RECEIVED

JUN 2 3 2010

1	SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
2	OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA
3	
4	IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF BLACK HILLS POWER, INC. FOR AUTHORITY EL09-018
5	BLACK HILLS POWER, INC. FOR AUTHORITY EL09-018 TO INCREASE ITS ELECTRIC RATES
6	
7	Transcript of Proceedings ORIGINAL June 10, 2010
8	=======================================
9	
10	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DUSTIN JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN (via DDN) STEVE KOLBECK, VICE CHAIRMAN (via telephone)
11	GARY HANSON, COMMISSIONER (via DDN)
12	COMMISSION STAFF John Smith (via DDN)
13	Karen Cremer Greg Rislov
14	Dave Jacobson Tim Binder
15	Jon Thurber Terri Labrie Baker
16	Bob Knadle Cindy Kemnitz
17	Demaris Axthelm
18	APPEARANCES
19	Lee A. Magnuson (via DDN), appearing on behalf of Black Hills Power,
20	Sam Khoroosi (via telephone), appearing on behalf of the Residential Consumer
21	Coalition, Andrew Moratzka (via DDN),
22	appearing on behalf of Black Hills Industrial Interveners.
23	Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR, CRR
24	
25	

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol Building, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 10th day of June, 2010, commencing at 1 o'clock p.m.

Meeting of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission to order. It is June 10. It's approximately 1 o'clock. The meeting is taking place electronically both in the Capitol Building in Pierre and at the Mitchell Technical Institute. We also, as is typical, have folks participating telephonically.

There is one Docket on the agenda for today. That's EL09-018. That is the Black Hills Power rate case.

We do have three questions before the Commission today. I should tell you that I am Dusty Johnson. My colleagues Steve Kolbeck and Gary Hanson are also participating in the meeting.

We do have a court reporter, Ms. Cheri Wittler. And so to aid her in her work let's go ahead and pause for a moment and let her know who we have on the telephone and at each location. We will begin here in Mitchell, and we would just ask each person to identify themselves.

MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you, Chairman Johnson. I am Lee Magnuson from Lynn, Jackson Law Firm here as outside counsel for Black Hills Power.

MR. WHITE: Kyle White with Black Hills Corporation.

```
1
              MR. BRINK:
                          Todd Brink with Black Hills
2
    Corporation.
3
              MR. MORATZKA:
                            Andrew Moratzka, M-O-R-S-T-Z-K-A,
4
    here on behalf of the Black Hills Industrial Interveners.
5
    And at the Capitol is Chuck Schroyer, also appearing for
    Black Hills Interveners.
6
7
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:
                                 Great.
                                          Thanks, Mr. Moratzka.
8
    Let's go ahead and work the phone lines and see what
9
    parties we have there.
10
              Mr. Khoroosi, I know you're on.
              MR. KHOROOSI: Yes. Good afternoon,
11
12
     Commissioner.
                    Sam Khoroosi, spelled K-H-O-R-O-O-S-I,
     appearing from Sioux Falls on behalf of the Residential
13
14
    Consumers Coalition.
15
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:
                                 Mr. Khoroosi, do you have any
16
     other person with you or with your intervening party on
17
     the telephone line?
18
              MR. KHOROOSI:
                             No.
19
              CHAIRMAN JOHNSON:
                                 Okay. That's fine.
                                                       And then
20
     let's -- I know we've got Mr. Faulkenberg on the phone as
21
     well for the Industrial Interveners. Is that right?
22
              Anybody else, Mr. Moratzka, you want to
23
     introduce?
24
              Okay. Let's go ahead and do Pierre there.
25
     Ms. Cremer, do you want to let us know who you have there
```

and who you have on the telephone?

MS. CREMER: Thank you, this is Karen Cremer from Pierre with Staff. I have Terry Labrie Baker, Tim Binder, Dave Jacobson, Jon Thurber, Bob Knadle, and even though Rislov isn't with me I will mention that he's here.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Great. Thanks very much.

MS. CREMER: And on the phone we have Dave Peterson and George Evans.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Great. Thanks. With that, I think we've got everybody introduced we need to have introduced. And unless there's -- unless either of my colleagues have some other issue, we will take up the first question on today's agenda which deals with an amendment to the contract of Chesapeake Regulatory Consultants.

Ms. Cremer.

MS. CREMER: Thank you. I forgot to mention too Cindy Kemnitz is also here with us today.

The first issue that is listed on the agenda is shall the Commission approve the consultant contracts for Chesapeake, and then the second deals with Slater.

And for Chesapeake Dave Jacobson has the details of that, as does Cindy, and then for the Slater contract.

And then Dave Peterson is also on the phone from

Chesapeake if you have questions. And then for the Slater contract it would be Jon Thurber and Cindy again. And George Evans if you have questions in particular about that.

So I will turn this over to Dave Jacobson.

MR. JACOBSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And, Mr. Jacobson -- go ahead, Mr. Jacobson. Go ahead.

MR. JACOBSON: Yes. As the agenda describes, we are requesting the ability to amend the contract up to the amounts described on the agenda. And the primary reason is that there is now a possibility that we are facing a hearing that would last three weeks as opposed to the original four-day hearing. I would stress that these amounts are a maximum amount and that depending on how the proceedings go, that the actual amounts billed will depend on the extent of the proceedings and the work that is forthcoming.

Could well be less -- total billings could well be less than what is shown on here, but we are trying to avoid further amendment to the contract.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thanks, Mr. Jacobson. Did any other Intervener wish to address these two questions?

Hearing none, then we'll open it up to Commissioner questions.

1.5

Mr. Jacobson, I would have one. It seems to me that -- I mean, I understand the Chesapeake question. They were originally at 66,000 and some change, and now you all are asking to go up to \$90,000 plus.

I'm not sure I understand what you're asking for with Slater. I think the original Commission approval with Slater was 46,000. You're asking for a smaller amount. Am I missing something?

MR. JACOBSON: One thing that -- these amounts shown -- excuse me. The amounts requested are not the total contract. They are additions to what has already been agreed to. For instance, the Chesapeake original contract, as you mentioned, was 66,000 and some. This would be an additional 90,000 and some.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I thought, Mr. Jacobson, that when I had read the letter from Chesapeake they described an additional 22,000. And so you added the 66 and the 22 and in one letter they had asked for 88,840 and the second letter they asked for 87,840.

MR. JACOBSON: That is correct. That is correct, Chairman. You are right. What the consultant actually asked for was his estimate based on the Commission approving the settlement at this point and no further proceedings.

We as Staff went ahead and instead of just

relying on that number came up with our number, which with the help of Cindy Kemnitz have determined that if we go to full hearing, briefing, possible appeals and the whole three-week hearing, preparation to hearing, and everything, all costs included as best we could estimate that, for instance, for Chesapeake in additional to the original 66,000 we would need 90,000 plus more.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. So, in essence, I mean, you're kind of asking us to ignore the two letters from Chesapeake because you're coming at your math a little bit differently than theirs.

MR. JACOBSON: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: They're using an interim step, and you're saying let's just kind of go to the end here; we can always spend less if we don't need the money?

MR. JACOBSON: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you. Other

Commissioner questions?

2.0

COMMISSIONER HANSON: None from me. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay.

Hearing no further Commissioner questions, any Commissioner discussion or action?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I move for approval for the contract with Chesapeake.

1 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. A Motion has been made 2 to increase the Chesapeake contract by \$90,228 by 3 Commissioner Hanson. 4 Any discussion on the pending Motion? 5 Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote. 6 Hanson. COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye. 8 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck. 9 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye. 10 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. 11 Motion carries 3-0. 12 Is there any further action on these contracts? 13 I will move that the Commission approve the 14 amended contract with Slater Consulting in the amount of 15 \$25,453. 16 Any discussion on the pending Motion? 17 Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote. 18 Hanson. 19 COMMISSIONER HANSON: 20 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck. 21 COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye. 22 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. And the 23 Motion carries 3-0. 24 With that, we'll proceed to the final question 25 on our agenda today. It is shall the Commission grant

the Joint Motion of Black Hills Power and the Industrial Interveners?

And at this time we will pause to see whether the Interveners or Black Hills Power wishes to make comments first.

MR. MAGNUSON: This is Lee Magnuson, outside counsel for Black Hills Power. Before the Commission today is the Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement Stipulation between Black Hills Power and Black Hills Industrial Interveners.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Magnuson, I do apologize for interrupting you. I just want to make clear to everybody before we get going. At this point we are broadcasting on the internet. The meeting rooms in Mitchell and Pierre have not be closed. The information filed specifically -- there was some information filed confidential.

Obviously you're aware, but I'll just remind everybody that if we could try to keep this meeting open by asking questions in a general, nonnumber-specific way, I think that serves the public interest.

If, of course, we need to ask specific questions about specific confidential information, then you'll need to ask that Ms. Axthelm and myself do what we can technologically to try to clear the folks who are not

parties to the case.

2.0

So with that, my apologies. Go ahead and proceed.

MR. MAGNUSON: Thank you very much because that is exactly correct. The Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement Stipulation has been filed with the PUC on a nonconfidential basis. However, attached to and as part of that Joint Motion is the confidential settlement agreement between Black Hills Power, Inc., and Black Hills Industrial Interveners.

So, generally speaking, Chairman Johnson, Black Hills Power is here today requesting approval of the Black Hills Power and Black Hills Industrial Interveners settlement as a Contract with Deviations to the Black Hills Power tariff and to include in the Order that Black Hills Power should file a conforming tariff schedule, the Contracts with Deviations pursuant to the Administrative Rules within 30 days with the request that the Contract with Deviations that would be filed within 30 days be filed on and treated as on a confidential basis.

We would also request that the Order of this Commission include a finding that the confidential settlement agreement was just, reasonable, and in the public interest.

And with that, we would just note that we are available to answer any questions that might be posed.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Let's go ahead and hear from the Industrial Interveners.

MR. MORATZKA: Thank you, Chair Johnson,
Commissioners. We appreciate, first of all, the
willingness to be flexible and allowing us to appear in
Mitchell. It's a little bit shorter drive. So I
appreciate the effort and the use of technology in this
hearing.

I'd also echo Mr. Magnuson's comments and note that the settlement is the result of extensive negotiations taking place over a five-month period. The parties worked very, very hard, met in person in Rapid City to go over different proposals, and we think the result is fair and reasonable.

And I also don't have anything to add, unless the Commissioners have questions.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Of course, those are the only two parties to the settlement, but let's pause and see if any other parties to the case have comment.

The Residential Coalition?

MR. KHOROOSI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Sam Khoroosi appearing on behalf of the Residential

Consumers Coalition.

We have no objection to the proposed joint settlement Motion with the understanding, of course -- and I believe Mr. Magnuson would agree that we do not by our -- by our lack of objection to this Motion waive any issues that we would wish to present at the hearing on the 28th.

1.3

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Commission Staff, any comment?

MS. CREMER: Thank you. This is Karen Cremer of Staff.

Staff would have no comment on the agreement itself. I don't know if later you're going to ask for a recommendation, and I could just give it at that time if you do.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. Let us open it up to Commissioner questions then.

I have a few, and we'll dive in then. First so that I can make sure my understanding of the issue is right, I will -- Mr. Smith, I'll kind of explain to you what I think the statutory framework is, and you tell me to what extent I'm wrong.

It seems to me that there are two -- there are two statutes that kind of come into play here. The first, most applicable, is 49-34A-8.3, which explicitly envisions a business development rate. I mean, that is

really the controlling statute in this kind of proceeding. Okay. The standard there says has to be in the public interest.

The second is more general, more broad,

49-34A-6, which indicates that all rates in effect under

control of the Commission -- or authority of the

Commission have to be just and reasonable. Does that

make sense? Am I missing anything?

MR. SMITH: No. I mean, that's the way I read the law.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. So using those two as kind of the basis for my thoughts, it seems to me that there are two reasons we have these rates. I mean, that's sort of a law, not a policy.

One is that large users bring certain economies of scale. It costs less to provide them power per unit than it does smaller users. And so having them charged tariff rates in some cases can overcharge them for their -- certainly their fixed costs. You know, they overcontribute to the fixed costs of the utility. So that's one reason.

The second reason is -- and I think this is more implicit in the business development rate, and that is that there can be positive benefits that accrue to all rate payers by having robust business development. And

the flip side of that is that if there were going to be negative impacts because of, you know, increasing rates, that those detriments could be felt across a broad -- I mean, beyond just a single customer class.

MR. SMITH: I believe that's the intent of Section 8.3. That's my own belief. I wasn't here when they passed it, but it would seem to be the purpose of it.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Well, Mr. Rislov, I mean, that kind of -- is my understanding basically right?

MR. RISLOV: That's correct. I think you couldn't have stated it better as far as costs are concerned and getting into the unit benefits.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. So now the reason I ask those is that I agree with all of that -- and I know I've taken a little bit of time to get here, but my next few questions I think are going to be centered around whether or not I think we've met those standards and met any burden that the statute envisions.

So with that, can somebody remind me and for any party, I mean, what's the -- I know there has been a class cost of service study done. I know that it has been referred to and referenced throughout application materials. I know that it is not particularly recent.

So somebody remind me about the age of that study.

2.2

MR. WHITE: Well, the class cost of service study is filed as part of the application. It is a cost of service study that utilizes some fairly historic data that was developed primarily in 1995, '94, '95 as part of that rate case.

We have fairly large groups of customers in that we're only allocating costs straight to four classes of customers: The residential, the small general service, the lighting, and the large general service and industrial contract customers.

So what these contracts allow us to do is provide some differentiation within a fairly large class of customers. And I believe that these contracts that we envision having will result in recognizing the economies of scale of these large customers and their unique service characteristics as well as their unique usage characteristics.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And that's what I guess I'm trying to drive to. I mean, do we have -- the class cost of service study really talked about the tariff rate, the classes, so to speak.

