakota -- State of South Dakota's website.

So hopefully as I'm trying to refer to lines of text, that you and $I$ are about the same.
A. Okay.
Q. Now I understand you're not a lawyer, and so I'm not asking for legal analysis. I just would like to walk through a couple of the phrases that are in the rule and
hopefully get a better understanding of your interpretation.
A. Okay.

MS. CREMER: If I could just interrupt for a moment, did he talk about this rule in his testimony? MR. MORATZKA: Yes, he did.

MS. CREMER: Where? I'm not -- I don't doubt you, Drew, but --

MR. MORATZKA: Rebuttal, page 8, lines 22
through page 9, line 14, page 13--
MS. CREMER: Okay. There I found it.
And so your line of questioning has to do with what?

MR. MORATZKA: Mr. Peterson's understanding of the rule.

MS. CREMER: Okay.
Q. Mr. Peterson, you would agree, wouldn't you, that the Administrative Rule 20:10:13:44 requires analysis of a 12 -month historical test year; is that correct?
A. Yes. That's correct.
Q. And would you agree, Mr. Peterson, that the qualification to that that would prohibit adjustments is set forth in the final five lines of the rule beginning with the word "however"?
A. Yes.
Q. Could you, for the benefit of the record, read the sentence that starts with the word "however"?
A. Certainly. "However, no adjustment 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 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."
Q. Thank you, Mr. Peterson.

Could you turn to page 13 of your rebuttal
testimony.
A. I'm there.
Q. Could you, Mr. Peterson, look to lines 21 through 23?
A. Okay.
Q. I guess I'm having a hard time understanding what I understand your claim to be. And I'll state my understanding, and then if you could correct me or confirm my understanding, that would be great.

I understand that your testimony is that although the rule requires expected changes in revenue to be incorporated into any proposed -- any adjustment, that your interpretation of that language is that the
adjustment has to be one that produces revenue.
Is my understanding correct?
A. Almost correct.

The adjustments that are revenue producing or income producing would have to reflect either the additional revenue or the additional income that results from that change in operation before it would be recognized as a known and measurable adjustment.

And those types of changes are not included in the Settlement between the company and the Staff.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Peterson. And maybe to put a finer point or a better portion in your testimony that discusses this, is that laid out on page 9, lines 1 through 6?
A. Yeah. That's my restatement or my understanding of the Commission's practice and the Commission Staff's interpretation of the rule, yes.
Q. But, Mr. Peterson, I wonder, wouldn't that interpretation allow the company to cherry pick cost adjustments that don't have a revenue component?

MS. CREMER: Well, and I'm just going to interrupt here because that seems a more appropriate question for the company to ask them if they're cherry picking as opposed to asking Staff if the company is cherry picking. So I would object.

MR. SMITH: Okay. I think that's already been asked of the company a couple of times.

MS. CREMER: I would agree.
MR. SMITH: I'm going to let him answer it, and I'm going to overrule it if he has an opinion. And that's fine too.
A. The company -- we're using an historic test year to set rates for a future period. So the idea is to use those known expenses during the test year but reflect any known changes that occurred after the test year that will be reflected or will occur also during the rate effective period.

So the company has an opportunity to come forward with any number of adjustments as long as they meet the specific criteria that they're known and measurable and that they fall within the 24 -month period.

If they are expense reducing -- or, you know, income producing aspects or revenue producing aspects of those changes, then the Commission has a choice or has the ability to examine those changes and determine whether they are sufficiently known and measurable to reflect them or if the revenue aspects of, let's say, a generating facility you just added are not known and measurable, to exclude that plant investment from the cost of service or revenue requirement.

That's precisely what we've done in the Settlement. I don't consider that cherry picking at all. It's really the company's fiduciary responsibility to come forward with all known changes that it's aware of, and it's also the Staff's responsibility to closely examine the evidence that those changes are known and measurable, normal and recurring expenses.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Peterson. And I appreciate your and Commission Staff's interpretation of the rule.

For my benefit, could you point me to a place in the rule that supports the interpretation that the changes that -- that the last portion of the sentence in the last line of the rule only requires an analysis of changes in revenues when those revenues relate to an expense or investment that has an incremental revenue component? A. Yeah. Here's my take on that, and I tell you, I'm not a lawyer.

But if the rule intended that all revenues, not just those associated with plant additions, if all revenues are intended or are supposed to be recognized -- well, all changes in revenue are supposed to be recognized within that 24 -month period, the rule would require a forecast test year. It does not.

So the only logical conclusion is that the revenue effect of posttest year changes, specific posttest year
changes, has to be acknowledged or recognized in an adjustment before the adjustment itself can be reflected in the revenue requirement.

And that's precisely the standard that the Commission Staff has relied on since the inception of this rule.
Q. Mr. Peterson, thank you.

Can you point me to docket or some other opinion where -- the Commission has issued where the Commission has been asked for an interpretation of this rule and one was provided?
A. I'm not aware of that specific finding by the Commission, but it is imbedded in virtually every settlement that the Commission has approved since the inception of this rule.
Q. And, Mr. Peterson, you would agree that the Settlement in this case is not precedential, wouldn't you?
A. No. I wasn't intending to state that it's not precedential. And it is not.

But I'm just saying that that is the standard that the Commission Staff has relied on for all of these years, and the Commission has accepted settlements based on the reliance of that standard.
Q. And, I guess, finally, Mr. Peterson, you don't see
any inherent unfairness in looking back for a historic test year using sales revenue from a backward looking test year and allowing cost adjustments to come in without -- and letting them come in for up to 24 months after that test year, without requiring the utility to put forth some analysis on the change in revenue?

MS. CREMER: I'm going to object as to the argumentative nature of the question. I think you can probably modify that to be a question as opposed to really an opinion on your part as to what his opinion should be.

MR. SMITH: I think the question is understandable as a question.

Mr. Peterson, can you understand it?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. SMITH: Okay. I'm going to overrule then and go ahead and answer.
A. I think I have a couple of different responses to the question.

24 months was set by the rule. You know, I have no ability to change that. That's not the standard used everywhere. Some commissions have the 12 -month rule. New Jersey has a three-month, six-month, nine-month rule on posttest year changes. So it really depends on the jurisdiction in which you operate.

The law is the law here in South Dakota. We have to recognize changes that are known and measurable up to 24 months beyond the end of the test year. But the Commission Staff is very careful to identify any of those changes that have a revenue aspect to it. And those changes the Staff considers are not reasonably known and measurable and have been excluded from the Staff's proposed revenue requirement in this case and ultimately excluded in the Settlement Stipulation.

