ORIGINAL

TECEWED

	C) SE ESTIMA THE SELECTION OF THE SELECT
1	THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION DEC n 2 2004
2	OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTASOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
3	= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =
4	IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
5	BLACK HILLS CORPORATION FOR A STATEMENT TO THE SECURITIES AND EL04-026
6	EXCHANGE COMMISSION REGARDING INVESTMENT IN FOREIGN UTILITIES
7	
8	Transcript of Proceedings November 19, 2004
9	NOVERBEL 13, 2001
10	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
11	ROBERT SAHR, CHAIRMAN GARY HANSON, VICE CHAIRMAN
12	JIM BURG, COMMISSIONER
13	COMMISSION STAFF John Smith
14	Rolayne Ailts Wiest Karen Cremer
15	Sara Harens Greg Rislov
16	Harlan Best Keith Senger
17	Dave Jacobson Michele Farris
18	Jim Mehlhaff Tina Douglas
19	Heather Forney Pam Bonrud
20	ram bonrud
21	APPEARANCES BY PHONE
22	Brian Iverson
23	Steve Helmers
24	Reported by Leslie A. Hicks, Professional Reporter
25	

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 412, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 19th day of November 2004, commencing at 10:10 a.m.

and call the meeting back to order. We are still under Electric, and we're on the item EL04-026, In the Matter of the Petition of Black Hills Corporation for a Statement to the Securities and Exchange Commission Regarding Investment in Foreign Utilities, and the question today is how shall the Commission proceed.

Mr. Iverson?

MR. IVERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Black Hills Corporation has filed an application with the SEC, as you stated, to become a registered holding company under the Public Holding Company Act. As part of that process, SEC asks each regulatory body that Black Hills Corporation is governed by to confirm that their regulatory authority over our utilities is -- is in place and that the consumers in this case of South Dakota will be properly protected if we continue our investments in wholesaler generators and any foreign utility companies, and we don't have any of the latter. And so we would just ask that the Commission approve the request and issue the letter to the SEC confirming that the authority is sufficient to protect the customers of South Dakota.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Great. Thank you very much.

I'm going to turn to Mr. Smith. I know he's been working on this issue, and see what his comments are.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This particular case, Commission counsel and staff have been working together on, and Mr. Rislov, the Commission's advisor, and we wish to recommend that the Commission issue the letter.

We do have a couple of recommended changes to the proposed letter that Black Hills submitted with its -- with its application, and I would like to go through those.

And, Mr. Iverson, I apologize, but due to the way this week went I was unable to get this to you before today, and if I -- if I could I'd like to just read the changes.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: Yeah. John, why don't you go ahead and read the proposed changes and everyone can follow along on their copies.

MR. SMITH: Basically, I don't think we have any problems with the substance of the letter. There were a couple of things in there and then you can respond,

Mr. Iverson, if you feel this is unwarranted or -- or cause you a problem.

MR. IVERSON: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: I think the problem that -- that we perceived was merely with the level of -- of strength, if you will, of the assurance that we were giving in here, particularly in the light of what happened with the Northwest

situation. And what I'd like to propose is that in -- on the first page in the first paragraph of the proposed letter at the beginning of the sentence -- second sentence, which now begins with, "The Public Utilities Commission's" -- second paragraph. Pardon me. The second paragraph of the letter, second sentence, we add the phrase "at this time."

And I think it will become apparent why in a minute. The second -- I think it's the third paragraph on the second page which begins, "The Public Utilities Commission's regulatory jurisdiction over Black Hills Power is sufficient to assure..." Our proposed language would read, "The Public Utilities Commission's regulatory jurisdiction over Black Hills Power is sufficient at this time to provide a reasonable level of assurance..."

And then at the end instead of with the language on customers and all that, we would propose deleting that and simply adding and concluding that sentence with "...impact on Black Hills Power's South Dakota ratepayers."

And then at the end of the -- of the letter we would propose due to the developments that have occurred nationally through the last few years related to various companies in the wake of the -- of the energy -- problems that have happened in the energy business, most notably the Westar situation at FERC, we would propose adding in the following language, and it deals partially with a unique

situation with our statutes where our statutes under certain circumstances divest this Commission of jurisdiction upon the occurrence of -- of a situation where FERC or any federal regulatory agency assumes jurisdiction over the matter.

And the language we would propose is this as the last paragraph: "Under certain circumstances, to the extent that Black Hills Power's issuance of securities, incurrence of obligations or liabilities or reorganization transactions might in the future come under the regulatory jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or other federal agency" --

CHAIRMAN SAHR: And Mr. Smith can make the copy of the letter available as well, as far as anyone who's keeping minutes or who needs a copy of it. We'll fax a photocopy of it.