MR. WHITE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I mean, do we have -- is there any support, any evidentiary information, that

indicates that, yes, this rate, whatever the rate is, is a fair rate because it more closely matches the costs imposed by these users on the system?

I mean, philosophically it makes sense, but I'm just curious about the actual evidence.

MR. WHITE: Because of the nature of the negotiations, we utilized information with regard to each customer. And we then looked at their usage characteristics, the voltage level of their service, their summer/winter peak contributions, and then, in addition, their contributions to the community betterment.

And certainly each of these customers is either a major employer or a critical customer of the company.

And, in fact, they represent in the neighborhood of 9 or 10 percent of the local Black Hills Power.

We have more than likely not included specific details about these customers' usage characteristics within the record at this point. And we hesitate to do that because it is generally considered proprietary information by those customers not to be disclosed.

And so I would say that there is clear evidence as to the nature of the customers and their importance to us but not maybe the specific usage and revenue characteristics on a customer-by-customer basis right now

in the record.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Ms. Cremer, or anyone from Staff, I presume that Staff has not been privy to the kind of customer specific information Mr. White is referring to. Is that right?

MR. KNADLE: This is Bob Knadle from Staff. That would be correct. Staff wasn't involved in the negotiations between the Industrials and Black Hills Power in the settlement agreement.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Okay. Normally it seems to me when we talk about these Contracts with Deviation it's not unusual for a Commissioner to ask Staff, you know, has there been some contribution to the system costs of these users?

I mean, and really part of that question -- the unasked part of that question is to make sure that there's not a subsidy.

I mean, Mr. Knadle, without seeing this information, I mean, what confidence do we have that these users are paying their own way?

MR. KNADLE: In the Staff settlement with the company, which you're going to hear on the 28th, it does have the division of the revenue deficiency among the customer classes, and that's what the settlement agreement is based on between the company and -- Staff

and the company. And that's what the tariff rates are based on, that class cost of service revenue responsibility.

So if there is a reduction in the revenue responsibility, for example, for these large industrials, that's going to be borne by these shareholders, not any of the remaining customers. So that should satisfy your concern and Staff's.

MR. WHITE: And I can indicate also that the rates that are proposed in these Contracts with Deviations do fully cover our fixed costs of service and certainly in most instances all of our variable costs.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. So that sort of deals with, again, there are two bases for these Contract with Deviations. That sort of deals with the cost, I mean, the economies of scale, so to speak.

Second one really deals more with the public interest test as envisioned by the business development rate. Do we have -- I mean, big picture, Mr. White, I mean, clearly we know these are big users, and they are important to the community. I don't think from a big picture perspective anybody disputes that.

Do we have anything in the record, though, to indicate that this rate is in the public interest?

MR. WHITE: I think what we can do is we can

give you an indication today that from the company's perspective certainly it is in the public interest. The nature of the customers that we serve in this class are important to the overall revenue requirements of the company.

1.3

As I mentioned, 9 to 10 percent of the revenue requirements are supported by these customers and will continue to be going forward.

Without these customers, if they were to go out of business, there would be an expectation that those costs would be recovered from other customers. So certainly that standard supports it.

When you look at the nature of the manufacturing customers, certainty the two saw mills are the ones that have gone through some transition. The Neiman Corporation has purchased the saw mill in Hill City and also the one in Spearfish, both under certain duress to those companies, and has reestablished those as quality, ongoing manufacturing facilities.

When you look at the Homestake Mine, it was at one point a 9 and a half million dollar customer of this company, and they closed. And so they now are rejuvenating that and working hard to find the future benefits of that mine, which brings additional electric load but hopefully brings significant influence in the

scientific community.

When I look to Rapid City Regional Hospital, because of their nonprofit mission, they have been willing to go into our small communities and buy up hospitals and health care facilities. And because of the centralization of that management function and the administration, I think they are providing viable health care in communities that may not have had that but for the mission of Rapid City Regional Hospital.

They have 17 accounts that are combined under our combined account billing service, something that is fairly unique for a nongovernmental type organization.

And then Dakota Cement, they are a customer that has worked very closely with us historically to utilize off-peak service, which comes at a lower cost, reduces our need for on-peak capacity requirements. They also have had curtailment service in the summertime when they've been in better economic situations.

They have seen particular challenge to their sales because of the downturn in the economy the last year or two. And so I believe personally that each of these customers are contributing to their fixed costs and the majority of the cases 100 percent of the variable costs and that continuing to provide them the support that makes their business viable is in the public

interest and should be supported by you as Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I think this situation's a little bit complicated, perhaps only in my mind, because normally these contracts are reviewed by the Commission outside of a rate case proceeding. At least, you know, in my six years of experience that's been the case.

So in that situation it's very easy to say, you know, customers already have a rate. This contract is not affecting the rate of any other customer in the territory. So, clearly, they aren't related. I mean, if there's a burden to be borne by this, it is clearly a shareholder burden. There can be no other way for the costs to be shifted.

In this situation we've got a rate case and these contracts being pursued on parallel tracks. And I think it does at least lead me to ask, well, I mean, had these contracts been negotiated a little bit differently, would that have changed the negotiations that the company took sort of with the Staff, or were there some interplay between the two.

And it seems to me the safest answer is to say, no, what happened with these customers does not affect any other customer in the service territory. That's a lot easier to say outside of a rate case.

Is there a reason this is being done now as

opposed to 10 days after the final decision on the pending rate case?

MR. WHITE: Well, this group of Industrial customers, the mix of customers changes a bit from rate case to rate case. But both in the 1995 rate case settlement, which was approved by the Commission, and in the 2006 rate case settlement, which was approved by the Commission, this group of customers had Contract with Deviations.

And what has historically been done is Staff negotiates an overall revenue requirement, allocates it to the customer classes and then the company is in a position then to make decisions about how it deals with specific Interveners like the Black Hills Industrial consumers.

We have followed that same process once again in this rate case. So I wouldn't say that this is unusual to the process. And, in fact, if you're going to pursue negotiated settlements with multiple parties, it almost has to work this way.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Sure. Well, and that is a good reminder because you're right. This has been not unusual for Black Hills Power. I was looking at the other utility companies where it would be unusual. I don't think I've had another rate case, either natural

gas or electric where this has been the norm, but you're right. For your company it has been. Okay.

It doesn't appear as though this settlement is contingent in any way upon the other settlement that's been agreed to with Staff. I mean, is that appropriate?

MR. WHITE: Well, you had mentioned why is it tied in to the rate case? Why wouldn't it be dealt with outside of the rate case?

In effect, because we're willing to accept these contracts with these customers, irregardless of how you may decide on the settlement with Staff, it almost does separate them.

And we have elected not to make the settlement with the Industrials contingent upon a successful outcome with the Staff because we do believe that these contracts meet the public interest standard and are satisfactory to the corporation at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yeah. And I think the difficulty in my mind comes in that -- you know, I mean, let's presume that the ultimate outcome of the rate case -- I mean, let's say the settlement's turned down, we go to a full hearing, or maybe even a Circuit Court ultimately determines that -- and I'll just pick a number for argument's sake. 18 percent is the right number. The Commission heard and allowing 12.7 as the base

increase, 18 is the right number.

It seems to me when we ask about just and reasonable, which is a standard we've got to meet, don't you think at least part of that interplay between what is just and reasonable for these customers has at least something to do with the increase that other customers have?

I mean, there can be a separation there for the economies of scale we're talking about, but doesn't there need to be some comparison to make sure it's just and reasonable?

MR. WHITE: I don't think so. Because they have unique service characteristics. They have unique business needs. They make a unique contribution to the communities that we serve. And so, therefore, they stand alone separate from the determination of the just and reasonable rates that the Commission will consider when you consider the settlement with Staff on June 28.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: What about, I mean, a rate of return? I mean, one of the reasons the commissions care so much about having an adequate return is that, I mean, sure, you may be able to authorize a low rate but to a certain extent everybody gains by having a utility company that has a return high enough to be able to attract the capital necessary to maintain a safe and

reliable system.

I mean, if all of this does indeed come out of shareholders' pockets, is there any issue -- I mean, and it's not confidential, but I think the blended return, rate of return that has been agreed to with Staff is something short of 8 and a half percent.

Clearly the practical application of this Settlement Stipulation with Interveners is that it brings that return down.

MR. WHITE: Slightly.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Is there anything in the record that would allow the Commission to say that that rate of return is still adequate according to our witnesses and according to your witnesses to be able to attract adequate capital to run a safe and reliable utility?

MR. WHITE: Well, to the extent that it represents 9 to 10 percent of our business, that's where the risk that we have is. The risk that we have is greater in that these customers may reduce their loads and impact our rate of return even more that way.

One of the considerations in the Staff settlement is that we agree to a three-year rate freeze on base rate increases. There are some provisions in there for extraordinary circumstances where we could file

earlier than that, but generally what is provided for in the settlement with Staff is that we have agreed to what the company believes is an acceptable rate of return and we believe we can operate our business successfully for at least three more years without the need for a base rate increase.

And so to a certain extent I appreciate your concern for the return of the utility, but in these rate cases we have to make a judgment about how successfully we can operate our business, and both with this settlement and with the settlement with Staff we're confident that we can operate the business successfully, continue to attract capital and provide quality services to customers.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Well, and obviously, as you know, my interest is not -- or as you might suspect, my interest is not just wanting to make sure that Black Hills Power is well run. That is your job.

It just seems to me as we get into these debates between various experts about what is a reasonable rate of return, I mean, if we say this number, well, this is the number below which you just can't go because this is what they're entitled to and this is what they need to have to be able to run their system properly. It seems to me if we're cutting other deals which change that

number, I mean, that is insightful condition, that maybe that X number isn't the magic number. And whether or not that has any applicability on this, I don't know, but it is insightful for the future perhaps.

So that's where my line of questioning is coming from.

Go ahead.

MR. WHITE: Commissioner, there are many factors that the utility needs to consider when it addresses a settlement with any of the parties to a rate case. And one of the important ones is rate of return. However, there are other factors that come into play, and we're comfortable that these settlements will work for us.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: It seems to me that there are at least two things that people can initially think, that I might initially think about settlements with large Interveners that differ from tariff rates.

One is that, well, sure, you know, you get treated differently because you're a big boy. And to that I guess I would say, well, yeah, that is the truth. That may be a rhetorical thing that people want to say, but there are differences.

They're not treated better because they're large. They're treated more fairly because their costs do differ. I mean, there are economies of scale.

So that kind of popless rhetoric I would say, well, you're right.

The other one that I think maybe bothers me a little bit more long-term is you get a different deal because you're an Intervener. And I wonder about the long-term public interest. I mean, that's why doing Contracts with Deviations outside of a rate case to me has some benefits. Are we just setting ourselves up?

I mean, the next time there's a rate case are we going to have 40 Interveners? I mean, help me -- help me understand why it's not just because of Interveners that this settlement makes sense.

MR. WHITE: Well, if you look at the history of Black Hills Power, we had 11-year rates, and during that period of time we had a significant number of Contracts with Deviations that we entered into with customers so we could meet their unique business needs and provide for opportunities for them to change their load characteristics to lower our costs. So it has been a common practice of our utility to utilize Contracts with Deviations outside of these rate cases.

What naturally happens is that when you have those contracts with customers they need to be updated when a rate case occurs. And what we have gone through here with these customers is update their contracts. And

if we have another rate case, we'll update their contracts again at that point in time.

It does not in any way for me mean that they've gotten a special deal. They've gotten their contract updated consistent with the new costs of the utility, and those businesses need to respond to those costs.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Because the bottom line -correct me if I'm wrong, but the bottom line is that any
customer that would meet the standards under state law
for being eligible for a Contract with Deviation in the
public interest, large user or a business development
type issue, rates that would be just and reasonable if
they were indeed lower than tariff rates, anybody would
be able to have that conversation with Black Hills Power,
would be eligible to negotiate a contract with you, not
just those that have intervened in this proceeding.

MR. WHITE: That's right. And we have even developed special tariffs that apply to one or two customers in order to offer that same type of characteristic like large demand curtailable service to other customers.

So it's been our practice to be responsive to our customer's needs, and we believe that the contracts that are provided for in this settlement are responsive to these particular customer's needs.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: During the 11-year period between rate cases in what was it, '95?

MR. WHITE: Yes.

Я

1.0

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. About -- I don't need an exact number. Can you give me an idea of how many Contracts with Deviations were negotiated in that interim, in that gap?

MR. WHITE: I would guess it would be maybe four to six. But what was more unique was we developed tariffs. And we developed the combined account billing general service large schedule.

And I'm not sure how many customers are on that, but it's, you know, 30 or 40 customers at least, representing multiple accounts that provided discounts that allow customers to combine their demand for certain contract provisions.

And so we've been flexible in that way. We have worked with customers when they have made load characteristics where we have adjusted contract capacities and those types of things. We meet with our largest customers, about 300 of them annually, and provide them with information about their usage, their load characteristics, a discussion about what prices may be going forward, comparisons, their historical data. So there is that opportunity to be aware and learn.

Because we look at it as a partnership. And
your support for that partnership has been important to
us in our ability to meet our customers' needs.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Thanks. My apologies
to my colleagues. I probably should have asked a few and
then let others hop in.

Commissioners Kolbeck, Hanson, questions?

Commissioners Kolbeck, Hanson, questions?

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: No.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Probably sucked them all up.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: I think your questions are right in line with mine making sure that this doesn't affect any other rate case or customer bases, and I think your questions are right on line.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I'm fine, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thanks.

Ms. Cremer, you indicated you believed you would have a recommendation? Or that, rather, Staff would have a recommendation?

MS. CREMER: Yes. Thank you.