So I don't think it's unfair, the treatment that the Staff is afforded posttest year changes, given the 24 -month rule in South Dakota.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Peterson.

Just to clarify, you would agree that according to the rule, that any adjustments would have to be known and measurable at the time the company filed its case; correct?
A. No. I wouldn't agree with that, no.
Q. And could you point me to the spot in the rule that would support that interpretation?
A. Yeah. Unfortunately, the rule was written by legislators or legislative research assistants, not by rate consultants or utility analysts.

It says at the time of the filing. The term "the filing" is not defined. There are many filings within a
rate case. There's the application and initial direct testimony of the company.

If the drafters of this rule intended it to be at the time of the application, the word would be application, not filing.

The Interveners filed testimony. The Staff filed testimony. You're asking for permission to file posthearing briefs. Like $I$ said, there are many filings in the case, and the term is simply not defined in the rule.

So the Commission Staff has interpreted it that the adjustments have to be sufficiently known and measurable at the time of their review within the filings of the case.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Peterson.

You would agree, wouldn't you, that the word
"filing" is used multiple times in 20:10:13:44, would you not?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you.

Briefly, Mr. Peterson, could I have you turn to
page 19 of your testimony?
A. Yes. I'm there.
Q. And you would agree that -- or at least as I understand your testimony, you agree that Mr. Kollen
properly identified -- or correctly identified an error in certain Black Hills Utility Holding Company figures that were allocated to the South Dakota retail jurisdiction under the Settlement?
A. Yes. That's correct.
Q. In other words then, the revenue requirement as set forth in the Proposed Settlement includes $\$ 286,000$ that the customers of -- or at least per Black Hills Power's books, will not be paying?
A. I'm not sure that $I$ would go that far. We believe that the end result of the -- of the Settlement is -results in just and reasonable rates, and it reasonably reflects the cost that the company will incur going forward.

There were a number of issues with which the Staff and the company disagree on. The Staff's resolution of those issues are stated in the Settlement Memorandum, but the company had its own basis for settling certain issues which were either advantageous or adverse to the company.

We did not -- we don't see the company's analysis of that. But the end result, we believe, was just and reasonable rates and reasonably reflects the cost that the company expects to incur going forward.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Peterson.

Could I have you turn to page 6 of your rebuttal testimony.
A. I'm there.
Q. And it's my understanding that your testimony is that the Settlement is not a black box; is that correct? A. From Staff's point of view it's not. The company had to analyze the Staff's offer using whatever methods they wished.

You know, we weren't privy to those discussions that the company held within itself. But from Staff's point of view, it is not a black box. And in all the terms -or the resolution of each issue it's set forth in the Staff's memorandum.

And that's really Staff's position.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Peterson.

But just to confirm, that analysis contains an error.
A. Yes, it does.

MR. MORATZKA: Thank you.
No further questions.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier?
MS. COLLIER: No questions.
MR. SMITH: Okay.
Commissioners.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Yes.

Mr. Peterson, this is Commissioner Nelson. Several questions.

You have listened to the past day's worth of questions, and several times I've questioned this concept of the five-year normalization. We're seeing that with pension expenses, and $I$ think we also see it with some Worker's Comp costs. And in both of those cases those normalizations benefit the company.

How do you know that there may not be other five-year normalization opportunities that would benefit ratepayers?

What is your analysis process to determine if those opportunities are there and take advantage of those?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. First of all, one is to make it clear that the company itself isn't the primary beneficiary or the only beneficiary of this normalization adjustment.

The expense, the pension expense in particular that is reflected in the Settlement Agreement, reflects nearly a -- or over a $\$ 500,000$ reduction in expense from the test year level.

But as far as are there other opportunities for -- for normalization that may cut in the opposite direction? Yeah. There's always that possibility in any
rate case.
In fact, in nearly all the rate cases that $I$ do for myself, you know, that's one of the analyses $I$ perform is essentially the same thing that was shown on Table 1 of page 16 of my testimony.

I usually ask the utility for five years worth of detailed $O \& M$ expenses by account, and $I$ do a variance analysis to identify abnormalities in the test year. And that's part of any rate case review.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. I appreciate knowing that.

Let me visit just a minute about Staff's memo comment on weather normalization. Now if I'm understanding this correctly, BHP did a weather normalization adjustment and came up with a reduction figure of 644,000. And Staff did their analysis and only came up with a reduction of 264,000 .

Would we have been better off if Staff had not done that analysis?

THE WITNESS: No. That's just the opposite. The company reduced its test year revenues by 644,000 in their adjustment. We reduced it by -- or the Staff reduced it by only 264,000 . So the test year -- the going forward, the pro forma revenues under Staff's revenue requirement analysis, showed a higher revenue
at existing rates, therefore, a lower revenue deficiency.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. I see where my thinking was in error on that, and I appreciate your pointing that out.

I think the only other question I've got, and this goes back to one of Mr. Moratzka's last questions dealing with page 19 of your testimony where we've got this acknowledged error, would you agree that it would be difficult for a Commissioner to approve a settlement that has a known error?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I could see where it places the Commission in an awkward position. And $I$ can also state that had the Staff been aware of this error during settlement negotiations, it would have been corrected.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.
No further questions.
MR. SMITH: Commissioner Fiegen.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Mr. Peterson, one
question on your direct testimony that you provided for January 15, I believe it was filed.

On page 17 of 30 you talk about incentive compensation. And the Commission Staff ever since I've seen them work on rate cases and what $I$ get to see anyway is they've been pretty hard on performance based on
financial and they have taken that always out of incentive compensation and they continue to do it again.

But in your testimony $I$ can't quite tell. Could you kind of rephrase it for me because it kind of looks like you agree with Mr. Kollen on some of the characteristics that he has put in his direct testimony.

THE WITNESS: Yes. And $I$ think your assessment or understanding of my testimony is probably correct.

The Staff raised issues with the incentive compensation plan the company had and the payments made under the plan.

But in the end through these settlement discussions we agreed to exclude the 666,000 related specifically to financial performance. And this is the way that the issue has been treated for Black Hills on prior settlements and for all other utilities in the state on prior settlements.

But yeah. I have concerns about every utility's incentive compensation plan, not just Black Hills.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Hello.
I have a different mic. I now have Ms. Cremer's mic., and it's a little tricky to run over here.

I still don't understand your testimony, though, on your concerns that you have with incentive pay. And you've agreed with the Staff Settlement, yet you still
have some concerns, and $I$ don't -- $I$ just can't quite understand it.