MR. SMITH: "...the Public Utilities

Commission could, under applicable state statutes, lose its
authority to regulate these matters. The Public Utilities

Commission accordingly suggests that in approving the
application, the SEC consider the extent to which separation
of the properties and operations of Black Hills Power from
the obligations and liabilities of Black Hills and its
affiliates is advised to minimize potential risk to Black
Hills Power's customers. In Westar Energy, Inc., the Federal
Energy Regulatory Commission announced its intention to

impose such conditions on all debt security issuances
involving regulated utilities. The SEC may wish to consider
whether conditions having this objective are prudent and
appropriate with respect to Black Hills' application."

Those would be our proposed amendments to the

And, lastly, we would propose that the Commission in its Order include a statement to the effect that by issuing this letter the Commission is not either approving nor indicating an intent to approve any of the transactions that are set forth within the application to the SEC.

And maybe with that, Mr. Iverson, you could -- you could comment.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: And, Mr. Iverson, we do realize that we're putting you on the spot here. What's your reaction to that proposed language?

MR. IVERSON: I have Steve Helmers here, the general counsel for the company.

MR. HELMERS: This is Steve Helmers. I understand the time issue, John, but it would have been helpful to see the language. My concern at this point is that we're within a few weeks of hopefully getting the approval the FEC, and language that — that even we might be able to accept, may not be acceptable to the SEC to the

extent it constitutes some kind of a qualification of -- of what is language supplied by the SEC for approval of this kind -- letters of this kind, so I guess I'm only -- I'm stating a concern that they may look at language like authorities sufficient at this time as unacceptable qualification and we may find ourselves coming back to review some language of that kind for clarification at least as to what the real concern is by the PUC.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SMITH: They may come back with a I think the only concern is just accuracy. question. think that's really it. In terms of, you know, we -- the Commission has jurisdiction at this point in time over a good portion of what is covered under the SEC's request for the views. And, again, all they ask for was the views of the Commission, but the fact is, you know, over the life of the very ambitious proposal that you -- you know, application that you have, we absolutely -- we just simply can't truthfully certify that over the entire life of whatever you do, Steve, that it's going to necessary -- that we are necessarily going to retain that jurisdiction over that time period.

I mean, you include in there, for example, specifically provisions with respect to potential reorganization, and we have no idea, for example, whether that might mean in the future formation of a Delaware

corporation and a merger into that or what might happen. We don't know. And I don't know that you do.

MR. HELMERS: The company has no such plans. These are very standard requests that form a part of a filing with the SEC and they're intended to create general baskets of authority that a company can use should events develop in the future so we don't have to repeatedly go back to the SEC for approval of certain transactions and, you know, you're correct. These are just -- they're, again, general baskets of authority in various categories and there's nothing in any of them that would specifically relate to Black Hills Power.

MR. SMITH: One of our people here is going to fax you the letter. And, again, I think your objection is a relatively general one that I don't even know that the language matters, but we'll fax you the letter, and what I recommend that the Commission defer this item and take up the other matters so they can get the copy and take a look at it.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: I think that's probably a good course. Again, what's the deadline for this?

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ SMITH: The 24th. So we do have -- we have five days.

CHAIRMAN SAHR: And I certainly -- I know my schedule is open next week so if it entails having to take a couple days and look at it and get the language done, that certainly isn't a problem for me.

(Short pause in proceedings.) 1 CHAIRMAN SAHR: Are you ready to comment or I 2 certainly don't mind taking this up early next week if that's 3 what we need to do. Mr. Iverson, Mr. Helmers? 4 If you could fax that over to us MR. HELMERS: 5 we'll start looking at it right away and hopefully have 6 something early next week to keep the process moving. 7 If that's all right with you I CHAIRMAN SAHR: 8 think that makes sense from -- at least from my perspective. 9 Mr. Smith, do you have any comments? 10 11 MR. SMITH: No, that would be great. apologize, Steve, that we got jammed like this. That's the 12 13 way it happened. 14 MR. HELMERS: For planning purposes I can -- I can call in at any time. 15 MR. IVERSON: All right. We'll work with 16 17 Mr. Smith then and keep it moving. CHAIRMAN SAHR: Okay. Then I -- just to take 18 care of this docket then I'll move that we defer this until 19 20 next week. 21 MR. SMITH: Second. 22 COMMISSIONER HANSON: Concur. CHAIRMAN SAHR: That concludes the agenda. 23 24 (Hearing concluded at 10:28 a.m.) 25

1	STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA)
2	:SS CERTIFICATE
3	COUNTY OF HUGHES)
4	
5	I, LESLIE A. HICKS, a Professional Reporter and
6	Notary Public in and for the State of South Dakota;
7	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing pages 1-11,
8	inclusive, are a true and correct transcript of my stenotype
9	notes made during the time of the taking of the proceedings.
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not an attorney for, nor
11	related to the parties to this action and that I am in no way
12	interested in the outcome of this action.
13	In testimony whereof, I have hereto set my hand and
14	official seal this 2nd day of December 2004.
15	
16	Lead is Attick
17	Leslie A. Hicks, Notary Public and
18	Professional Reporter
19	
20	
21	
22	SEAL
23	
24	
25	