Staff's review of the settlement indicates that Staff's agreement that was reached with Black Hills Power is in no way impacted by the approval of this settlement agreement, and, therefore, we would recommend granting

1 | the Joint Motion.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. So I know, Mr. White, this has been said a number of times, but I just think I want to make it crystal clear because I do think there's a lot of confusion surrounding this decision not among those of us participating here but around your general customer base.

MR. WHITE: Right.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Is the Commission's decision today on the settlement Stipulation -- does the Commission's decision today in any way affect the rates that any other customer would pay?

MR. WHITE: No.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. All right.

Mr. Rislov, Mr. Smith, do you have anything else to add before the Commission --

MR. RISLOV: Excuse me, Commissioner. This is Greg Rislov. And I have several I'd like to ask.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yeah. Go ahead, please.

MR. RISLOV: Kyle, I think you mentioned -Mr. White, that is. Excuse me. You mentioned that there
was concern about, I believe, companies going out of
business.

Is there any -- I mean, have you done anything that would indicate or make it appear that there's danger

of that? I mean, is there any history that you could give us?

 $\cdot 16$

MR. WHITE: Well, I did mention the Homestake Mining Company situation. We also serve surface gold mining operations in the past. There was some concern when Merillat announced the closing of their particle board manufacturing plant in Rapid City, and we were fortunate that an outside party came in and took over ownership and operation of it and has now renamed it Dakota Panel.

So even within this group I believe Pope and Talbot, the saw mill that Neiman bought in Spearfish, was in a bankruptcy situation. So there are instances when businesses get into trouble, and at those points utilities have to make a decision whether it's worthwhile to get involved and cover fixed costs and provide some support to that business or wait and see. And we've done both in our history.

MR. RISLOV: Mr. White, you mentioned in the past the Contract with Deviations. And, as you know, I was on Staff at that point. And going back into the '80s and the '90s I recall that there were just a handful of businesses, six or seven, that represented approximately I believe the number was 25 to 33 percent of your load; is that correct?

MR. WHITE: That would be roughly correct. Our Industrial customers represented about a third of our total load at one point.

MR. RISLOV: And in that case, you know, just a handful captured that large of number. In this case it doesn't appear that these customers are quite that large.

I guess without giving anything away, are these among the top 90 percent of your largest customers, or could you give me some idea of what this group would represent among your larger customers? Excuse me.

MR. WHITE: Right. There are five customers represented and we checked this morning and all of them would have purchases of energy in our top 10 customers for size at Black Hills Power. So it is a representative group, and it represents a high percentage of our large industrial customers.

MR. RISLOV: And if you'll remember correctly, there was a push by the State back in the late '80s, early '90s with regard to economic development, and that included employment. What type of employment are we talking about with these companies?

I mean, how dramatic of an effect do they have in the Black Hills with regard to the number of employees that they have serving them?

MR. WHITE: Well, it would be a guess on my

part, but I would expect that they are approaching 3,000 employees or more.

MR. RISLOV: The combined effect of the five?

MR. WHITE: Yes.

MR. RISLOV: And I did -- I want to go the other way a little bit. If the Commission didn't approve this, who wins? Who loses?

MR. WHITE: Well, if the Commission didn't approve this, I suspect that the Industrial customers would want to pursue their rights at a longer hearing and address the other settlement with Staff.

In our instance, if it's not approved, I think both Black Hills Power and the Industrial consumers would be losers because that's why we negotiated this transaction is we both felt there were benefits to us in doing so. No other customers would likely lose.

MR. RISLOV: That was too loose a question. Let me try to frame that a little better. There is a settlement sitting before the Commission that will have to be ruled on after June 28.

If we presume that settlement will be accepted by the Commission, not withstanding, who would win and who would lose if the Commission did not approve today's settlement?

MR. WHITE: There would be no effect on the

Customers that are not represented within this group, and I -- as I stated earlier, this group of customers may or may not lose, depending upon what the Commission did in that settlement.

Most likely they would not have as favorable of pricing and contract terms because they would be on our general tariffs. And Black Hills Power most likely would get a few more dollars of revenue from this class of customers. But --

MR. RISLOV: In other words, the winner today if the Commission doesn't approve this would be the stockholders of Black Hills Power short term?

MR. WHITE: Yes.

MR. RISLOV: And that's the only winner short term?

MR. WHITE: I agree.

MR. RISLOV: I guess I want to go one more direction. And considering these are Contracts with Deviations, these are your larger customers, you know, we're comparing the numbers somewhat to the class cost of service study.

And giving it some thought, I'm not necessarily fully comfortable with that because Contracts with Deviations can be negotiated apart from the rate case.

You could negotiate one next year with --

MR. WHITE: Yes.

MR. RISLOV: And so considering how large they are and we understand that each represents a unique class, that number, while an aggregate that we can see in the case with regard to class cost of service study, wouldn't necessarily be -- you can't really do the addition and subtraction and necessarily come up with what I would term to be an accurate result of perhaps a negotiation of a Contract with Deviations a year down the road, so to speak.

MR. WHITE: I agree.

MR. RISLOV: Okay. I just wanted to make sure of that.

I think that's it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: This is Dusty Johnson. I might have two more to add then. You mentioned, Mr. White, your company's willingness in the past to make new tariffs to fit unique characteristics of a customer or some small number of customers.

Why doesn't having a super big industrial customer tariff make more sense?

MR. WHITE: Well, because each of the customers has unique load characteristics and business needs, and when you have a generic tariff -- let's say our industrial contract service tariff -- it may have price

points that don't fit the desires of the operations that we're working with. It may not provide priceability that they need in order to make advanced sales in those types of things.

So what we have done is customize these contracts and these negotiations, and that's been the preference of our customers.

We have had industrial contracts or schedules out there in the past. They've been set. They're available for any new customer that may come in and build a large facility for us. But it's been our customers' preference since the early days when deregulation was considered to get into a more contractual relationship with our utility, similar to what they do with all their other vendors of services.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So we've got five large users that are Interveners, but it sounds in your top 10 there are also five that are not. I mean, if all rates need to be fair and reasonable -- I'm sorry, just and reasonable, I mean, what about the other five? I mean, the Commission -- they're not getting a different deal.

MR. WHITE: Well, the top 10 that I referred to is by energy. And some of those customers have multiple and maybe 100 or more different locations that are being aggregated to come up with that amount.

What we have represented here are large customers with one, two, three main points of location that are large. And so the service characteristics are different than what you'll find with some of the rest of those customers.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I see. There was business X that had 10 locations scattered throughout 10 of your towns on your service territory.

MR. WHITE: Right.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: It would be fair to look at those a little differently than one large factory?

MR. WHITE: Yes.

MS. AXTHELM: Dusty, I would like to make a reminder to those people that are on the telephone if they could mute their phones. We're getting feedback from a phone.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Looking at the top 10,
Mr. White, because you brought it up, I mean, are there
some of the top five that are not Interveners but do look
and feel a whole lot like the five we're talking about?
Just trying to make sure --

MR. WHITE: We haven't made a review of that.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And here's why I'm asking.

If you had two identical customers, one of which was an
Intervener in this proceeding, one of which was not, to

have them paying different rates would be difficult for me to explain how that's just and reasonable. And so what I'm trying to do is determine -- I want to make sure that there are no like products among --

MR. WHITE: Right. Well, if we go through these, we only have one manufacturer of cement. They're represented. The largest forest products services are all represented and Dakota Panel and the two Neiman saw mills. Rapid City Regional Hospital is the only major nonprofit medical employer in the region.

And then when you look to the Sanford Lab,
Homestake, they're the only one scientific community, and
they were already under the contract to try to encourage
the development of that business and the benefits that it
could bring to the Black Hills. So I would say that
segmentation-wise we've picked up everybody that
represents those particular business classifications.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: So, of course, unique is an overused word, but you would say that at least from the public interest standard, sort of the business development rationale, these are unique -- I mean, there's nobody quite like them -- and that they are nearly unique with regard to the amount of energy they are using?

MR. WHITE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. Any other questions or comments?

MR. SMITH: One last one for me. And there's -nothing would preclude should another large customer come
to town or if one out there because of its particular
characteristics, you know, business climate and so on
approached Black Hills, there's nothing in any of these
settlements that would preclude you from negotiating
under the business development a contract with them and
bringing it before the Commission?

MR. WHITE: No. That's the purpose of why we proposed that business development tariff and supported the statute that backs it up was to give us that opportunity and flexibility to compete for new customers in our service territory, to help with economic development, and to accommodate business needs to enhance the businesses that we already serve.

But there is a set of characteristics that need to be applied. And we will work with customers if there is a good reason to do so.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Other questions?

MR. SMITH: Kyle, you know, Dusty brought up the record issue. Would it be objectionable to Black Hills if the Chairman has the authority under the law to administer an oath, would it be -- do you want to do

that?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I don't. Mr. Smith and I had talked about that as a side bar. I'm sorry to interrupt. Do you mind?

MR. SMITH: No.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I am a little nervous -- not a little nervous. I'm a lot -- I'm uncomfortable with the fact that we do have some statutory standard that I think we need to meet. You've made some very good representations today that I think have gone a long ways to explaining how those standards could be met.

I know Mr. Smith mentioned that swearing you under oath right now would be an option. I think it might be cleaner if the Commission were going to make an approval of the settlement stipulation, that would be contingent upon the filing of an Affidavit by you in support of your comments made today.

MR. WHITE: I'd be happy to do that.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I want you to be able to go back, take a look at what you said, and make sure that if you need to make any clarifications in your Affidavit, you make those.

MR. WHITE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Smith, that works

25 | legally?

MR. SMITH: I think so, yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I do think in the relatively thin filing that was made before this Commission there's not a lot that would indicate that the rate is just and reasonable or in the public interest.

Again, you've explained why you believe those standards have been met. So let's get it in the record.

MR. WHITE: Okay.

1.9

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Other Commissioner or advisor comments or questions?

MR. RISLOV: This is Greg Rislov again. And I don't -- I don't know if this is going to be a question, but I do want to go back again to the thought that we've been approving Contracts with Deviations for many, many years for every company, as a matter of fact.

But, Kyle, Mr. White, touched upon some of the societal benefits related to the Black Hills. But the one thing I really want to emphasize is that because Black Hills is somewhat unique compared to the other electric companies in South Dakota where such a large portion of their load is served by such a small number of customers, there's a certain sensitivity toward maintaining those businesses in the Black Hills simply because they do employ so many people.

It's been a big issue before other Commissioners. And I understand it's been 15 and 20 years ago and you three weren't here, but it has been an issue.

And I guess bottom line, we were sold on the fact -- some of it coming from here, some of it coming from there -- that the benefit to the Black Hills would not just accrue to these large users. That keeping these businesses online was critical to keep those average costs down for the residential and small commercial users. And because a lot of those businesses appear to go through cycles, there was concern that they be able to operate successfully over a long period of time.

I guess that was my point. We can talk about societal benefits, but it's critical in a class cost to service basis that those numbers stay there in order to average those costs down.

Now I'm not trying to necessarily speak in support of what the company's done, but I do want to point out the rationale the Commissioners did use in the past when reviewing these Contracts with Deviations for what is a unique service territory out in the Black Hills.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Rislov. Other

22

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

23

24

25

comments or questions?

1.0

Any Commission action?

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: This is Commissioner
Kolbeck. I'm very confident that Staff and the
Interveners have come to a good conclusion over the last
five and a half months as was stated, and I'll Motion
that we approve the Settlement Stipulation.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. If I could offer a friendly amendment, Commissioner Kolbeck, I would feel more comfortable voting for the Motion if it was conditional upon an Affidavit being filed by Mr. White in support of his comments today.

COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Yes. As soon as you finish -- yep. That's good. I would consider that friendly and accept the amendment.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. So, again, the Motion for the Commission is to approve the settlement between the Black Hills Industrial Interveners and Black Hills Power. Those are the only two parties to the agreement. Although no other Intervener in the proceeding has objected to that agreement.

We've got a Motion pending. Is there any discussion on the pending Motion?

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Mr. Chairman, can you hear me all right?

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes, I can, Commissioner. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: I apologize. I have about a 5-second delay so I -- you don't hear me immediately, and I hear myself as I'm speaking so I apologize for that.

My only statement would be that I have the same concerns as you did. I primarily was concerned with two portions that you covered very, very well, and that is I do not wish to imply by the Commission's actions that you -- residential consumer rates speak greater than the rates we approved for the Industrial customers simply because of discussion that has transpired here today, especially pertaining to the economies of scale for the Industrial customers.

I also wish to be -- to be understood that our action will not effectively influence or dictate the rate for residential customers. And I truly believe, however, that when a customer freely negotiates an acceptable rate with a utility company that does not affect rates of other classes, then frankly, I see absolutely no reason to oppose it. And for that reason I'll be supporting the Motion.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Commissioner.