I've read it a couple of times, and I'm still not getting what you're trying to let me know.

THE WITNESS: Well, I'll try to say it again. I'm very critical of many incentive compensation plans. And I will say that Black Hills' incentive compensation plan is much different than most or many other utilities.

Most utilities $I$ have seen have financial triggers in their incentive compensation plan. Those financial triggers work to -- the employees are only compensated if corporate financial goals are met first. In other words, if the stockholders get paid first, and if the workers achieve their performance or safety or customer satisfaction goal, then they'll get their incentive compensation if certain corporate financial targets are met.

Black Hills doesn't have those triggers in their plan. If customer safety goals are met, the employees eligible will receive their incentive compensation regardless of the company's earnings, even if they have negative earnings.

So I applaud Black Hills for having a plan like that. But there are things like service, supplemental
and executive retirement programs that grant additional incentive compensation to a very few people that are -that are -- by definition, exceed the plans that abide to the general body of eligible employees. I'm critical of those types of plans.

So I have a lot of questions and concerns about incentive compensation plans, but in the end the trade-offs in the negotiations involving this issue and other issues, that Staff felt it best to go back to the way that we've treated incentive compensation for all of the utilities and for this utility in prior settlements and include just those related specifically to achieving financial performance goals.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Peterson. Now I understand that you were talking about the utility history in general.

Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Additional Commissioner questions.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Nelson again. I want to follow up on that. And you talked about -- I'm focused on the figure that -- I'm not sure if it's confidential or not, but the figure we talked about yesterday dealing with restrictive stock.

You just mentioned a trade-off. What did the company trade off to get that?

THE WITNESS: Well, I think there were a number of trade-offs. We didn't -- like I say, we don't know exactly what induced Black Hills to accept any of these adjustments that the Staff proposes but we do know that we got a two-year rate moratorium and we got what we believe is a reasonable award on return on equity.

We think we have a fair apportionment of the increases to the rate classes. You know, I think there are a number of benefits to not only residential customers but to the Industrial customers also.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you. But I've got to just ask a couple of other questions on a couple other issues.

Yesterday we spent some time talking about the FutureTrack program.

Do you believe the settlement legitimately covers the Industrial Interveners' concerns with that program?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I think it should. The Staff did not accept the FutureTrack program the company proposed.

What we did agree to in place of that is to reflect the actual cost of employees actually hired. Not to a target level of employees that they haven't hired or intend to hire at some point in the future but to reflect
the actual cost of employees that have actually been hired.

And in addition we also insisted that the cost of those employees be split between operating expenses and capitalize that, activities, so that today's ratepayers aren't excessively burdened with costs that appropriately should have been capitalized.

That too is a difference between the Settlement position and the workforce plan as filed.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: No further questions.
MR. SMITH: Commissioner Fiegen.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So this is really our last opportunity to ask about the Settlement document also? Because I have questions a little bit about the Settlement, but $I$ better start asking; right?

Okay. So, Mr. Peterson, you're still on.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: We certainly appreciate the Settlement and especially the two-year moratorium. But I'm just about wondering -- and, of course, I'm a -I'm just wondering, Black Hills for the past several years has been in an expansion mode of generation. So their rates have been certainly -- and they're expensive. Has certainly been different than the utilities across the state that aren't building generation.

But they stated yesterday that they are kind of done with expansion of generation. So a two-year moratorium shouldn't be as hard as it was a few years ago when they were in the expansion mode, and the Settlement could have even extended that two-year moratorium because of the generation expansion being done.

Would you agree with that, Mr. Peterson, that that could have been looked at?

THE WITNESS: I will say that it certainly was looked at. But generation expansion isn't the only expansion that a utility has to deal with.

More and more people are requiring greater and greater reliability of the distribution system, and that's causing many utilities, including Black Hills Power, to upgrade its distribution facilities.

And the trade-offs for a longer moratorium probably would have meant a much greater rate increase to make sure that the rate awards would cover necessary distribution expansion projects.

So it's not just the ability to ask for a two-year versus three-year, four-year moratorium. Each one of those years comes at a different cost. And I can virtually guarantee that you wouldn't have the 6.9 percent -- or 6.9 million dollar revenue increase if there was a three or four-year rate moratorium.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Any additional Commissioner questions?

Or, Greg, do you have any?
Okay. I'm going to give them the -- I give them
another opportunity, Karen, after Commissioner questions.
So, Mr. Magnuson, anything?
MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you. I have no further
questions.
Thanks.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Mr. Moratzka?
MR. MORATZKA: No further questions.
Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier?
MS. COLLIER: No further questions.
Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Okay. And Staff?
MS. CREMER: Staff does not have anything.
Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Okay. I guess, Mr. Peterson, you
may step down. All right. Thank you.
(The witness is excused.)
MR. SMITH: Is that it for Staff's case?
Correct?
MS. CREMER: Yes. Except Commissioner Nelson
has expressed a great deal of interest in calling Mr. Paulson as a witness, but I'll leave that up to him. COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I think that would be fun.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I think we could probably get a majority of the Commissioners to join me on that. But I will pass.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: We can swear him in.
MR. SMITH: Okay. I think at this time let's take a break, and then we'll go back to your redirect -or your rebuttal. Excuse me. And then once you're done, we're done.

Why don't we get back about 10 to 10:00 or so. Does that sound okay? Do you want to go all the way to $10 ?$

MR. MAGNUSON: If we could, please.
MR. SMITH: All right.
(A short recess is taken)
MR. SMITH: Black Hills Power, please proceed with your rebuttal.

MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you, Mr. Smith. With the Commission's approval, I would like to cover two procedural matters before we do our rebuttal case.

MR. SMITH: Sure.
MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you. The first is one to
correct a typographical error. I'm looking at Joint Exhibit 5, which is the Interim Refund Plan.

Third paragraph, third line, it says "For the test year ending September 30, 2014." That is a typographical error. That should be corrected to read "test year ending September 30, 2013."

MR. SMITH: Okay.
MR. MAGNUSON: And $I$ have not had a chance to visit with all of the parties, but I assume that will be acceptable since it's merely just a typographical matter.

MR. SMITH: Any objection?
MR. MORATZKA: No objection. Thank you.
MS. COLLIER: No objection.
MS. CREMER: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Okay. And are you going to submit a replacement page so we can put it on the --

MR. MAGNUSON: We will. Because of our difficulties of getting everything printed it and everything, may be just a couple of days.

