### BEFORE THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

)

)

)

)

)

In the Matter of the Application of Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC, d/b/a Black Hills Energy, for Approval of the Commission to Make Certain Changes in its Rates for Natural Gas Service

Docket No. 25-BHCG-298-RTS

### DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ETHAN J. FRITEL

### **ON BEHALF OF**

BLACK HILLS/KANSAS GAS UTILITY COMPANY, LLC, d/b/a BLACK HILLS ENERGY

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION	
II.	STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS	1
III.	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY	2
IV.	TEST YEAR REVENUES UNDER CURRENT RATES	4
V.	ADJUSTMENTS MADE TO BILLING DETERMINANTS	4
	a. Synchronization Adjustment	5
	b. Weather Normalization Adjustment	5
	c. Irrigation Adjustment	14
	d. Other Adjustments	
VI.	LOAD FACTOR STUDY	
VII.	CLASS COST OF SERVICE	19
VIII.	RATE DESIGN	
IX.	DEVELOPMENT OF REVENUE UNDER PROPOSED RATES	
X.	CUSTOMER BILL IMPACTS	
XI.	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	

### EXHIBIT

KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-1	Education, Employment History and Professional
	Experience
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-2	Normal and Test Year Heating Degree Days
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-3	Weather Normalization Statistical Results
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-4	Weather Normalization Adjustment
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-5	Irrigation Normalization Adjustment
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-6	Test Year Revenues Under Existing Rates
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-7	Revenue Synchronization
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-8	Load Factor Analysis
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-9	Mains Classification and Weighting Factor Study
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-10	Mains Classification Study
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-11	Service Line Weighting Factor Study
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-12	Meter Weighting Factor Study
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13	Functional Cost Classification
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-14	Class Cost of Service Study
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-15	<b>Revenues Under Current and Proposed Rates</b>
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-16	Average Customer Bill Impacts Under Current
	and Proposed Rates

### List of Acronyms

AVTS	Ad Valorem Tax Surcharge
BHC	Black Hills Corporation
BHSC	Black Hills Service Company
BHUH	Black Hills Utility Holdings, Inc.
"Black Hills" or "the	Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC dba Black
Company"	Hills Energy
CCOSS	Class Cost of Service Study
"Commission" or	Kansas Corporation Commission
"KCC"	
GSRS	Gas System Reliability Surcharge Rider
HDD	Heating Degree Day
LVTS	Large Volume Transportation Service
NOAA	National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
PGA	Purchased Gas Adjustment
Pro Forma Period	October 1, 2024, through September 30, 2025 (Capital and
	O&M)
TA Rider	Tax Adjustment Rider
Test Year	Historical Test Year based on 12 months ending September
	30, 2024 (10/1/2023 to 9/30/2024)
WNA	Weather Normalization Adjustment

1		I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>
2	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
3	A.	My name is Ethan J. Fritel, and my business address is 7001 Mt. Rushmore Rd., Rapid
4		City, South Dakota 57702.
5	Q.	BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
6	A.	I am employed by Black Hills Service Company, LLC ("BHSC"), a wholly owned
7		subsidiary of Black Hills Corporation ("BHC"). I am a Senior Regulatory Analyst.
8	Q.	ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING?
9	A.	I am testifying on behalf of Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC d/b/a Black
10		Hills Energy ("Black Hills" or "the Company"). Black Hills is a wholly owned
11		subsidiary of Black Hills Utility Holdings, Inc. ("BHUH"). BHUH is a wholly owned
12		subsidiary of BHC.
13		II. STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
14	Q.	WILL YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND
15		BUSINESS EXPERIENCE?
16	А.	My education, employment history, and professional experience are provided on KSG
17		Direct Exhibit EJF-1.
18	Q.	WHAT ARE YOUR CURRENT JOB RESPONSIBILITIES?
19	A.	I am responsible for gathering, researching, and analyzing customer billing data, and
20		other information to prepare analyses in support of internal analysis and external
21		regulatory reports and filings. I am also responsible for preparing class cost of services
22		studies and designing rates for the Company's rate proceedings.
Ē	j. Direct 7	TESTIMONY OF ETHAN J. FRITEL 1

## 1 Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE ANY REGULATORY

### 2 **BODIES**?

- 3 A. Yes. I have filed testimony with the Wyoming Public Service Commission, the
- 4 Colorado Public Utilities Commission, and the Iowa Utilities Board.

### 5 Q. ARE YOU SPONSORING ANY EXHIBITS?

6 A. Yes, I am sponsoring the following Exhibits:

KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-1	Education, Employment History and Professional
	Experience
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-2	Normal and Test Year Heating Degree Days
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-3	Weather Normalization Statistical Results
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-4	Weather Normalization Adjustment
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-5	Irrigation Normalization Adjustment
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-6	Test Year Revenues Under Existing Rates
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-7	Revenue Synchronization
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-8	Load Factor Analysis
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-9	Mains Classification and Weighting Factor Study
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-10	Mains Classification Study
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-11	Meter Weighting Factor Study
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-12	Service Line Cost Study
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13	Functional Cost Classification
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-14	Class Cost of Service Study
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-15	<b>Revenues Under Current and Proposed Rates</b>
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-16	Average Customer Bill Impacts Under Current and
	Proposed Rates