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	Yeah. Well said.						
2	Any further discussion on the pending Motion?						
3	Hearing none, we'll proceed to vote.						
4	Hanson.						
5	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.						
6	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck.						
7	COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye.						
8	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye, and the						
9	Motion carries 3-0.						
10	I believe that's all the business to come before						
11	the Commission today. Am I in error?						
12	Hearing no comments, is there a Motion to						
13	adjourn?						
14	COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: So moved to adjourn.						
15	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: With that, we'll proceed to						
16	vote on the Motion to adjourn.						
17	Hanson.						
18	COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.						
19	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Kolbeck.						
20	COMMISSIONER KOLBECK: Aye.						
21	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Johnson votes aye. The						
22	Motion carries 3-0. Thanks everyone. Have a good day.						
23	(The hearing is concluded at 2:03 p.m.)						
24							
25							

1	STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA)
2	:SS CERTIFICATE
3	COUNTY OF SULLY)
4	
5	I, CHERI MCCOMSEY WITTLER, a Registered
6	Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter and
7	Notary Public in and for the State of South Dakota:
8	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that as the duly-appointed
9	shorthand reporter, I took in shorthand the proceedings
10	had in the above-entitled matter on the 10th day of June,
11	2010, and that the attached is a true and correct
12	transcription of the proceedings so taken.
13	Dated at Onida, South Dakota this 21st day of
14	June, 2010.
15	
16	
17	Chim. m.
18	Cheri McComsey Wittler, Notary Public and
19	Registered Professional Reporter Certified Realtime Reporter
20	deretried Redreime Reporter
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

\$	4	accurate [1] - 38:8 action [4] - 8:23, 9:12,	allowing [2] - 12:7, 24:25	49:11 attract [3] - 25:25,
				1
\$25,453 [1] - 9:15	40 [2] - 29:10, 31:13	46:2, 47:17	almost [2] - 23:19,	26:15, 27:13
\$90,000[1] - 7:4	46,000 [1] - 7:7	actions [1] - 47:10	24:11	authority [2] - 14:6,
\$90,228 [1] - 9:2	49-34A-6 [1] - 14:5	actual [2] - 6:16, 17:5	alone [1] - 25:16	42:24
400,220(1) 0.2	49-34A-8.3 _[1] - 13:24	Ad [1] - 3:1	amend [1] - 6:10	AUTHORITY [1] - 1:4
•	- +5-54A-0.5[1] - 15.24	add [3] - 12:17, 33:15,	amended [1] - 9:14	authorize [1] - 25:22
		− 38:16	amendment [4] - 5:15,	available [2] - 12:2,
	5	added [1] - 7:17	6:21, 46:9, 46:15	39:10
'80s [2] - 34:21, 35:18		addition [2] - 17:11,	amount [5] - 6:15, 7:8,	Avenue [1] - 2:3
'90s [2] - 34:22, 35:19	5-second [1] - 47:4	38:7	9:14, 39:25, 41:23	average [2] - 45:9,
'94 [1] - 16:5	500 [1] - 2:3	additional [4] - 7:14,	amounts [5] - 6:11,	45:17
• •	300 [1] - 2.3	7:17, 8:6, 20:24	6:15, 6:16, 7:9, 7:10	avoid [1] - 6:21
'95 _[2] - 16:5, 31:2		additions [1] - 7:11	Andrew [2] - 1:21, 4:3	aware [2] - 10:18,
	6	address [2] - 6:23,	announced [1] - 34:6	31:25
1		36:11	annually [1] - 31:21	
	66 [1] - 7:17	addresses [1] - 28:9	l .	Axthelm [2] - 1:17, 10:24
1[2] - 2:5, 3:3		1	answer [2] - 12:2,	
	66,000 [3] - 7:3, 7:13,	adequate [3] - 25:21,	22:21	AXTHELM [1] - 40:13
10 [12] - 1:7, 3:3,	8:7	26:13, 26:15	apart [1] - 37:24	aye [12] - 9:7, 9:9,
17:16, 20:6, 23:1,		adjourn [3] - 48:13,	apologies [2] - 11:2,	9:10, 9:19, 9:21,
26:18, 35:13, 39:17,	8	48:14, 48:16	32:4	9:22, 48:5, 48:7,
39:22, 40:7, 40:17		adjusted [1] - 31:19	apologize [3] - 10:11,	48:8, 48:18, 48:20,
100[2] - 21:23, 39:24	a 20.0	administer [1] - 42:25	47:3, 47:5	48:21
10th [2] - 2:4, 49:10	8[1] - 26:6	administration [1] -	appeals [1] - 8:3	
11-year [2] - 29:14,	8.3[1] - 15:6	21:7	appear [5] - 12:7,	В
31:1	87,840 [1] - 7:19	administrative [1] -	24:3, 33:25, 35:6,	
12.7 [1] ~ 24:25	88,840 [1] - 7:18	11:18	45:11	
15 _[1] - 45:2		advanced [1] - 39:3	APPEARANCES [1] -	backs [1] - 42:13
17 [1] - 21:10	9	advisor [1] - 44:10	1:18	Baker [2] - 1:15, 5:3
		1 '''	_	bankruptcy [1] - 34:13
18 [2] - 24:24, 25:1		affect [4] - 22:22,	appearing [6] - 1:19,	bar[1] - 43:3
1995 [2] - 16:5, 23:5	9 [4] - 17:15, 20:6,	32:12, 33:11, 47:20	1:20, 1:22, 4:5, 4:13,	base [4] - 24:25,
	20:21, 26:18	affecting [1] - 22:9	12:24	26:24, 27:5, 33:7
2	90 [1] - 35:8	affidavit [1] - 43:16	applicability [1] - 28:3	based [3] - 7:22,
	90,000 [2] - 7:14, 8:7	Affidavit [2] - 43:21,	applicable [1] - 13:24	18:25, 19:2
20 [1] - 45:3		46:11	APPLICATION [1] -	bases [2] - 19:14,
• •	Α	afternoon [1] - 4:11	1:4	l .
2006 [1] - 23:7		age [1] - 16:1	application [3] -	32:12
2010 [4] - 1:7, 2:4,		agenda [6] - 3:8, 5:14,	15:24, 16:3, 26:7	basis [5] - 11:7, 11:21,
49:11, 49:14	ability [2] - 6:10, 32:3	5:20, 6:9, 6:11, 9:25	applied [1] - 42:19	14:12, 17:25, 45:16
21st [1] - 49:13	able [7] - 25:22, 25:24,	aggregate [1] - 38:4	apply [1] - 30:18	BEFORE[1] - 1:9
22 [1] - 7:17	26:14, 27:24, 30:14,	aggregated [1] - 39:25	appointed [1] - 49:8	begin [1] - 3:18
22,000 [1] - 7:17	43:19, 45:12	ago [1] - 45:3	appreciate [3] - 12:6,	behalf [6] - 1:19, 1:20,
25 [1] - 34:24	above-entitled [2] -	i -	12:9, 27:7	1:22, 4:4, 4:13,
28 [2] - 25:18, 36:20	2:2, 49:10	agree [5] - 13:3,	1	12:24
28th [2] - 13:6, 18:22	absolutely [1] - 47:21	15:16, 26:23, 37:16,	approached [1] - 42:7	belief [1] - 15:6
2:03 [1] - 48:23		38:11	approaching [1] -	believes [1] - 27:3
	accept [2] - 24:9,	agreed [4] - 7:12,	36:1	below [1] - 27:22
2	46:15	24:5, 26:5, 27:2	appropriate [1] - 24:5	benefit [1] - 45:7
3	acceptable [2] - 27:3,	agreement [9] - 11:9,	approval [7] - 7:6,	benefits [8] - 14:24,
	47:19	11:24, 13:11, 18:9,	8:24, 10:8, 11:5,	
3,000 [1] - 36:1	accepted [1] - 36:21	18:25, 32:23, 32:25,	11:12, 32:24, 43:15	15:14, 20:24, 29:8,
3-0 [4] - 9:11, 9:23,	accommodate [1] -	46:19, 46:21	approve [8] - 5:21,	36:15, 41:14, 44:18,
	42:16	ahead [11] - 3:16, 4:8,	9:13, 36:6, 36:9,	45:15
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	according [2] - 26:13,	4:24, 6:8, 7:25, 11:2,	36:23, 37:11, 46:7,	best [1] - 8:5
48:9, 48:22		12:3, 28:7, 33:19,	46:17	better [4] - 15:13,
48:9, 48:22 30 [3] - 11:18, 11:20,	26:14		1	21:18, 28:23, 36:18
48:9, 48:22 30 [3] - 11:18, 11:20, 31:13			approved (a) - 23.6	.,,
48:9, 48:22 30 [3] - 11:18, 11:20, 31:13 300 [1] - 31:21	account [2] - 21:11,	47:2	approved [4] - 23:6,	
48:9, 48:22 30 [3] - 11:18, 11:20, 31:13	account [2] - 21:11, 31:10	47:2 aid [1] - 3:16	23:7, 36:12, 47:12	
48:9, 48:22 30 [3] - 11:18, 11:20, 31:13 300 [1] - 31:21	account [2] - 21:11, 31:10 accounts [2] - 21:10,	47:2 aid [1] - 3:16 allocates [1] - 23:11	23:7, 36:12, 47:12 approving [2] - 7:23,	betterment [1] - 17:12 between [9] - 10:9,
48:9, 48:22 30 [3] - 11:18, 11:20, 31:13 300 [1] - 31:21	account _[2] - 21:11, 31:10 accounts _[2] - 21:10, 31:14	47:2 aid [1] - 3:16 allocates [1] - 23:11 allocating [1] - 16:8	23:7, 36:12, 47:12 approving [2] - 7:23, 44:15	betterment [1] - 17:12 between [9] - 10:9, 11:9, 18:8, 18:25,
48:9, 48:22 30 [3] - 11:18, 11:20, 31:13 300 [1] - 31:21	account [2] - 21:11, 31:10 accounts [2] - 21:10,	47:2 aid [1] - 3:16 allocates [1] - 23:11	23:7, 36:12, 47:12 approving [2] - 7:23,	betterment [1] - 17:12 between [9] - 10:9,

beyond [1] - 15:4 big [6] - 19:19, 19:20, 19:21, 28:19, 38:20, 45:1 billed [1] - 6:16 billing [2] - 21:11, 31:10 billings [1] - 6:19 Binder [2] - 1:14, 5:4 bit [8] - 8:11, 12:8, 15:17, 22:3, 22:17, 23:4, 29:4, 36:6 Black [43] - 1:19, 1:22, 3:9, 3:23, 3:24, 4:1, 4:4, 4:6, 10:1, 10:4, 10:7, 10:9, 11:9, 11:12, 11:13, 11:15, 11:16, 17:16, 18:8, 23:14, 23:23, 27:17, 29:14, 30:14, 32:23, 35:14, 35:23, 36:13, 37:7, 37:12, 41:15, 42:7, 42:23, 44:18, 44:20, 44:24, 45:7, 45:23, 46:18 BLACK [1] - 1:4 blended [1] - 26:4 board [1] - 34:7 Bob [3] - 1:16, 5:4, 18:6 borne [2] - 19:6, 22:11 bothers [1] - 29:3 bottom [3] - 30:7, 30:8, 45:5 bought [1] - 34:12 boy [1] - 28:19 briefing [1] - 8:3 bring [2] - 14:15, 41:15 bringing [1] - 42:10 brings [3] - 20:24, 20:25, 26:8 BRINK [1] - 4:1 Brink [1] - 4:1 broad [2] - 14:4, 15:3 broadcasting [1] -10:14 brought [2] - 40:18, 42:22 build [1] - 39:10 Building [2] - 2:3, 3:5 burden [3] - 15:20, 22:11, 22:12 business [25] - 13:25, 14:23, 14:25, 19:18, 20:10, 21:25, 25:14, 26:18, 27:4, 27:10, 27:12, 29:17, 30:11, 33:23, 34:17, 38:23, 40:6, 41:14, 41:17,

41:20, 42:6, 42:9, 42:12, 42:16, 48:10 businesses [7] - 30:6, 34:14, 34:23, 42:17, 44:24, 45:9, 45:11 buy [1] - 21:4

C

capacities [1] - 31:20 capacity [1] - 21:16 capital [3] - 25:25, 26:15, 27:13 capitol [1] - 4:5 Capitol [3] - 2:2, 2:3, 3:5 captured [1] - 35:5 care [3] - 21:5, 21:8, 25:20 carries [4] - 9:11, 9:23, 48:9, 48:22 case [28] - 3:10, 11:1, 12:21, 16:6, 22:5, 22:6, 22:14, 22:24, 23:2, 23:5, 23:7, 23:17, 23:25, 24:7, 24:8, 24:21, 28:10, 29:7, 29:9, 29:24, 30:1, 32:12, 35:4, 35:5, 37:24, 38:5 cases [5] - 14:18, 21:23, 27:9, 29:21, 31:2 cement [1] - 41:6 Cement [1] - 21:13 centered [1] - 15:18 centralization [1] -21:6 certain [6] - 14:15, 20:17, 25:23, 27:7, 31:15, 44:23 certainly [5] - 14:19, 17:13, 19:12, 20:2, 20:12 certainty [1] - 20:14 CERTIFICATE [1] -49:2 Certified [2] - 49:6, 49:19 **CERTIFY** [1] - 49:8 Chair [1] - 12:5 CHAIRMAN [76] -1:10, 1:10, 3:1, 4:7, 4:15, 4:19, 5:7, 5:10, 6:7, 6:22, 7:15, 8:8, 8:13, 8:18, 8:21, 9:1, 9:8, 9:10, 9:20, 9:22, 10:11, 12:3, 12:19,