MR. SMITH: Oh, I don't mean now. Just at some point so we can get it on the website.

MR. MAGNUSON: Yes. We will submit corrected Joint Exhibit 5.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you. The second matter -again, I'm anticipating that there won't be any problems -- we do not have Kyle White's nonconfidential version of his testimony marked as an exhibit. It has been prefiled in that form so everybody has a copy, but we have not marked it as an exhibit. So we would like to mark that as an exhibit.

We would propose that Exhibit 78 be Kyle White's nonconfidential version of his rebuttal testimony.

MR. SMITH: Okay. I would assume there's no objection because the confidential version's already been admitted.

MR. MORATZKA: That's correct. No objection.
And you said 78?
MR. MAGNUSON: That's correct, Drew.
MR. MORATZKA: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier, I'm assuming no objection.

MS. COLLIER: No objection.
MS. CREMER: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Well, please proceed, Black Hills.

MS. KOENIG: Black Hills Power calls Kyle White. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. KOENIG:
Q. Mr. White, do you recall the line of questioning that took place yesterday regarding the number of rate cases Black Hills Power has filed in the last 10 or so years?

MR. MORATZKA: Just a procedural matter. Is
Mr. White under oath?
MS. KOENIG: Yes.
MR. SMITH: He is.
MR. MORATZKA: Thank you.
Q. In your 30 plus years with the company how many rate cases has Black Hills Power filed with the Commission?
A. Five.
Q. In the 1995 rate case what was the primary driver for that filing?
A. The primary driver for that filing was the Neil Simpson 2 coal-fired power plant.

MR. SMITH: Is your mic. on?
THE WITNESS: It is. I'll move it closer.
Q. What was the primary driver for the 2006 Black Hills Power rate case?
A. Well, after 11 years with no changes in the prices that Black Hills Power's customers had paid, we found it necessary to reinstate an energy cost adjustment or a fuel and purchase power adjustment, and that was the
primary driver of the 2006 case.
Q. What was the primary driver for the 2009 rate case?
A. That was related to the Wygen III coal-fired power plant.
Q. And the primary driver for the 2012 rate case?
A. Well, it was related actually to the primary driver for this rate case, the Cheyenne Prairie Generating Station, in that the company had participated in developing legislation for a phase-in plan, and the phase-in plan had a requirement of a parallel rate case.
Q. Then, to reiterate, the primary driver for the current rate case is what?
A. Is the Cheyenne Prairie Generating Station, significant capital infrastructure investments, the decommissioning of three coal-fired power plants, and the storm Atlas cost recovery.
Q. Did Mr. Kollen indicate yesterday that there may be a second error in the Settlement Agreement associated with debt cost?
A. Yes. He did indicate that there may be a second error in the Settlement, and $I$ would like to address that today.
Q. Do you agree with Mr. Kollen's opinion regarding the debt cost?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Was this topic addressed in the rebuttal testimony that was filed by Black Hills Power?
A. Yes. Mr. Thurber addressed it in his testimony. MS. KOENIG: May I approach the witness?

MR. SMITH: You may.
(Exhibit BHP 79 is marked for identification)
Q. Mr. White, I've handed you a two-page document. Can you identify this document?
A. Yes. It is Black Hills Power's Response to South Dakota PUC Staff Request No. 2-57.
Q. Is the Bates No. on the bottom of that document BHP-SD-008926?
A. Yes. And the second sheet is 27.
Q. And what is reflected in the second sheet?
A. The second sheet represents the pro forma debt capital and related cost for Black Hills Power after it issued the 85 million dollars of first mortgage bonds last year.
Q. And was the second sheet provided as an attachment
to the response to Data Request 2-57?
A. Yes, it was.

MS. KOENIG: Black Hills Power moves to admit
Exhibit 79 .
MR. SMITH: Is there an objection?

MR. MORATZKA: No objection.
MS. COLLIER: No objection.
MS. CREMER: No objection.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Black Hills 79 is admitted.
Q. Is the actual debt cost that was reflected in the Settlement depicted on Attachment 2-57?
A. Yes. On line number 8, Column J the debt cost is 4.46 percent.
Q. Are you able to provide the Commission an explanation for the disconnect between the debt cost and the Settlement Agreement and what Mr. Kollen has indicated that he believes the debt cost to be?
A. Yes. Initially the company expected that it may utilize a public placement of the first mortgage bonds. And that usually has an additional discount associated with it, which increases the term interest cost -- or the term cost of the debt.

In this case we were able to place it as a private placement, and so there was no related discount. And so your actual interest rate plus the cost of issuing is what we're reflecting as the 4.46 percent.
Q. So just to be clear, in your opinion, is there an error in the Settlement Agreement associated with debt cost?
A. No, there is not.
Q. Did Black Hills Power make significant compromises to reach the Settlement Agreement that is presently before the Commission today?
A. Yes. We did.
Q. And could you provide just a general overview of those compromises?
A. The company and Staff went through a thorough examination of our business operations. We had the opportunity to talk about things like return on equity, capital structure, recovery of certain expenses, and we did make significant compromises.

You're aware of what the return on equity is confidentially in the Settlement. Last year the company had settlements approved in Wyoming for Black Hills Power at 9.9 percent return on equity with an actual capital structure.

We also had Cheyenne Light gas and electric cases both approved with 9.29 percent with an actual capital structure. In a litigated decision in Colorado the Commission authorized a 9.83 percent return on equity with an actual capital structure.

MR. SMITH: Are you going down a confidential path here?

THE WITNESS: I am not.
A. And, in addition, in each of those cases we had full
recovery of our incentive compensation as a recognized necessary cost to attract, motivate, and retain employees.

We also have compromised somewhat in the rate design. The company would prefer to have higher costs associated with customer charges. And so there are customer benefits that are provided in the way Staff has negotiated this case.

We've also compromised on certain known and measurable adjustments. We have amortizations that, you know, with the time value money don't have an impact financially in the company, but there were numerous changes and compromises that were made to reach that Settlement.

And the Settlement recognizes that the company had certain expectations in the amount that we filed for at 14.6 million dollars. We're actually compromised now down to 6.89 million dollars. Plus we've agreed to live with these rates for a two-year period of time.

In addition, the energy cost adjustments was modified from what the company's initial application was to ensure that customers still had a utility interested in power marketing its profitability through that guarantee of a million dollars each year.
Q. Is there anything else that you would like to
address today?
A. Yes. The Settlement is before you. You've had some questions about the error both of myself, Mr. Thurber, Mr. Peterson.

