From: Don Ribordy [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, September 19, 2026 12:20 PM
To: PUC-PUC <PUC@state.sd.us>
Subject: [EXT] Docket EL26-204 Comment

Hello,

I am writing to express my concern about the rate proposal for Black Hills Energy PIPR on Docket #EL26-204.

I'm having a hard time trying to understand why BHE is asking for this PIPR to recover costs related to the construction of the Lange II power facility.
This $19.70 charge added to my be amounts to an increase of 25.2%.

Black Hills Corp's net profitability is currently 13.4%. In addition to that they are paying a dividend at 3.99%. Neither Cash flow or Income seem to be an issue for BHE. If I am understanding the information correctly that 13.4% net profitability is after the costs of building the Lange II plan.
They say this PIPR is to "recover' the cost of building the Lange II plant, so I take that to mean they have already paid for it.

When you take all that together this just seems to be an unreasonable request on the part of BHE. This increase combined with the proposed increase in Docket EL26-003 would increase my monthly electric bill by 44.2%. That's asking for too much all at once.

I realize they have not had a rate increase in 10 years. I believe a combined (Docket EL26-003 + Docket EL26-204) overall rate increase of 8% now and 8% in another year would be acceptable at the present time.
Asking for both of these increases at these rates at this time doesn't seem reasonable. To me it seems to just be driven by greed and nothing more.

I hope the commission will do the right thing and protect rate-payers by reigning in these extremely high increases to consumers.
Thank you,

--
Don Ribordy
[redacted]
Rapid City, SD 57701
Ph: [redacted]