13:7, 13:15, 14:11,

15:9, 15:15, 16:19, 16:24, 18:2, 18:10, 19:13, 22:2, 23:21, 24:18, 25:19, 26:11, 27:15, 28:14, 30:7, 31:1, 31:4, 32:4, 32:9, 32:14, 32:17, 33:2, 33:9, 33:14, 33:19, 38:15, 39:16, 40:6, 40:10, 40:17, 40:23, 41:18, 42:1, 42:21, 43:2, 43:6, 43:19, 43:24, 44:2, 44:10, 45:25, 46:8, 46:16, 47:1, 47:25, 48:6, 48:8, 48:15, 48:19, 48:21 chairman [6] - 3:21, 7:21, 12:23, 32:15, 42:24, 46:24 Chairman [1] - 11:11 challenge [1] - 21:19 change [3] - 7:3, 27:25, 29:18 changed [1] - 22:18 changes [1] - 23:4 characteristic [1] -30:20 characteristics [14] -16:17, 16:18, 17:9, 17:18, 17:25, 25:13, 29:19, 31:19, 31:23, 38:18, 38:23, 40:3, 42:6, 42:18 charged [1] - 14:17 checked [1] - 35:12 Cheri [3] - 1:23, 3:15, 49:18 CHERI [1] - 49:5 Chesapeake [11] -5:15, 5:22, 5:23, 6:1, 7:2, 7:12, 7:16, 8:6, 8:10, 8:25, 9:2 Chuck [1] - 4:5 Cindy [5] - 1:16, 5:19, 5:24, 6:2, 8:2 Circuit[1] - 24:22 circumstances [1] -26:25 City [6] - 12:15, 20:16, 21:2, 21:9, 34:7, 41:9 clarifications [1] -43:21 class [12] - 15:4, 15:23, 16:2, 16:13, 16:20, 19:2, 20:3, 37:8, 37:20, 38:4, 38:5, 45:15

classes [5] - 16:8,

16:22, 18:24, 23:12, 47:21 classifications [1] -41:17 cleaner[1] - 43:14 clear [4] - 10:12, 10:25, 17:22, 33:4 clearly [4] - 19:20, 22:10, 22:11, 26:7 climate [1] - 42:6 closed [2] - 10:15, 20:22 closely [2] - 17:2, 21:14 closing [1] - 34:6 Coalition [3] - 1:21, 4:14, 12:25 coalition [1] - 12:22 colleagues [3] - 3:13, 5:13, 32:5 combine [1] - 31:15 combined [4] - 21:10, 21:11, 31:10, 36:3 comfortable [3] -28:13, 37:23, 46:10 coming [4] - 8:10, 28:5, 45:6 commencing [1] - 2:4 comment [3] - 12:21, 13:8, 13:11 comments [8] - 10:5, 12:11, 42:2, 43:17, 44:11, 46:1, 46:12, 48:12 commercial [1] -45:10 COMMISSION [3] -1:1, 1:9, 1:12 Commission [33] -3:2, 3:11, 5:21, 7:6, 7:23, 9:13, 9:25, 10:7, 11:23, 13:7, 14:6, 14:7, 22:4, 23:6, 23:8, 24:25, 25:17, 26:12, 33:16, 36:6, 36:8, 36:19, 36:22, 36:23, 37:3, 37:11, 39:21, 42:10, 43:14, 44:3, 46:2, 46:17, 48:11 Commission's [3] -33:9, 33:11, 47:10 Commissioner [15] -4:12, 6:25, 8:19, 8:22, 8:23, 9:3, 13:16, 18:12, 28:8, 33:17, 44:10, 46:3, 46:9, 47:1, 47:25 COMMISSIONER [19] - 1:11, 8:20, 8:24,

9:7, 9:9, 9:19, 9:21, 32:8, 32:10, 32:15, 46:3, 46:13, 46:24, 47:3, 48:5, 48:7, 48:14, 48:18, 48:20 Commissioners [6] -12:6, 12:18, 22:1, 32:7, 45:2, 45:20 commissions [1] -25:20 common [1] - 29:20 communities [3] -21:4, 21:8, 25:15 community [4] -17:11, 19:21, 21:1, 41:12 companies [5] -20:18, 23:24, 33:22, 35:21, 44:21 company [14] - 17:14, 18:22, 18:25, 19:1, 20:5, 20:22, 22:18, 23:12, 24:2, 25:24, 27:3, 34:4, 44:16, 47:20 company's [3] - 20:1, 38:17, 45:19 compared [1] - 44:20 comparing [1] - 37:20 comparison [1] -25:10 comparisons [1] -31:24 compete [1] - 42:14 complicated [1] - 22:3 concern [5] - 19:8, 27:8, 33:22, 34:5, 45:12 concerned [2] - 15:14, 47:8 concerns [1] - 47:8 concluded [1] - 48:23 conclusion [1] - 46:5 condition [1] - 28:1 conditional [1] - 46:11 confidence [1] - 18:19 confident [2] - 27:12, 46:4 confidential [6] -10:17, 10:23, 11:8, 11:20, 11:23, 26:4 conforming [1] -11:16 confusion [1] - 33:5 consider [4] - 25:17, 25:18, 28:9, 46:14 considerations [1] -26:22 considered [2] -17:20, 39:13

10:	1	3		

3

dusty [1] - 40 Dusty [3] - 3:12, 38:15, 42:22

Ε

early [2] - 35:19, 39:12 easier[1] - 22:24 East [1] - 2:3 easy [1] - 22:7 echo [1] - 12:11 economic [3] - 21:18, 35:19, 42:15 economies [6] -14:15, 16:15, 19:16, 25:9, 28:25, 47:14 economy [1] - 21:20 effect [5] - 14:5, 24:9, 35:22, 36:3, 36:25 effectively [1] - 47:17 effort [1] - 12:9 either [3] - 5:12, 17:13, 23:25 EL09-018 [2] - 1:4, 3:9 elected [1] - 24:13 **ELECTRIC** [1] - 1:5 electric [3] - 20:24, 24:1, 44:21 electronically [1] - 3:4 eligible [2] - 30:10, 30:15 emphasize [1] - 44:19 employ [1] - 44:25 employees [2] - 35:23, 36:2 employer [2] - 17:14, 41:10 employment [2] -35:20 encourage [1] - 41:13 end [1] - 8:14 energy [3] - 35:13, 39:23, 41:23 enhance [1] - 42:16 entered [1] - 29:16 entitled [3] - 2:2, 27:23, 49:10 envision [1] - 16:15 envisioned [1] - 19:18 envisions [2] - 13:25, 15:20 error [1] - 48:11 especially [1] - 47:14 essence [1] - 8:8 estimate [2] - 7:22, Evans [2] - 5:9, 6:3 evidence [2] - 17:5, 17:22

cost [10] - 15:23, 16:2, 16:3, 16:20, 19:2, 19:15, 21:15, 37:20, 38:5, 45:15 costs [21] - 8:5, 14:16, 14:19, 14:20, 15:13, 16:8, 17:2, 18:14, 19:11, 19:12, 20:11, 21:22, 21:24, 22:13, 28:25, 29:19, 30:5, 30:6, 34:16, 45:10, 45:17 counsel [2] - 3:23, 10:7 COUNTY [1] - 49:3 course [4] - 10:22, 12:19, 13:2, 41:18 Court [1] - 24:22 court [1] - 3:15 cover[2] - 19:11, 34:16 covered [1] - 47:9 Cremer [7] - 1:13, 4:25, 5:2, 5:17, 13:9, 18:2, 32:18 CREMER [5] - 5:2, 5:8, 5:18, 13:9, 32:21 critical [3] - 17:14, 45:9, 45:15 CRR [1] - 1:23 crystal [1] - 33:4 curious [1] - 17:5 curtailable [1] - 30:20 curtailment [1] - 21:17 customer [21] - 15:4, 17:8, 17:14, 17:25, 18:4, 18:24, 20:21, 21:13, 22:9, 22:23, 23:12, 30:9, 32:12, 33:7, 33:12, 38:18, 38:21, 39:10, 42:4, 47:19 customer's [2] -30:23, 30:25 customer-bycustomer [1] - 17:25 customers [61] - 16:7, 16:9, 16:11, 16:14, 16:16, 17:13, 17:21, 17:23, 19:7, 20:3, 20:7, 20:9, 20:11, 20:14, 21:22, 22:8, 22:22, 23:4, 23:8, 24:10, 25:5, 25:6, 26:20, 27:14, 29:16, 29:23, 29:25, 30:19, 30:21, 31:12, 31:13,

developed [4] - 16:5, 30:18, 31:9, 31:10 development[11] -13:25, 14:23, 14:25, 19:18, 30:11, 35:19, 41:14, 41:21, 42:9, 42:12, 42:16 Deviation [1] - 18:12 deviation [1] - 30:10 Deviations [16] -11:14, 11:17, 11:19, 19:11, 19:15, 23:9, 29:7, 29:16, 29:21, 31:6, 34:20, 37:19, 37:24, 38:9, 44:15, 45:21 dictate [1] - 47:17 differ [2] - 28:17, 28:25 differences [1] - 28:22 different [6] - 12:15, 29:4, 39:21, 39:24, 40:4, 41:1 differentiation [1] -16:13 differently [4] - 8:11, 22:17, 28:19, 40:11 difficult [1] - 41:1 difficulty [1] - 24:19 direction [1] - 37:18 disclosed [1] - 17:21 discounts [1] - 31:14 discussion [7] - 8:23, 9:4, 9:16, 31:23, 46:23, 47:13, 48:2 disputes [1] - 19:22 dive [1] - 13:17 division [1] - 18:23 DO [1] - 49:8 Docket [1] - 3:8 dollar[1] - 20:21 dollars [1] - 37:8 done [7] - 15:23, 22:25, 23:10, 33:24, 34:17, 39:5, 45:19 down [5] - 24:21, 26:9, 38:9, 45:10, 45:17 downturn [1] - 21:20 dramatic [1] - 35:22 drive [2] - 12:8, 16:20 duly [1] - 49:8 duly-appointed [1] -49:8 duress [1] - 20:17 during [2] - 29:14,

determined [1] - 8:2

determines [1] - 24:23

detriments [1] - 15:3

35:10, 35:11, 35:13,

35:16, 36:9, 36:16,

37:19, 38:19, 38:22,

39:7, 39:23, 40:2,

40:5, 40:24, 42:14,

17:18, 32:3, 39:11

customize [1] - 39:5

D

cutting [1] - 27:25

cycles [1] - 45:12

DAKOTA [2] - 1:2,

Dakota [9] - 2:2, 2:3,

3:2, 21:13, 34:10,

41:8, 44:21, 49:7,

data [2] - 16:4, 31:24

Dave [6] - 1:14, 5:4,

5:9, 5:23, 5:25, 6:5

11:20, 23:1, 39:12

DDN [5] - 1:10, 1:11,

deal [3] - 29:4, 30:4,

deals [7] - 5:14, 5:22,

23:13, 27:25

dealt [1] - 24:7

debates [1] - 27:19

decision [5] - 23:1,

33:6, 33:9, 33:11,

decisions [1] - 23:13

deficiency [1] - 18:23

demand [2] - 30:20,

Demaris [1] - 1:17

deregulation [1] -

described [2] - 6:11,

describes [1] - 6:9

desires [1] - 39:1

details [2] - 5:23,

determination [1] -

determine [1] - 41:3

delay [1] - 47:4

decide [1] - 24:11

19:13, 19:15, 19:17,

1:12, 1:19, 1:21

39:21

34:15

31:15

39:12

7:16

17:18

25:16

31:15, 31:18, 31:21,

35:2, 35:6, 35:8,

danger [1] - 33:25

Dated [1] - 49:13

days [4] - 11:18,

49:1

49:13

47:15, 47:18

customers' [3] -

42:19, 44:23, 47:12,

37:1, 37:2, 37:9,

31:1

DUSTIN[1] - 1:10

considering [2] -37:18, 38:2 consistent [1] - 30:5 consultant [2] - 5:21, 7:21 Consultants [1] - 5:16 consulting [1] - 9:14 Consumer [1] - 1:20 consumer [1] - 47:11 Consumers [2] - 4:14, 12:25 consumers [2] -23:15, 36:13 contingent [3] - 24:4, 24:14, 43:16 continue [2] - 20:8, 27:13 continuing [1] - 21:24 contract [21] - 5:15, 5:24, 6:2, 6:10, 6:21, 7:11, 7:13, 8:25, 9:2, 9:14, 16:11, 22:8, 30:4, 30:10, 30:15, 31:16, 31:19, 37:6, 38:25, 41:13, 42:9 Contract [6] - 11:14, 11:19, 19:14, 23:8, 34:20, 38:9 Contracts [11] - 11:17, 18:11, 19:10, 29:7, 29:15, 29:20, 31:6, 37:18, 37:23, 44:15, 45:21 contracts [15] - 5:21, 9:12, 16:12, 16:14, 22:4, 22:15, 22:17, 24:10, 24:15, 29:23, 29:25, 30:2, 30:23, 39:6, 39:8 contractual [1] - 39:13 contributing [1] -

21:22

30:14

contribution [2] -

contributions [2] -

18:13, 25:14

17:10, 17:11

control [1] - 14:6

conversation [1] -

corporation [2] -

20:16, 24:17

3:25, 4:2

49:11

Corporation [2] -

correct [11] - 7:20,

7:21, 8:12, 8:17,

11:5, 15:12, 18:7,

30:8, 34:25, 35:1,

correctly [1] - 35:17

controlling [1] - 14:1

evidentiary [1] - 16:25 exact [1] - 31:5 exactly [1] - 11:5 example [1] - 19:5 excuse [4] - 7:10, 33:17, 33:21, 35:10 expect [1] - 36:1 expectation [1] -20:10 experience [1] - 22:6 experts [1] - 27:20 explain [2] - 13:19, 41:2 explained [1] - 44:6 explaining [1] - 43:11 explicitly [1] - 13:24 extensive [1] - 12:12 extent [5] - 6:17, 13:21, 25:23, 26:17, 27:7 extraordinary [1] -26:25