The company would be interested in understanding more fully the Commission's potential concerns with regard to that. We've stated that we used the best available information at the time that we entered into the Settlement. We've seen changes that have occurred since the settlement. There's always new information like the Wyodak $1-\mathrm{M}$ cost that we've talked about.

But if there's a hesitation by the Commission, the company would like to be aware of what that hesitation might be in approving the Settlement.
Q. Are you still -- is the company still fully supportive of the Settlement Agreement that is presently before the Commission for approval?
A. Yes, we are.

MS. KOENIG: At this time Mr. White's available for questions.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Moratzka.
MR. MORATZKA: Could I have just 30 seconds?
MR. SMITH: Sure.
MR. MORATZKA: No further questions.
Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier?
MS. COLLIER: Thank you.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. COLLIER:
Q. You were asked by your counsel about the primary drivers for the five rate cases since 1995. And, as I understand it, basically four out of those five are directly related to the creation of various generating power plants.

Is that correct?
A. That's correct. And it's actually five cases since my career began in 1982.
Q. Yeah. So four out of the five -- because one of
them I believe you said was for an energy cost adjustment?
A. That's correct.
Q. So the -- from 1995 until the decommissioning in 2013 BHP was primarily relying upon coal-fired plants for a good portion of its power generation.

Is that accurate?
A. That's accurate.
Q. Would it also be accurate to say that the change from coal to natural gas was in part motivated by federal energy standards that were coming into play?
A. In part. And also in part by the nature of the load
that needed to be served.
Q. So does BHP have in place a plan for how they will deal with future power generation if and when the current power generation mode is no longer available or acceptable?
A. Well, we're actually in a window where we have adequate resources, and we believe we have access to the power markets to make up any difference that may occur for the next several years.

Our most recent integrated resource plan identified a need for additional generation in the 2023-2024 time frame. And so our expectation is that we now have resources available to meet our customers' needs for the next several years, absent no additional governmental impositions that might cause that to change, and that we actually have a relatively new generation fleet.

We believe other utilities will start to catch up with us as they make changes in their generation fleet in response to the governmental mandates and just the general aging of the coal-fired power fleet and the nuclear fleet in the United States.

So we believe we're near a period of time where we'll have more rate stability. That doesn't mean that our other costs don't go up and that we may not need to be before this Commission again. But we've committed for
a couple of years to not come before the commission with a base rate increase.

MS. COLLIER: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Staff.
MS. CREMER: Staff doesn't have any questions.
Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Commissioners.
Commissioner Fiegen.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Just to clarify your testimony once again, you started in 1982.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: You talked about the different rate cases that have been in front of the Public Utilities Commission.

So if my math is right, are you telling me that over the last 32 years there has been five rate cases in front of the Commission?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you. I just
wanted to clarify that because $I$ couldn't quite tell between '82 and'95.

Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: I think I know the answer -- I'm pretty sure I know the answer to this, but

I'm just curious.
Do you see any of the compromises at all that you spoke to or that -- any of the others in any way potentially affecting the residential rates?

THE WITNESS: Well, yes. We have a lower
revenue requirement which benefits all classes. We're consistent with our allocation of the rate increase from our application to the actual settlement, and so the residential class got a substantial benefit there.

The Commission Staff has had a very tight hold on raising customer charges. You know, we're lucky to get 50 cents a rate case, which means over my 30 years that customer charge has not increased very much. And those kinds of things have happened.

The residential customer also benefits from the energy cost adjustment and the power marketing credit guarantee that's provided for in that, along with some of the sharing elements in that energy cost adjustment.

So yeah. I think there are significant benefits that arise through a settlement that aren't available to a Commission in just a straight litigated decision.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Additional Commissioner questions?
Any follow-up to the Commissioner questions, Mr. Moratzka?

MR. MORATZKA: None. Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier?
MS. COLLIER: None. Thank you.
MS. CREMER: Staff doesn't have any. Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Black Hills, do you have any
redirect?
MS. KOENIG: May we have a short break?
MR. SMITH: Sure. It's 21 after. How about
10: 30?
MS. KOENIG: Sure. Thank you.
(A short recess is taken)
MR. SMITH: Black Hills, please proceed.
MS. KOENIG: Black Hills Power has no further
questions for Mr. White.
MR. SMITH: Okay. You may step down, Mr. White.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
(The witness is excused.)
MR. SMITH: Call your next witness.
MR. MAGNUSON: The company, Black Hills Power,
has no more witnesses to call at this time.
We would rest.
MR. SMITH: Well, $I$ think our evidentiary
portion of the hearing is at a conclusion.
At this point based on the decision we made at the beginning, we'll turn to motions. And we have three
of them.
We have two Motions For Approval of Settlement Stipulation, and we have the Motion of the Industrial Interveners for a briefing schedule.

Commissioners, how do you want to handle -which ones of those do you want to deal with?

I think one issue we need to know up front -and I'm assuming $I$ know the answer, but do you intend to take this under advisement, or do you intend to take action today?

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Normally I'm the guy who wants to take action, but in this case $I$ would take it under advisement.

MR. SMITH: That appears to be a consensus of the Commission.

My assumption then is that the two motions for Settlement Stipulation approval will be delayed, action on those, until a subsequent meeting of the Commission; is that correct?

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Correct.
MR. SMITH: Okay. So let's turn to a Motion for a briefing schedule.

And I guess question one is does the Commission want posthearing briefing?

My assumption is yes, but I -- go ahead and
comment.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: My response to that would be yes. And if $I$ might just be a little proactive, you know, I read your Motion. I'm not sure that we can live with the schedule, however. You know, we need to have a decision by the end of March.

I am looking at a Commission meeting that is already scheduled for March 17 that might be a great time for us to deal with this issue, and so a schedule that would accommodate that meeting would be something that $I$ would support.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: And, Mr. Chairman, when you say "decision by the end of March" you also mean that our Order has to be written and filed. Because, otherwise, the interim rates -- we have some issues with interim rates.

MR. SMITH: Our statutory deadine is March 31. So it's one year after the -- so we've got to be -- the decision has to be out by then.

So just thoughts of the parties on what you'd like to see in terms of a briefing schedule.

MR. MORATZKA: Could we perhaps modify the Motion and maybe toss that out for the parties' discussion?

MR. SMITH: Sure.

MR. MORATZKA: I think what we'd be willing to do in recognizing the time frame and wanting to be sure the Commission has adequate time, that it may be beneficial just to have one set of simultaneous briefs exchanged and try to pencil the date out -- or the due date, you know, somewhere in between three and four weeks prior to the March 17 date if that would give the Commission enough time to review the parties' submissions.

