
From: David Brouwer [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2021 4:14 PM
To: PUC-PUC <PUC@state.sd.us>
Subject: [EXT] EL21-011

RE: EL21-011

Black Hills Power

Public Utilities Commission;

I find it disappointing and outrages that Black Hills Power (BHP) is asking for such a request. It is so transparent what they are asking for, more profits for themselves. They have absolutely no interest in their customers as can be seen in their statements that they haven't notified them of this request.

This request is wrong on many levels to the rate payers of BHP as well as how this could have a grave effect on the rate payers across the state if you choose to accept this request. What they are asking for is the PUC to help them increase their margin for their investors at the cost of the customers that they service and NO cost to BHP. BHP themselves stated that they would "grandfather" in current users of this process so they will experience minimal economic impact, by making that statement it only tells us that anyone who wants to do this in the future will do so at a significant economic impact if this change takes place. To be honest, granting this request will stop small scale renewable energy projects in their tracks. That is counterintuitive if you want to keep the customers best interest in mind, they should have the ability to supply their energy as they see is in their best interest. When looking at renewable energy by far the best economical way to do so is on a small scale/individual basis. The utilities and multi-billion dollar corporations don't see it that way as they can't make a profit off of it. The worst and least economical way to produce renewable energy is through industrial projects, but that is of course what utilities want as they can control the power and make a profit on it. In addition, the citizens of this state are paying for the incentives of Utilities and corporations to build these industrial scale projects through their taxes going towards the production tax credit and other incentives that the Federal government is giving to them; along with paying increased energy costs. BHP states that it is costing their customers money which I find hard to believe if you look at the entire picture. They are giving you one piece of the pie but failing to take into account the rest of the pie. Lower energy demands due to these Qualified Facilities will reduce the cost in all aspects of service, maintenance, and needs that they provide to customers.

Another level to look at is just the simple fact of allowing an individual or business to provide energy for their needs in the best way they see fit. It is about doing the right thing and being fair to the citizens of this State and the customers of BHP. These individuals paid for their entire small-scale renewable energy project as well as the continual maintenance that is required. This has taken place with absolutely NO investment on the part of BHP. With this request BHP is wanting to take ALL the power these individuals produce at a below market price and go around and charge them full price for all the power that they need. They will be unable to use any of the power that they have paid for and produced. When reading what I have just said it seems to me that whoever would allow this or do this should be brought to court and punished for such an unfair and unethical practice! Again, this isn't about the customers at all but all about BHP making more profit at the cost of their customers. If you used the logic that BHP is giving you then if I decrease my thermostat in the winter and increase it in the summer to reduce my energy needs and cost then they would see that as something that is having a negative effect on their customers and I should pay an extra cost/tariff to pay my fair share. I'm sorry but that is not logical at all.

There are many reasons for an individual or business to place a small-scale/"Qualified Facility" on their property. It may be to lower their reliance on a problematic grid, lower their energy cost, limiting fossil fuels, this list goes on. The customers of BHP and the people of South Dakota shouldn't be limited to how they want to do this as long as it is done in a safe manner. This request of BHP has nothing to do about what is right for their customers but more about what is right for their bottom line.

I urge you to DENY this request by BHP for their customers and the precedent that it would set across the State.

Respectfully,

David Brouwer

[REDACTED]

Beresford, SD 57004

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]