F

facilities [2] - 20:19, 21:5 facility [1] - 39:11 facing [1] - 6:13 fact [5] - 17:15, 23:18, 43:8, 44:16, 45:6 factors [2] - 28:8, 28:12 factory [1] - 40:11 fair [4] - 12:16, 17:2, 39:19, 40:10 fairly [5] - 16:4, 16:7, 16:13, 21:12, 28:24 Falls [1] - 4:13 far[1] - 15:13 Faulkenberg [1] - 4:20 favorable [1] - 37:5 feedback [1] - 40:15 felt [2] - 15:3, 36:15 few [4] - 13:17, 15:18, 32:5, 37:8 file [2] - 11:16, 26:25 filed [7] - 10:16, 11:6, 11:19, 11:20, 16:3, 46:11 filing [2] - 43:16, 44:3 final [2] - 9:24, 23:1 fine [2] - 4:19, 32:15 finish [1] - 46:14 firm [1] - 3:22 first [6] - 5:14, 5:20, 10:5, 12:6, 13:17, 13:24 fit [2] - 38:18, 39:1

five [9] - 12:13, 35:11, 36:3, 39:16, 39:18, 39:20, 40:19, 40:20, 46:6 five-month [1] - 12:13 fixed [5] - 14:19, 14:20, 19:11, 21:22, 34:16 flexibility [1] - 42:14 flexible [2] - 12:7, 31:17 flip [1] - 15:1 folks [2] - 3:6, 10:25 followed [1] - 23:16 FOR [1] - 1:4 forest [1] - 41:7 forgot [1] - 5:18 forthcoming [1] - 6:18 fortunate [1] - 34:8 forward [2] - 20:8, 31:24 four [3] - 6:14, 16:8, 31:8 four-day [1] - 6:14 frame [1] - 36:18 framework [1] - 13:20 frankly [1] - 47:21 freely [1] - 47:19 freeze [1] - 26:23 friendly [2] - 46:9, 46:15 full [2] - 8:3, 24:22 fully [2] - 19:11, 37:23 function [1] - 21:6 future [2] - 20:23, 28:4

G

gains [1] - 25:23 gap [1] - 31:7 Gary [1] - 3:13 GARY [1] - 1:11 gas [1] - 24:1 general [7] - 10:20, 14:4, 16:9, 16:10, 31:11, 33:7, 37:7 generally [3] - 11:11, 17:20, 27:1 generic [1] - 38:24 George [2] - 5:9, 6:3 gold [1] - 34:4 grant [1] - 9:25 granting [1] - 32:25 great [3] - 4:7, 5:7, 5:10 greater [2] - 26:20, 47:11 Greg [3] - 1:13, 33:18, 44:12

group [7] - 23:3, 23:8, 34:11, 35:9, 35:15, 37:1, 37:2 groups [1] - 16:7 guess [8] - 16:19, 28:20, 31:8, 35:7, 35:25, 37:17, 45:5, 45:14

Н

haif [3] - 20:21, 26:6,

handful [2] - 34:22,

Hanson [7] - 3:13, 9:3,

HANSON [10] - 1:11,

9:6, 9:18, 32:7, 48:4,

8:20, 8:24, 9:7, 9:19,

32:15, 46:24, 47:3,

46:6

35:5

48:17

48:5, 48:18 happy [1] - 43:18 hard [2] - 12:14, 20:23 health [2] - 21:5, 21:7 hear [5] - 12:3, 18:22, 46:24, 47:4, 47:5 heard [1] - 24:25 hearing [16] - 6:13, 6:14, 6:24, 8:3, 8:4, 8:22, 9:5, 9:17, 12:10, 13:5, 24:22, 36:10, 48:3, 48:12, 48:23 held [1] - 2:1 help [4] - 8:2, 29:10, 42:15 HEREBY [1] - 49:8 hesitate [1] - 17:19 high [2] - 25:24, 35:15 Hill [1] - 20:16 Hills [43] - 1:19, 1:22, 3:9, 3:23, 3:24, 4:1, 4:4, 4:6, 10:1, 10:4, 10:7, 10:9, 11:9, 11:10, 11:12, 11:13, 11:15, 11:16, 17:16, 18:8, 23:14, 23:23, 27:18, 29:14, 30:14, 32:23, 35:14, 35:23, 36:13, 37:7, 37:12, 41:15, 42:7, 42:23, 44:18, 44:20, 44:24, 45:7, 45:23, 46:18 HILLS [1] - 1:4 historic [1] - 16:4 historical [1] - 31:24 historically [2] -21:14, 23:10

history [3] - 29:13, 34:1, 34:18 Hoc [1] - 3:1 Homestake [3] -20:20, 34:3, 41:12 hop [1] - 32:6 hopefully [1] - 20:25 Hospital [3] - 21:2, 21:9, 41:9 hospitals [1] - 21:5

1

idea [2] - 31:5, 35:9 identical [1] - 40:24 identify [1] - 3:19 ignore [1] - 8:9 immediately [1] - 47:4 impact [1] - 26:21 impacted [1] - 32:24 impacts [1] - 15:2 implicit [1] - 14:23 imply [1] - 47:10 importance [1] - 17:23 important [4] - 19:21, 20:4, 28:11, 32:2 imposed [1] - 17:3 IN [1] - 1:4 Inc [1] - 11:9 INC [1] - 1:4 include [2] - 11:15, 11:23 included [3] - 8:5, 17:17, 35:20 increase [4] - 9:2, 25:1, 25:6, 27:6 **INCREASE** [1] - 1:5 increases [1] - 26:24 increasing [1] - 15:2 indeed [2] - 26:2, indicate [4] - 19:9. 19:24, 33:25, 44:4 indicated [1] - 32:18 indicates [3] - 14:5, 17:1, 32:22 indication [1] - 20:1 Industrial [16] - 1:22, 4:4, 4:21, 10:1, 10:10, 11:10, 11:13, 12:4, 23:3, 23:14, 35:2, 36:9, 36:13, 46:18, 47:12, 47:15 industrial [5] - 16:11, 35:16, 38:20, 38:25, 39:8 industrials [3] - 18:8, 19:5, 24:14 influence [2] - 20:25,

47.17 information [9] -10:15, 10:16, 10:23, 16:25, 17:7, 17:21, 18:4, 18:19, 31:22 insightful [2] - 28:1, 28:4 instance [3] - 7:12, 8:6, 36:12 instances [2] - 19:12, 34:13 instead [1] - 7:25 institute [1] - 3:6 intent [1] - 15:5 interest [14] - 10:21, 11:25, 14:3, 19:18, 19:24, 20:2, 22:1, 24:16, 27:16, 27:17, 29:6, 30:11, 41:20, 44:5 interim [2] - 8:13, 31:7 internet [1] - 10:14 interplay [2] - 22:19, 25:4 interrupt[1] - 43:3 interrupting [1] -10:12 intervened [1] - 30:16 Intervener [4] - 6:23, 29:5, 40:25, 46:20 Interveners [19] -1:22, 4:4, 4:6, 4:21, 10:2, 10:4, 10:10, 11:10, 11:14, 12:4, 23:14, 26:8, 28:17, 29:10, 29:11, 39:17, 40:19, 46:5, 46:18 intervening (1) - 4:16 introduce [1] - 4:23 introduced [2] - 5:11, 5:12 involved [2] - 18:7, 34:16 irregardless [1] -24:10

J

issue [8] - 5:13, 5:20,

42:23, 45:1, 45:4

issues [1] - 13:5

itself [1] - 13:12

ITS [1] - 1:5

13:18, 26:3, 30:12,

Jackson [1] - 3:22 Jacobson [9] - 1:14, 5:4, 5:23, 6:5, 6:7, 6:8, 6:22, 7:1, 7:15 JACOBSON [6] - 6:6,

6:9, 7:9, 7:20, 8:12, 8:17 job [1] - 27:18 John [1] - 1:12 Johnson [9] - 3:12, 3:21, 9:10, 9:22, 11:11, 12:5, 38:15. 48.8.48.21 JOHNSON [75] - 1:10, 3:1, 4:7, 4:15, 4:19, 5:7, 5:10, 6:7, 6:22, 7:15, 8:8, 8:13, 8:18, 8:21, 9:1, 9:8, 9:10, 9:20, 9:22, 10:11, 12:3, 12:19, 13:7, 13:15, 14:11, 15:9, 15:15, 16:19, 16:24, 18:2, 18:10, 19:13, 22:2, 23:21, 24:18, 25:19, 26:11, 27:15, 28:14, 30:7, 31:1, 31:4, 32:4, 32:9, 32:14, 32:17, 33:2, 33:9, 33:14, 33:19, 38:15, 39:16, 40:6, 40:10, 40:17, 40:23, 41:18, 42:1, 42:21, 43:2, 43:6, 43:19, 43:24, 44:2, 44:10, 45:25, 46:8, 46:16, 47:1, 47:25, 48:6, 48:8, 48:15, 48:19, 48:21 Joint [5] - 10:1, 10:8, 11:5, 11:8, 33:1 joint [1] - 13:1 Jon [3] - 1:15, 5:4, 6:2 judgment [1] - 27:9 June [7] - 1:7, 2:4, 3:3, 25:18, 36:20, 49:10, 49:14

Κ

Karen [3] - 1:13, 5:2, 13:9 keep [2] - 10:19, 45:9 keeping [1] - 45:8 Kemnitz [3] - 1:16, 5:19, 8:2 KHOROOSI [4] - 4:11, 4:12, 4:18, 12:23 Khoroosi [5] - 1:20, 4:10, 4:12, 4:15, 12:24 kind [9] - 8:9, 8:14, 13:19, 13:23, 14:1, 14:12, 15:10, 18:4, 29:1 KNADLE [2] - 18:6, 18:21 Knadle [4] - 1:16, 5:4, 18:6, 18:18 Kolbeck [8] - 3:13, 9:8, 9:20, 32:7, 46:4, 46:9, 48:6, 48:19 KOLBECK [10] - 1:10, 9:9, 9:21, 32:8, 32:10, 46:3, 46:13, 48:7, 48:14, 48:20 Kyle [4] - 3:24, 33:20, 42:22, 44:17

L

Labrie [2] - 1:15, 5:3

16:7, 16:10, 16:13,

16:16, 19:5, 28:16,

31:11, 35:5, 35:6,

35:15, 38:2, 39:11,

39:16, 40:1, 40:3,

40:11, 42:4, 44:21,

28:24, 30:11, 30:20,

lab [1] - 41:11

lack [1] - 13:4

large [23] - 14:15.

45:8 larger [2] - 35:10, 37:19 largest [3] - 31:21, 35:8, 41:7 last [4] - 6:13, 21:20, 42:3, 46:5 late [1] - 35:18 law [5] - 3:22, 14:10, 14:14, 30:9, 42:24 lead [1] - 22:16 learn [1] - 31:25 least [8] - 22:5, 22:16, 25:4, 25:5, 27:5, 28:15, 31:13, 41:19 Lee [3] - 1:19, 3:22, 10:6 legally [1] - 43:25 less [4] - 6:19, 6:20, 8:15, 14:16 letter[3] - 7:16, 7:18, 7:19 letters [1] - 8:9 level [1] - 17:9 lighting [1] - 16:10 likely [4] - 17:17, 36:16, 37:5, 37:7 line [7] - 4:17, 28:5, 30:7, 30:8, 32:11, 32:13, 45:5 lines [1] - 4:8 listed [1] - 5:20

load 181 - 20:25, 29:18. 31:18, 31:23, 34:24, 35:3, 38:23, 44:22 loads [1] - 26:20 local [1] - 17:16 location [2] - 3:18, 40:2 locations [2] - 39:24, 40:7 long-term [2] - 29:4, look [9] - 20:13, 20:20, 21:2, 29:13, 32:1, 40:10, 40:19, 41:11, 43:20 looked [1] - 17:8 looking [2] - 23:23, 40:17 loose [1] - 36:17 lose [3] - 36:16, 36:23, 37:3 losers [1] - 36:14 loses [1] - 36:7 low (11 - 25:22 lower [3] - 21:15, 29:19, 30:13 Lynn [1] - 3:22

М

magic [1] - 28:2 MAGNUSON [3] -3:21, 10:6, 11:4 Magnuson [5] - 1:19, 3:22, 10:6, 10:11, 13:3 Magnuson's [1] -12:11 main [1] - 40:2 maintain [1] - 25:25 maintaining [1] -44:24 major [2] - 17:14, 41:9 majority [1] - 21:23 management [1] -21:6 manufacturer[1] manufacturing [3] -20:13, 20:19, 34:7 matches [1] - 17:2 materials [1] - 15:25 math [1] - 8:10 matter [3] - 2:2, 44:16, 49:10 MATTER [1] - 1:4 maximum [1] - 6:15 MCCOMSEY [1] - 49:5 McComsey [2] - 1:23,

mean [43] - 7:2, 8:9, 13:25, 14:9, 14:13, 15:4, 15:10, 15:22, 16:20, 16:24, 17:4, 18:15, 18:18, 18:19, 19:15, 19:19, 19:20, 22:10, 22:16, 24:5, 24:19, 24:21, 25:8, 25:19, 25:20, 25:21, 26:2, 26:3, 27:21, 28:1, 28:25, 29:6, 29:9, 29:10, 30:3, 33:24, 34:1, 35:22, 39:18, 39:20, 40:18, 41:21 medical [1] - 41:10 meet [7] - 24:16, 25:3, 29:17, 30:9, 31:20, 32:3, 43:9 Meeting [1] - 3:2 meeting [4] - 3:4, 3:14, 10:14, 10:19 mention [3] - 5:5, 5:18, 34:3 mentioned [8] - 7:13, 20:6, 24:6, 33:20, 33:21, 34:19, 38:16, 43:12 Merillat [1] - 34:6 met [5] - 12:14, 15:19, 43:11, 44:7 might [5] - 12:2, 27:16, 28:16, 38:16, 43:14 mill [2] - 20:16, 34:12 million [1] - 20:21 mills [2] - 20:14, 41:9 mind [3] - 22:3, 24:19, 43:4 Mine [1] - 20:20 mine [2] - 20:24, 32:11 mining [2] - 34:4, 34:5 missing [2] - 7:8, 14:8 mission [2] - 21:3, 21:9 Mitchell [4] - 3:5, 3:19, 10:15, 12:8 mix [1] - 23:4 moment[1] - 3:17 money [1] - 8:16 month [1] - 12:13 months [1] - 46:6