And then, you know, since we're only doing one brief, if the Commission wants to put a cap on pages, I don't know, something like 40 , or no cap, we're open to suggestions. But that was our thought after thinking about this a little further.

Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Black Hills.
MR. MAGNUSON: Two things.
First, I would -- I think, before we take our position on the briefing, $I$ would like to hear from Staff.

But, second, the Settlement Stipulation provides for rates to be implemented for services rendered on or before March 1 of 2015. And so by virtue of any action that it's going to be taking place after March 1 , it's not in compliance with what we have with the Settlement

Stipulation.
With that being said, I think that the record is complete. I think you have a full and complete record before you.

The other thing $I$ note is that in order for the company to implement rates they need a certain period of time to modify the bills and to get those rates into their system so that it can go out to the customers.

So I'm not sure that I'm offering any solutions, but I'm identifying some potential problems.

So with that being said, before we take a position on briefing, I think I would like to hear what Staff has to say.

MR. SMITH: Karen.
MS. CREMER: And with that $I$ will -- my issue or one of my issues is whenever this is heard, if there is a modification to the Settlement Stipulation that invokes Roman Numeral 2, paragraph 2, which allows the parties to walk away from the Settlement Agreement, which means we then go to hearing on the full case.

And Staff has not filed its testimony. Our litigation position is considerably different than what you've heard, you know, through modified testimony.

So you would have to hold a hearing and get your decision out by March 17. I don't think, frankly, that
we can wait until the 17 th of March or really even much late in February because we have to hold a hearing possibly, which would be a week-long hearing.

So those are my thoughts.
MR. SMITH: Ms. Collier.
MS. COLLIER: I understand the points that have been raised. And even though we have not participated a great deal in filings, what $I$ have heard today includes two -- at least two legal issues that $I$ think absolutely require briefing because they are legal issues, and this is a factual evidentiary hearing.

And it seems to me that without the briefing based upon all the testimony that's been here today, that not only -- of course, $I$ understand the possibility of a party walking away but also of setting the scene for if anyone were to file an appeal, not having a particularly well prepared case ready.

It just seems to me like it really needs to be addressed. And if the Commission wanted to limit issues or pages as a way of addressing some of those things, that would be another option.

But I know that the other Interveners have a large number of issues. I'm speaking mostly of concern because of what I've heard relating to at least two legal issues.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I have two questions.
Did we get an answer as to when the transcript would be ready?

## (Discussion off the record)

CHAIRMAN NELSON: February 6 if I'm looking at this correctly.

The second question, how much time does the company need to change their billing system?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: May I ask General Counsel a quick question on how he interprets the law?

So I know on siting cases we have to be done within a year. But I remember an Xcel rate case that we had a few years ago that our order was not out within that year and it extended $I$ think into August or something and it should have been done June 30.

And $I$ can't remember all the circumstances, but then the interim rate that Xcel put on, they could have kept that entire amount but they graciously gave it back to the consumers.

Could you please explain that one year and how that Xcel Energy rate case was a little bit different?

MR. SMITH: Well, $I$ don't know that $I$ can exactly remember that, to tell you the truth.

But, again, things are different too, though, when you're in a situation where you don't have a
contested case situation. I mean, that changes things. And, you know, here it's a little bit different, you know, when we're in a contested situation.

But $I$ think -- $I$ mean, $I$ really think it's
critical that we meet at least the one-year deadline, and that's March 31.

The filing was on March 31, if I recall; right?
MR. MAGNUSON: That's correct.
MR. SMITH: So, I mean, what we're dealing with again is this March 1 effective date that's specified in the Stipulation. And, you know, again --

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So my question is we haven't met it every time, but it's just because it wasn't contested and the utility just worked with us? Or --

MR. SMITH: Right. I think in some cases -- you know, there's -- I think there's flexibility in the date that it will go into effect. And we have even had situations where the company has gone ahead with its -its implementation prior to when we've actually got the actual written decision out.

But here in this case, you know, they've specified a March 1 date. And our legal deadine is March 31. And I definitely think we need to comply with that in this case.

Mr. Moratzka?
Oh --
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Can $I$ get the answer to my question?

MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you, Commissioner Nelson.
The response $I$ got from my people is it has to be implemented -- it has to be tested all before it can be finally implemented. So approximately two to three weeks, maybe as little as 10 days, but $I$ believe that would really be pushing it. I got a couple of different opinions as $I$ was sitting here.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, the last thing we want is for it to be implemented and then be incorrect and that further confuses things.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Moratzka.
MR. MORATZKA: Just a quick point of clarification.

Our understanding on the Order and Notice of Hearing in this matter is that there were two issues before the Commission. One, should the Proposed Settlement be approved; and, two, as we're reading, if not, then what rates, terms, and conditions shall the Commission approve?

And our understanding would be then based on everything that came in today and yesterday, the

Commission can either approve the Settlement or approve the Settlement as modified. We don't need anymore hearings, is our understanding.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Black Hills, do you have a opinion on that?

MR. MAGNUSON: Well, the Settlement Stipulation that's being requested for approval today includes the provision that if there's any material modification of that document by this Commission, that the parties have the right to withdraw from that Settlement Stipulation.

Now what's the definition of material? We wouldn't know that until we got some indication of what that modification might be. But if it was material, certainly the company or Staff could withdraw from that Settlement Stipulation, which then means that it would go to a fully litigated hearing.

Now with that being said, all of the evidence that has come in today would stay in place. And so I'm not saying that when $I$ say fully litigated hearing there probably wouldn't be a lot of additional evidence necessary, but there would be some additional evidence that would be necessary. Because just, as Karen Cremer said, that their testimony on a fully litigated case is going to be different than what they did here.

The same holds true for the company. Our
testimony would be different in a fully litigated case.
MR. SMITH: Thoughts, Commissioners, on what you think. It's feasible?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: You know, I totally missed that March 1 date in the things that I looked at. I just overread it or assumed, made an assumption that it was after March 31. Why would that be in a settlement, I guess?

I guess maybe you don't have to answer that and we're not at that point, but $I$ just missed that.

MR. MAGNUSON: May I go ahead and address Commissioner Fiegen's inquiry?

There's probably two main reasons why the company is interested in getting a decision sooner because of that March 1 date. Two reasons: Number one, we have interim rates in place right now. The sooner the actual final rates get implemented, the sooner we can return money to the customers.