Moratzka [4] - 1:21,

MORATZKA [2] - 4:3,

morning [1] - 35:12

MORSTZKA [1] - 4:3

most [4] - 13:24,

4:3, 4:7, 4:22

12:5

49:18

19:12, 37:5, 37:7 Motion [23] - 9:1, 9:4, 9:11, 9:16, 9:23, 10:1, 10:8, 11:5, 11:8, 13:2, 13:4, 33:1, 46:6, 46:10, 46:16, 46:22, 46:23, 47:23, 48:2, 48:9, 48:12, 48:16, 48:22 move [2] - 8:24, 9:13 moved [1] - 48:14 MR [78] - 3:21, 3:24, 4:1, 4:3, 4:11, 4:18, 6:6, 6:9, 7:9, 7:20, 8:12, 8:17, 10:6, 11:4, 12:5, 12:23, 14:9, 15:5, 15:12. 16:2, 16:23, 17:6, 18:6, 18:21, 19:9, 19:25, 23:3, 24:6, 25:12, 26:10, 26:17, 28:8, 29:13, 30:17, 31:3, 31:8, 33:8, 33:13, 33:17, 33:20, 34:3, 34:19, 35:1, 35:4, 35:11, 35:17, 35:25, 36:3, 36:4, 36:5, 36:8, 36:17, 36:25, 37:10, 37:13, 37:14, 37:16, 37:17, 38:1, 38:2, 38:11, 38:12, 38:22, 39:22, 40:9, 40:12, 40:22, 41:5, 41:25, 42:3, 42:11, 42:22, 43:5, 43:18, 43:23, 44:1, 44:9, 44:12 MS [6] - 5:2, 5:8, 5:18, 13:9, 32:21, 40:13 multiple [3] - 23:19, 31:14, 39:23 mute [1] - 40:15

Ν

natural [1] - 23:25 naturally [1] - 29:22 nature [4] - 17:6, 17:23, 20:3, 20:13 nearly [1] - 41:23 necessarily [4] -37:22, 38:6, 38:7, 45:18 necessary [1] - 25:25 need [17] - 5:11, 8:7, 8:15, 10:22, 10:23, 21:16, 25:10, 27:5, 27:23, 29:23, 30:6, 31:4, 39:3, 39:18, 42:18, 43:9, 43:21 needs [8] - 25:14, 28:9, 29:17, 30:23, 30:25, 32:3, 38:23, 42.16 negative [1] - 15:2 negotiate [2] - 30:15, 37:25 negotiated [5] - 22:17. 23:19, 31:6, 36:14, 37:24 negotiates [2] - 23:11, 47:19 negotiating [1] - 42:8 negotiation [1] - 38:9 negotiations [5] -12:13, 17:7, 18:8, 22:18. 39:6 neighborhood [1] -17:15 Neiman [3] - 20:15, 34:12, 41:8 nervous [2] - 43:6. 43:7 new [4] - 30:5, 38:18, 39:10, 42:14 next [3] - 15:17, 29:9, 37:25 nobody [1] - 41:22 nonconfidential [1] -11:7 none [5] - 6:24, 8:20, 9:5, 9:17, 48:3 nongovernmental [1] - 21:12 nonnumber [1] -10:20 nonnumber-specific [1] - 10:20 nonprofit [2] - 21:3, 41:10 norm [1] - 24:1 normally [2] - 18:10, 22:4 Notary [2] - 49:7, 49:18 note [2] - 12:1, 12:11 nothing [2] - 42:4, 42:7 number [19] - 8:1, 24:23, 24:24, 25:1, 27:21, 27:22, 28:1, 28:2, 29:15, 31:5, 33:3, 34:24, 35:5, 35:23, 38:4, 38:19, 44:22 numbers [2] - 37:20, 45:16

0

o'clock [2] - 2:5, 3:3 oath [2] - 42:25, 43:13 objected [1] - 46:21 objection [2] - 13:1, 13:4 objectionable [1] -42:23 obviously [2] - 10:18. 27:15 occurs [1] - 29:24 OF [7] - 1:2, 1:4, 2:1, 49:1, 49:3 off-peak [1] - 21:15 offer [2] - 30:19, 46:8 on-peak [1] - 21:16 once [1] - 23:16 one [28] - 3:8, 7:1, 7:9, 7:18, 14:15, 14:21, 19:17, 20:17, 20:21, 25:20, 26:22, 28:11, 28:18, 29:3, 30:18, 35:3, 37:17, 37:25, 40:2, 40:11, 40:24, 40:25, 41:6, 41:12, 42:3, 42:5, 44:19 ones [2] - 20:14, 28:11 ongoing [1] - 20:19 Onida [1] - 49:13 online [1] - 45:9 open [3] - 6:24, 10:19, 13:16 operate [4] - 27:4, 27:10, 27:12, 45:13 operation [1] - 34:9 operations [2] - 34:5, 39:1 opportunities [1] -29:18 opportunity [2] -31:25, 42:14 oppose [1] - 47:22 opposed [2] - 6:13, 23:1 option [1] - 43:13 order [6] - 3:3, 11:15, 11:22, 30:19, 39:3, 45:16 organization [1] -21:12 original [4] - 6:14, 7:6, 7:12, 8:7 originally [1] - 7:3 ourselves [1] - 29:8 outcome [2] - 24:14, 24:20

outside [8] - 3:23,

10:6, 22:5, 22:24,

24:8, 29:7, 29:21, 34:8 overall [2] - 20:4, 23:11 overcharge [1] - 14:18 overcontribute [1] -14:20 overused [1] - 41:19 own [2] - 15:6, 18:20 ownership [1] - 34:9

P

p.m [2] - 2:5, 48:23 Panel [2] - 34:10, 41:8 parallel [1] - 22:15 part [7] - 11:7, 16:3. 16:5, 18:15, 18:16, 25:4, 36:1 participating [3] - 3:7, 3:14, 33:6 particle [1] - 34:6 particular [5] - 6:3, 21:19, 30:25, 41:17, 42:5 particularly [1] - 15:25 parties [8] - 4:9, 11:1, 12:14, 12:20, 12:21, 23:19, 28:10, 46:19 partnership [2] - 32:1, 32:2 party [3] - 4:16, 15:22, 34:8 passed [1] - 15:7 past [5] - 34:5, 34:20, 38:17, 39:9, 45:21 pause [3] - 3:16, 10:3, 12:20 pay [1] - 33:12 payers [1] - 14:25 paying [2] - 18:20, 41:1 peak [3] - 17:10, 21:15, 21:16 pending [6] - 9:4, 9:16, 23:2, 46:22, 46:23, 48:2 people [4] - 28:15, 28:21, 40:14, 44:25 per[1] - 14:16 percent [8] - 17:16, 20:6, 21:23, 24:24, 26:6, 26:18, 34:24, 35:8 percentage [1] - 35:15 perhaps [3] - 22:3, 28:4, 38:8 period [4] - 12:13, 29:15, 31:1, 45:13

person [3] - 3:19, 4:16, 12:14 personally [1] - 21:21 perspective [2] -19:22, 20:2 pertaining [1] - 47:14 Peterson [2] - 5:9, 5:25 philosophically [1] -17:4 phone (5) - 4:8, 4:20, 5:8, 5:25, 40:16 phones [1] - 40:15 pick [1] - 24:23 picked[1] - 41:16 picture [2] - 19:19, 19:22 Pierre [5] - 2:3, 3:5, 4:24, 5:3, 10:15 place [2] - 3:4, 12:13 plant [1] - 34:7 play [2] - 13:23, 28:12 plus [2] - 7:4, 8:7 pockets [1] - 26:3 point [10] - 7:23, 10:13, 17:19, 20:21, 24:17, 30:2, 34:21, 35:3, 45:14, 45:20 points [3] - 34:14, 39:1, 40:2 policy [1] - 14:14 Pope [1] - 34:11 portion [1] - 44:22 portions [1] - 47:9 posed [1] - 12:2 position [1] - 23:13 positive [1] - 14:24 possibility [1] - 6:12 possible [1] - 8:3 Power [24] - 1:19, 3:9, 3:23, 10:1, 10:4, 10:7, 10:9, 11:9, 11:12, 11:13, 11:15, 11:16, 17:16, 18:9, 23:23, 27:18, 29:14, 30:14, 32:23, 35:14, 36:13, 37:7, 37:12, 46:19 power [1] - 14:16 POWER [1] - 1:4 practical [1] - 26:7 practice [2] - 29:20, 30:22 preclude [2] - 42:4, 42:8 preference [2] - 39:7, 39:12 preparation[1] - 8:4 present[1] - 13:5 presume [3] - 18:3,

24:20, 36:21 price[1] - 38:25 priceability [1] - 39:2 prices [1] - 31:23 pricing [1] - 37:6 primarily [2] - 16:5, 47:8 primary [1] - 6:11 privy [1] - 18:3 proceed [6] - 9:5, 9:17, 9:24, 11:3, 48:3, 48:15 proceeding [5] - 14:2, 22:5, 30:16, 40:25, 46:20 Proceedings [1] - 1:7 proceedings [5] -6:16, 6:17, 7:24, 49:9, 49:12 PROCEEDINGS [1] process [2] - 23:16, 23:18 products [2] - 41:4, 41:7 Professional [2] -49:6, 49:19 properly [1] - 27:24 proposals [1] - 12:15 proposed [3] - 13:1, 19:10, 42:12 proprietary [1] - 17:20 provide [8] - 14:16, 16:13, 21:24, 27:13, 29:17, 31:22, 34:16, 39:2 provided [3] - 27:1, 30:24, 31:14 providing [1] - 21:7 provisions [2] - 26:24, 31:16 PUBLIC [2] - 1:1, 1:9 Public [3] - 3:2, 49:7, 49:18 public [12] - 10:21, 11:25, 14:3, 19:17, 19:24, 20:2, 21:25, 24:16, 29:6, 30:11, 41:20, 44:5 PUC [1] - 11:6 purchased [1] - 20:16 purchases [1] - 35:13 purpose [2] - 15:7, 42:11 pursuant [1] - 11:17 pursue [2] - 23:18, 36:10 pursued [1] - 22:15 push [1] - 35:18

Q

quality [2] - 20:18, 27:13 questioning [1] - 28:5 questions [20] - 3:11, 6:1, 6:3, 6:23, 6:25, 8:19, 8:22, 10:20, 10:22, 12:2, 12:18, 13:16, 15:18, 32:7, 32:10, 32:13, 42:1, 42:21, 44:11, 46:1 quite [2] - 35:6, 41:22

R

Rapid [5] - 12:15, 21:2, 21:9, 34:7, 41:9 rate [50] - 3:9, 13:25, 14:23, 14:25, 16:6, 16:21, 17:1, 17:2, 19:19, 19:24, 22:5, 22:8, 22:9, 22:14, 22:24, 23:2, 23:4, 23:5, 23:7, 23:17, 23:25, 24:7, 24:8, 24:20, 25:19, 25:22, 26:5, 26:13, 26:21, 26:23, 26:24, 27:3, 27:6, 27:8, 27:20, 28:10, 28:11, 29:7, 29:9, 29:21, 29:24, 30:1, 31:2, 32:12, 37:24, 44:4, 47:17, 47:19 rates [17] - 14:5, 14:13, 14:18, 15:2, 19:1, 19:10, 25:17, 28:17, 29:14, 30:12, 30:13, 33:11, 39:18, 41:1, 47:11, 47:12, 47:20 **RATES** [1] - 1:5 rather [1] - 32:19 rationale [2] - 41:21, 45:20 reached [1] - 32:23 read [2] - 7:16, 14:9 really [6] - 14:1, 16:21, 18:15, 19:17, 38:6, 44:19 Realtime [2] - 49:6, 49:19 reason [8] - 6:12, 14:21, 14:22, 15:15, 22:25, 42:20, 47:21, 47:22 reasonable [13] -

11:24, 12:16, 14:7, 25:3, 25:5, 25:11, 25:17, 27:20, 30:12, 39:19, 41:2, 44:5 reasons [2] - 14:13, 25:20 recent [1] - 15:25 recognizing [1] -16:15 recommend [1] -32:25 recommendation [3] -13:13, 32:19, 32:20 record [6] - 17:19, 18:1, 19:23, 26:12, 42:23, 44:8 recovered [1] - 20:11 reduce[1] - 26:20 reduces [1] - 21:15 reduction [1] - 19:4 reestablished [1] -20:18 referenced [1] - 15:24 referred [2] - 15:24, 39:22 referring [1] - 18:5 regard [5] - 17:7, 35:19, 35:23, 38:5, 41.23 region [1] - 41:10 Regional [3] - 21:2, 21:9, 41:9 Registered [2] - 49:5, 49:19 **Regulatory** [1] - 5:15 rejuvenating [1] -20:23 related [2] - 22:10, 44:18 relationship [1] -39:13 relatively [1] - 44:2 reliable [2] - 26:1, 26:15 relying [1] - 8:1 remaining [1] - 19:7 remember [1] - 35:17 remind [3] - 10:18, 15:21, 16:1 reminder [2] - 23:22, 40:14 renamed [1] - 34:9 Reported [1] - 1:23 reporter [2] - 3:15, 49:9 Reporter [4] - 49:6. 49:19, 49:19 represent [2] - 17:15,

35:10

representations [1] -

43:10 representative [1] -35:14 represented [7] -34:23, 35:2, 35:12, 37:1, 40:1, 41:7, 41:8 representing [1] -31:14 represents [4] - 26:18, 35:15, 38:3, 41:17 request [2] - 11:18, 11:22 requested [1] - 7:10 requesting [2] - 6:10, 11:12 requirement[1] -23:11 requirements [3] -20:4, 20:7, 21:16 Residential [3] - 1:20, 4:13, 12:24 residential [5] - 12:22, 16:9, 45:10, 47:11, 47:18 respond [1] - 30:6 responsibility [2] -19:3, 19:5 responsive [2] -30:22, 30:24 rest [1] - 40:4 result [4] - 12:12, 12:16, 16:15, 38:8 return [12] - 25:20, 25:21, 25:24, 26:4, 26:5, 26:9, 26:13, 26:21, 27:3, 27:8, 27:21, 28:11 revenue [8] - 17:24, 18:23, 19:2, 19:4, 20:4, 20:6, 23:11, 37:8 review [2] - 32:22, 40:22 reviewed [1] - 22:4 reviewing [1] - 45:21 rhetoric [1] - 29:1 rhetorical [1] - 28:21 rights [1] - 36:10 risk [2] - 26:19 RISLOV[15] - 15:12, 33:17, 33:20, 34:19, 35:4, 35:17, 36:3, 36:5, 36:17, 37:10, 37:14, 37:17, 38:2, 38:12, 44:12 Rislov [7] - 1:13, 5:5, 15:9, 33:15, 33:18, 44:12, 45:25

road [1] - 38:10

robust [1] - 14:25 rooms [1] - 10:14 roughly [1] - 35:1 RPR [1] - 1:23 ruled [1] - 36:20 rules [1] - 11:18 run [3] - 26:15, 27:18, 27:24

S

safe [2] - 25:25, 26:15 safest [1] - 22:21 sake [1] - 24:24 sales [2] - 21:20, 39:3 Sam [3] - 1:20, 4:12, 12:24 Sanford [1] - 41:11 satisfactory [1] -24:16 satisfy [1] - 19:7 saw [4] - 20:14, 20:16, 34:12, 41:8 scale [6] - 14:16, 16:16, 19:16, 25:9, 28:25, 47:14 scattered [1] - 40:7 schedule [2] - 11:17, 31:11 schedules [1] - 39:8 Schroyer [1] - 4:5 scientific [2] - 21:1. 41:12 second [5] - 5:22, 7:19, 14:4, 14:22, 19:17 Section [1] - 15:6 see [7] - 4:8, 10:3, 12:21, 34:17, 38:4, 40:6, 47:21 seeing [1] - 18:18 seem [1] - 15:7 segmentation [1] -41:16 segmentation-wise [1] - 41:16 sense [4] - 14:8, 17:4, 29:12, 38:21 sensitivity [1] - 44:23 separate [2] - 24:12, 25:16 separation [1] - 25:8 serve [4] - 20:3, 25:15, 34:4, 42:17 served [1] - 44:22 serves [1] - 10:21 service [25] - 15:23, 16:2, 16:4, 16:9, 16:10, 16:17, 16:21,

17:9, 19:2, 19:11, 21:11, 21:15, 21:17, 22:23, 25:13, 30:20, 31:11, 37:21, 38:5, 38:25, 40:3, 40:8, 42:15, 45:16, 45:22 services [3] - 27:13, 39:15, 41:7 serving [1] - 35:24 set [2] - 39:9, 42:18 setting [1] - 29:8 settlement [34] - 7:23, 11:8, 11:14, 11:24, 12:12, 12:20, 13:2, 18:9, 18:21, 18:24, 23:6, 23:7, 24:3, 24:4, 24:11, 24:13, 25:18, 26:23, 27:2, 27:11, 28:10, 29:12, 30:24, 32:22, 32:24, 33:10, 36:11, 36:19, 36:21, 36:24, 37:4, 43:15, 46:17 Settlement [4] - 10:8, 11:6, 26:8, 46:7 settlement's [1] -24:21 settlements [4] -23:19, 28:13, 28:16, seven [1] - 34:23 several [1] - 33:18 shall [2] - 5:21, 9:25 shareholder [1] -22:12 shareholders [1] -19:6 shareholders' [1] -26:3 shifted [1] - 22:13 **short** [3] - 26:6, 37:12, 37:14 shorter [1] - 12:8 shorthand [2] - 49:9 **shown** [2] - 6:20, 7:10 side [2] - 15:1, 43:3 significant[2] - 20:25, 29:15 similar[1] - 39:14 simply [2] - 44:24, 47:12 single [1] - 15:4 Sioux [1] - 4:13 sitting [1] - 36:19 situation [4] - 22:7, 22:14, 34:4, 34:13 situation's [1] - 22:2 situations [1] - 21:18 six [3] - 22:6, 31:9,

34:23

size [1] - 35:14 Slater [6] - 5:22, 5:24, 6:2, 7:6, 7:7, 9:14 slightly [1] - 26:10 small [5] - 16:9, 21:4, 38:19, 44:22, 45:10 smaller [2] - 7:7, 14:17 Smith [6] - 1:12, 13:19, 33:15, 43:2, 43:12, 43:24 **SMITH** [6] - 14:9, 15:5, 42:3, 42:22, 43:5, 44:1 societal [2] - 44:18, 45:15 sold [1] - 45:5 somewhat [2] - 37:20, 44:20 soon [1] - 46:13 sorry [2] - 39:19, 43:3 sort [5] - 14:14, 19:13, 19:15, 22:19, 41:20 sounds [1] - 39:17 South [6] - 2:2, 2:3, 3:2, 44:21, 49:7, 49:13 SOUTH [2] - 1:2, 49:1 speaking [2] - 11:11, 47:5 Spearfish [2] - 20:17, 34:12 special [2] - 30:4, 30:18 specific [7] - 10:20, 10:22, 10:23, 17:17, 17:24, 18:4, 23:14 specifically [1] - 10:16 spelled [1] - 4:12 spend [1] - 8:15 SS [1] - 49:2 **STAFF** [1] - 1:12 Staff [26] - 5:3, 7:25, 13:7, 13:10, 13:11, 18:3, 18:6, 18:7, 18:13, 18:21, 18:25, 22:19, 23:10, 24:5, 24:11, 24:15, 25:18, 26:5, 26:22, 27:2, 27:11, 32:19, 34:21, 36:11, 46:4 Staff's [3] - 19:8, 32:22, 32:23 stand [1] - 25:15 standard [6] - 14:2, 20:12, 24:16, 25:3, 41:20, 43:8 standards [4] - 15:19, 30:9, 43:11, 44:7 **STATE** [2] - 1:2, 49:1

state [2] - 30:9, 35:18 State [2] - 2:2, 49:7 statement [1] - 47:7 statute [3] - 14:1, 15:20, 42:13 statutes [1] - 13:23 statutory [2] - 13:20, 43:8 stay [1] - 45:16 step [1] - 8:14 STEVE [1] - 1:10 Steve [1] - 3:13 still [1] - 26:13 **stipulation** [1] - 43:15 **Stipulation** [5] - 10:9, 11:6, 26:8, 33:10, 46:7 stockholders [1] -37:12 straight [1] - 16:8 stress [1] - 6:14 study [7] - 15:23, 16:1, 16:3, 16:4, 16:21, 37:21, 38:5 subsidy [1] - 18:17 subtraction [1] - 38:7 successful [1] - 24:14 successfully [4] -27:4, 27:9, 27:12, 45:13 sucked [1] - 32:9 **SULLY** [1] - 49:3 summer/winter [1] -17:10 summertime [1] -21:17 super[1] - 38:20 support [7] - 16:25, 21:24, 32:2, 34:17, 43:17, 45:19, 46:12 supported [3] - 20:7, 22:1, 42:12 **supporting** [1] - 47:22 supports [1] - 20:12 surface [1] - 34:4 surrounding [1] - 33:5 suspect [2] - 27:16, 36:9 swearing [1] - 43:12 system [4] - 17:3, 18:14, 26:1, 27:24

Т

Talbot [1] - 34:12 tariff [11] - 11:15, 11:16, 14:18, 16:21, 19:1, 28:17, 30:13, 38:21, 38:24, 38:25,

10:25 technology [1] - 12:9 telephone [6] - 1:10, 1:20, 3:18, 4:17, 5:1, 40:14 telephonically [1] term [5] - 29:4, 29:6. 37:12, 37:15, 38:8 terms [1] - 37:6 Terri [1] - 1:15 territory [5] - 22:10, 22:23, 40:8, 42:15, 45:22 Terry [1] - 5:3 test [1] - 19:18 THE [5] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:4, 1:9 theirs [1] - 8:11 themselves [1] - 3:20 therefore [2] - 25:15, 32:25 they've [4] - 21:18, 30:3, 30:4, 39:9 thin [1] - 44:3 third [1] - 35:2 thoughts [1] - 14:12 three [7] - 3:11, 6:13, 8:4, 26:23, 27:5, 40:2, 45:3 three-week [1] - 8:4 three-year [1] - 26:23 throughout[2] -15:24, 40:7 Thurber [3] - 1:15, 5:4, 6:2 tied [1] - 24:7 Tim [2] - 1:14, 5:4 TO [1] - 1:5 today [15] - 3:8, 3:12, 5:19, 9:25, 10:8, 11:12, 20:1, 33:10, 33:11, 37:10, 43:10, 43:17, 46:12, 47:13, 48:11 today's [2] - 5:14, 36:23 Todd [1] - 4:1 took [3] - 22:19, 34:8, 49:9 top [6] - 35:8, 35:13, 39:17, 39:22, 40:17, 40:19 total [3] - 6:19, 7:11, 35:3

42:12

tariffs [4] - 30:18,

Technical [1] - 3:5

31:10, 37:7, 38:18

technologically [1] -

touched [1] - 44:17 toward [1] - 44:23 town [1] - 42:5 towns [1] - 40:8 tracks [1] - 22:15 transaction [1] - 36:15 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 2:1 Transcript[1] - 1:7 transcription[1] -49:12 transition [1] - 20:15 transpired [1] - 47:13 treated [4] - 11:20, 28:19, 28:23, 28:24 trouble [1] - 34:14 true [1] - 49:11 truly [1] - 47:18 truth [1] - 28:20 try [4] - 10:19, 10:25, 36:18, 41:13 trying [5] - 6:20, 16:20, 40:21, 41:3, 45:18 turn [1] - 6:5 turned [1] - 24:21 two [19] - 6:23, 8:9, 12:20, 13:22, 13:23, 14:11, 14:13, 19:14, 20:14, 21:21, 22:20, 28:15, 30:18, 38:16, 40:2, 40:24, 41:8, 46:19, 47:8 type [4] - 21:12, 30:12, 30:19, 35:20 types [2] - 31:20, 39:3 typical [1] - 3:6

U

ultimate [1] - 24:20 ultimately [1] - 24:23 unasked [1] - 18:16 uncomfortable [1] -43:7 under [8] - 14:5, 20:17, 21:10, 30:9, 41:13, 42:9, 42:24, 43:13 understood [1] -47:16 unique [16] - 16:16, 16:17, 21:12, 25:13, 25:14, 29:17, 31:9, 38:3, 38:18, 38:23, 41:18, 41:21, 41:23, 44:20, 45:22 unit [2] - 14:16, 15:14 unless [3] - 5:12, 12:17

unusual [4] - 18:12, 23:17, 23:23, 23:24 up [15] - 5:13, 6:10, 6:24, 7:4, 8:1, 13:16, 21:4, 29:8, 32:9, 38:7, 39:25, 40:18, 41:16, 42:13, 42:22 update [2] - 29:25, 30:1 updated [2] - 29:23, 30:5 usage [5] - 16:17, 17:8, 17:18, 17:24, 31:22 user[1] - 30:11 users [9] - 14:15, 14:17, 17:3, 18:14, 18:20, 19:20, 39:16, 45:8, 45:11 **UTILITIES** [2] - 1:1, 1:9 utilities [1] - 34:15 **Utilities** [1] - 3:2 utility [10] - 14:20, 23:24, 25:23, 26:16, 27:8, 28:9, 29:20, 30:5, 39:14, 47:20 utilize [2] - 21:14, 29:20 utilized [1] - 17:7 utilizes [1] - 16:4

٧

variable [2] - 19:12, 21:23 various [1] - 27:20 vendors [1] - 39:15 via [7] - 1:10, 1:10, 1:11, 1:12, 1:19, 1:20, 1:21 viable [2] - 21:7, 21:25 VICE [1] - 1:10 voltage [1] - 17:9 vote [4] - 9:5, 9:17, 48:3, 48:16 votes [4] - 9:10, 9:22, 48:8, 48:21 voting [1] - 46:10

W

wait [1] - 34:17 waive [1] - 13:4 ways [1] - 43:10 week [1] - 8:4 weeks [1] - 6:13 WHITE [40] - 3:24,

16:2, 16:23, 17:6, 19:9, 19:25, 23:3, 24:6, 25:12, 26:10, 26:17, 28:8, 29:13, 30:17, 31:3, 31:8, 33:8, 33:13, 34:3, 35:1, 35:11, 35:25, 36:4, 36:8, 36:25, 37:13, 37:16, 38:1, 38:11, 38:22, 39:22, 40:9, 40:12, 40:22, 41:5, 41:25, 42:11, 43:18, 43:23, 44:9 White [10] - 3:24, 18:4, 19:19, 33:3, 33:21, 34:19, 38:17, 40:18, 44:17, 46:11 whole [2] - 8:4, 40:20 willing [2] - 21:4, 24:9 willingness [2] - 12:7, 38:17 win [1] - 36:22 winner [2] - 37:10, 37:14 wins [1] - 36:7 wise [1] - 41:16 wish [4] - 6:23, 13:5, 47:10, 47:16 wishes [1] - 10:4 withstanding [1] -36:22 witnesses [2] - 26:14 WITTLER [1] - 49:5 Wittler [3] - 1:23, 3:15, 49:18 wonder [1] - 29:5 word[1] - 41:19 words [1] - 37:10 works [1] - 43:24 worthwhile [1] - 34:15

Υ

year [4] - 21:21, 26:23, 37:25, 38:9
years [4] - 22:6, 27:5, 44:16, 45:3