Second, the money that we're holding at the present time has a carrying cost. We have to pay interest back to those customers, and we'd prefer not to have to pay anymore interest than has already been accrued.

The other thing I might add, if I could, I don't know what the Commission's schedule is, but there had
been discussion about briefing, that people want to get the transcript. What I'm hearing is that a large portion of the briefing is going to revolve around legal issues, and I'm not sure necessarily the transcript is going to be necessary for those particular legal issues.

So off the top of my head, I'm wondering about a briefing deadline simultaneous briefs, no reply, of February 11.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: If I might just inform, we have a Commission meeting scheduled for the morning of February 13.

I'm intrigued with your proposal. I might move it up a day to the 10 th instead of the 11 th. But I'm intrigued with your proposal, curious with what the other Commissioners and parties believe.

MR. MORATZKA: While I understand and appreciate the parties' concerns and the Commission's interest in moving this matter along, I adamantly disagree with counsel's statement that facts are irrelevant.

We have had extensive cross on this issue. And so to say that the transcripts are unnecessary seems to be a bit of a stretch.

And, you know, next Monday is the 2 nd. The 6th is a Friday. That leaves us less than a week and a half to brief a case and get the transcript. Even if we're
only limited to the issue on -- the legal issue, there are a number of adjustments that we've objected to that relate to that interpretation.

And so fleshing -- you know, this isn't just a, you know, write a memo on the meaning of the rule. It's here's how the rule impacts the facts of this case.

I don't think the Commission should interpret the ruling in a vacuum. And so $I$-- we're happy to move, you know, the briefing, like I said, to late February, but $I$ don't understand bifurcating the issue or trying to speed things along.

And to respond to the point about March 1, we weren't party to the Settlement. It's really hard for us to say why someone would choose an effective date for the Settlement before the statutory time frame had arrived. I don't understand.

But what $I$ wondered if would be possible is the effective date of the rates could stem backward to March 1 and if the Settlement were approved so that we weren't, I guess, feeling as though we had to reach an answer to meet the terms of a settlement that the Interveners object to.

MR. SMITH: Black Hills, did you hear what he had to say?

MR. MAGNUSON: Yes.

And perhaps Drew misunderstands me. I did not say that the transcript was irrelevant, I think was his phrase. The transcript is important.

But we certainly can begin preparing our briefs on the legal issues well in advance of receipt of the transcript.

The rates, as $I$ understand them, subject to correction, actually go back to October 1 of 2014, whatever the final rates are. So that's what we're looking at for refunds to customers. Yes. We are concerned about the carrying costs for that.

I think generally speaking we would prefer to see a decision by this Commission well before March 31 and respect the date of March 1, 2015 , that was set forth in the Settlement Stipulation.

MR. SMITH: I don't have my calendar here, my work calendar. What do we have for available -(A short recess is taken)

MR. SMITH: Since the evidentiary hearing is over I am going to step down and turn the floor back over to the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Gee, thanks, Mr. Smith.
I think, one piece of information that came to light at least on this side of the table, Ms. Wittler indicated she could probably have the transcript ready by

February 4.
With that, Commissioner Fiegen, do you want to make a statement?

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Yes. I do have a question.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Certainly.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: I have a question of Staff and Black Hills Power.

In your Settlement Agreement, which I did not read this part of it, was the March 1 implementation deadine -- or you were going to implement rates on March 1 .

Do you consider that a material change if we put the Order out on March 31? Is that a material change in your Settlement?

MR. MAGNUSON: Your first question whether or not that is a material change, without taking a formal position on that statement, we may not consider that a material change.

However, with that being said, we've been informed that typically we are allowed about 30 days to test and implement billing rates. And so if that -- if the decision gets pushed back to March 31 , it will be another 30 days before we can implement rates, and the difference between the March 1 date and two months later
without taking any other costs into effect just because carrying charge will probably be about $\$ 40,000$.

MR. SMITH: On implementation too, if -- I mean, once the Commission has met and made its decision, even though the Order will take a little time to get done, would you not be able to begin your implementation once you know what the decision is? Even though the Order hasn't yet formally been issued.

MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you for that question. If the Settlement were approved exactly as it is set forth in the Settlement Stipulation and we received a decision, an oral decision from this Commission, we would immediately begin the process of switching over to those new rates.

We would not necessarily wait for the written Order for us to commence the process to get those rates switched over. That would be contingent on approval of the exact Settlement Stipulation as submitted.

If there are changes to that, then we have to try and make any of those changes.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: So the answer to your question would be if you implemented April 1 instead of March 1 , informally you're saying that that would not be a material change. And so if we look at a Commission meeting March 2 and give the Interveners ample time to
reply, that wouldn't be a material change.
MR. MAGNUSON: That's our informal or tentative position at this point.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Okay. Thank you.
And I'll make a comment whenever you want me to, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Just our observation from this side of the table. We know there was discussion among the attorneys.

Anybody want to share anything that maybe progressed?

MR. MORATZKA: I'll go ahead. I was trying to move things forward by just tossing out a date. And I understood that the transcripts would be ready February 6 so $I$ thought 10 days, which would put it at February 16 would be doable. Then $I$ realized that February 16 is President's Day, and so $I$ was suggesting to the parties that perhaps February 17 would be a decent day for simultaneous submission of briefs.

That was also on the assumption that that would then give the Commission 30 days roughly to look at our submissions at a March 17 hearing.

Now if the Commission's going to choose a March 2 date, you know, I'm not sure if the Commission feels comfortable with the February 17 exchange. I guess

I'd be all ears in listening.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: I want to just hold that question. It's a valid question. I'm going to let Ms. Cremer go, and then we'll come back to that.

MS. CREMER: Thank you.
This is Karen Cremer of Staff. And the problem is that if on March 2 things were approved as filed, then that will work.

If it's not approved as filed and it's a material change and we all decide to go to hearing, that becomes a real problem.

Now we can start writing our testimony now, I guess, and get that ready to go so it can be filed, you know, the middle of March. You can hold -- you know, if you're going to hold your hearing the middle of March and get a decision out.

But, again, that doesn't address the problem that if you don't approve as filed. And I know Mr. Moratzka has all sorts of argument as to why that's not accurate, but $I$ do disagree with him on that.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Well, the fact of the matter is we're in a box. And I'm not sure it's a box of anybody's making but it's a reality and $I$ don't know that there's a perfect solution.

Let me go back to Mr. Moratzka's question. At
least from this Commissioner, if we were to deal with this on March 2, February 17 would certainly be acceptable to me.

And I'm seeing nods from fellow Commissioners.
That doesn't resolve Ms. Cremer's concern. But I think it would be fair to say that, you know, if the Settlement is not resolved on March 2, this thing blows up anyway. I mean, it's going to be a slog. And that's part of our job. And it's reality.

MR. MORENO: There is a solution. March 1 is a Sunday. So wouldn't by operation of law the applicable date be the next business day because March 1 is a Sunday?

MR. MAGNUSON: Respectfully, no.
Rates are rates. They go by the day. It doesn't go by the next official business day.

From the company's perspective, we would be comfortable with the March 2 hearing date. And I respect and agree with attorney Cremer's observations. But from our standpoint, if this Commission were so inclined, we would be okay with a March 2 hearing date. And then you can work backwards from there on when you would like the briefs.

MR. SMITH: Unless -- any thoughts?
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Any direction you take I
will support.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: WOw.
Okay. Cheri's nodding it's on the record. And there was no expiration date on that statement.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: But I might appeal it.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: On this particular issue.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Go ahead and ask your question, and then $I$ may ask for a moment of recess.

MR. RISLOV: The Settlement states that the billings would be for service on and after. How many days does that give you as compared to billings on and after?

MR. WHITE: I'm not sure $I$ know exactly how to answer that question now that we have our advanced metering infrastructure. And so we're billing consistently throughout the month.

The rates become effective a certain date, and the programming within the billing system will prorate based upon that date. The refunds will be calculated based upon whenever this starts.

And so when we agreed to the Settlement there were two objectives, get lower rates for customers as soon as possible and mitigate the 7 percent interest that we pay on the over collection that's been happening since October 1.

But it's only a couple of days difference between the effective date and when the bills actually go out.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: With that, I'm going to take a five-minute recess.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Rislov, I'd like to see you in the hallway.

> (A short recess is taken)

CHAIRMAN NELSON: I'll call the meeting back to order.

I move that we set a briefing schedule of simultaneous briefs due on February 17 and that we take up this matter in our regularly scheduled meeting on March 2.

Discussion on the Motion.
If I might, Ms. Cremer, I'm very cognizant of your concerns. Should the Settlement be rejected -- as I said earlier, this thing's going to get messy irregardless. If we were to reject it today, it's going to get messy irregardless. And so I'm not sure that we can fix that concern regardless of what we do.

In my mind, given the constraints that we've got, this is the best that we can do. I appreciate the company giving us a little bit of leeway on that March 1 deadline. That helps us greatly.

And $I$ think we'll allow all parties their due process if it were to thoroughly brief us on the issues that they think we need to consider as we make this decision.

Other comments on the Motion?
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Could I be off the record for just a moment?

> (Discussion off the record)

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I don't have anything to add.

Thank you.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I do like your Motion. I want to make sure both parties, all parties actually, have adequate time to prepare. I mean, they've spent a lot of time on this docket already.

And yes. You never know what a Commission will decide, if they take the Settlement or not. And we are in a situation where if we do not accept this settlement because of some issues that we've raised, we will have a very, very busy March.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: This is a little bit out of order, but I'm just going to quickly go around the room to the attorneys.

Is there anything that you would dramatically
object to?
And $I$ know your uncomforts, but is there
something that we absolutely need to know before we move forward?

MR. MORATZKA: Not that I'm aware of.
Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Mr. Magnuson?
MR. MAGNUSON: It's acceptable as proposed.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Ms. Collier.
MS. COLLIER: I agree.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Ms. Cremer.
MS. CREMER: Nothing from Staff.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Thank you.
Any further discussion?
Seeing none, all those in favor will vote aye, those opposed, nay.

Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes aye.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson votes aye.
The Motion carries.
Is there anything else to be addressed for the good of the order?

And the attorneys are in stunned silence.
Mr. Magnuson.
MR. MAGNUSON: Let's talk about the March 2. That's an open meeting. I assume that's when you will proceed with your deliberations?

CHAIRMAN NELSON: That's correct. That is a meeting that is scheduled for $1: 30$ in the afternoon. We may -- it will definitely be an afternoon meeting. We may move it up to 1 o'clock to make sure we've got ample time. But because it's a Monday, we typically go with an afternoon type meeting.

And yes. I would anticipate that, barring something unforeseen, that we would have our full deliberation and a decision one way or the other that day.

MR. MAGNUSON: Just looking forward, we obviously have our full contingent of people here today. We'll make a decision on who all comes, but $I$ guess my question is do you expect that you would be taking testimony from any of our people that day? Or certainly if you were going to take testimony, it would be from a limited number, perhaps just one company representative?

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Absolutely. I don't
anticipate that we would take testimony. At that point
we will have the briefs. We've got everything that we've heard during these two days, and $I$ would expect at that point it will come down to any last-minute questions that we may have of the attorneys.

And I'm going to look at my fellow Commissioners to see if they disagree with that.

COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: And I would expect Mr. White to be available. And if that's by phone or in person. And then you would have access to all your people that they could answer our questions, I would assume.

So it doesn't mean that you have to be here in person, but we just want to make sure that we have our questions answered if needed.

MR. MAGNUSON: Very good. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: And as far as Staff is concerned, if Mr. Paulson's available in his suit coat that day, that would be appropriate also.

MS. CREMER: I have a question then.
So if there's a decision on the $2 n d$ and it modifies the Settlement Stipulation, we have until the 3rd to say that's not material to the parties, or we have until the -- is there a -- or, you know, is it just going to be here it is -- I'm not sure what -- you know, do we have an amount of time?

I think when it's been done in the past, and someone can correct me, $I$ think with Xcel possibly they had three days or five days to decide if they thought that was material or not. There will be some sort of a --

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Yeah. I don't think we can answer that today, other than $I$ appreciate you raising the question, and we'll be prepared to answer that at that time. If that's necessary.

MS. CREMER: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Any other issues?
If not, $I$ want to say to all of the attorneys and everybody that's testified here today I greatly appreciate the time and attention that you've given to this matter. The decorum with which you have operated, we appreciate that also. There were hard questions but fair questions, and we appreciate that.

Is there a Motion?
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I move to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Move to adjourn.
All those in favor will vote aye. Those opposed, nay.

Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN NELSON: Commissioner Fiegen.
COMMISSIONER FIEGEN: Fiegen votes aye.
CHAIRMAN NELSON: Nelson votes aye. We are adjourned.
(The hearing is adjourned at 11:25 a.m.)
(Staff Exhibit 2 is marked.)
(BHP Exhibit 78 is marked.)
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