### 7 Q. HAVE THE TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS THAT YOU ARE SPONSORING

- 8 BEEN PREPARED BY YOU OR UNDER YOUR SUPERVISION?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10

### III. <u>PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY</u>

- 11 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
- 12 A. The purpose of my testimony is to describe the test year adjustments to billing

1	determinants, the Class Cost of Service Study ("CCOSS") and proposed rate design. In
2	my testimony I sponsor the following analyses, studies, and proposals:
3	1. The billing determinants and revenues under current rates used in the
4	CCOSS and rate design, including:
5	a. The Company's proposed weather normalization adjustment
6	("WNA") of volumes for heating by the Residential, Small
7	Commercial, Small Volume Firm, and Large Volume Firm
8	customer classes;
9	b. The adjustment to irrigation volumes to reflect normal
10	conditions;
11	2. The customer class load factor analysis;
12	3. The weighting factors studies;
13	4. The CCOSS;
14	5. Design of the rates proposed by the Company and rate design to produce
15	revenues equal to the Company's proposed test year revenue
16	requirement; and,
17	6. The revenue proofs and bill impact analysis.
18	The following sections of my direct testimony generally follow this outline.

1

### IV. TEST YEAR REVENUES UNDER CURRENT RATES

# 2 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT IS MEANT BY THE TERM BILLING 3 DETERMINANTS.

A. A "therm" is a unit for quantity of heat that equals 100,000 British thermal units. Billing
determinants include the customer usage in therms, and the number of customer bills
issued to the customer. These billing determinants form the basis for calculating the
customers' bills. The billing determinants developed for the Black Hills rate
Application are used in the allocation of costs to each customer class in the CCOSS
and the determination of revenues under existing and proposed rates.

# 10 Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED A SUMMARY OF TEST YEAR BILLING 11 DETERMINANTS AND REVENUES BY CUSTOMER CLASS?

- A. Yes. The billing determinants reflected in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-6 shows the Test
  Year billing determinants and base rate revenues for the current customer classes
  including several adjustments. As described in Section V below, the billing
  determinants were adjusted for a weather normalization adjustment and an irrigation
  adjustment. A separate adjustment is made to synchronize Test Year billing
  determinants and Test Year revenues.
- 18

### V. ADJUSTMENTS MADE TO BILLING DETERMINANTS

19

20

0.

### PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ADJUSTMENTS MADE TO TEST YEAR BILLING

- DETERMINANTS AND REVENUES.
- A. Adjustments to billing determinants and revenues are necessary to reflect conditions
  that would be expected in a normal test year and to arrive at just and reasonable rates.

1		As noted above, the adjustments include the following: a) weather normalization
2		adjustment, b) irrigation adjustment, and c) revenue synchronization adjustment.
3		a. <u>Synchronization Adjustment</u>
4	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE WHY A SYNCHRONIZATION ADJUSTMENT IS
5		NECESSARY.
6	А.	The Synchronization Adjustment is necessary to account for the difference between
7		booked revenues and the revenues that result from applying the current rates to Test
8		Year billing determinants. The total amount of adjustment between billed and
9		calculated revenue based upon rates effective between October 1st, 2023, and
10		September 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2024, is \$136,907 as shown in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-7, column E.
11		This adjustment can also be seen on Adjustment IS-7 and Schedule I-7 of Ms. Samantha
12		K. Johnson's KSG Direct Exhibit SKJ-2.
13		b. <u>Weather Normalization Adjustment</u>
14	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE THE RATIONALE FOR ADJUSTING VOLUMES TO
15		<b>REFLECT NORMAL WEATHER CONDITIONS.</b>
16	А.	Because proposed rates are based on Test Year volumes (therms), those volumes should
17		be adjusted to reflect sales expected in a "normal" (typical) year. Assuming all other
18		factors are equal, if rates are based upon volume levels that are inflated due to colder-
19		than-normal weather, for example, the rates will be set too low and will only recover
20		costs during similar periods of colder-than-normal conditions. Similarly, if the weather
21		used to set rates is warmer-than-normal, rates will be set too high and will over recover

costs during periods of normal weather conditions. Thus, if Test Year weather

22

- conditions deviate from normal conditions, it is necessary to adjust the heating load to
   recognize what volumes would have been if conditions were normal.
- 3 Traditionally, warmer- or colder-than-normal weather is based on a comparison
  4 of actual heating degree-days during a Test Year to the heating degree-days that would
  5 be expected during a normal or typical year.

### 6 Q. PLEASE DEFINE A HEATING DEGREE-DAY.

- 7 A heating degree-day ("HDD") is calculated by subtracting the average daily A. 8 temperature from 65 degrees Fahrenheit. Average daily temperature equals the average 9 of the high and low temperatures on each day. In the gas industry, 65 degrees 10 Fahrenheit is commonly used for this calculation as the base temperature because it is 11 assumed that when average daily temperatures reach a level below 65 degrees, heat 12 sensitive customers will turn their heaters on for space heating. If the average daily 13 temperature exceeds 65 degrees, the HDD for that day is set equal to zero. The sum of 14 the daily HDDs for a particular month is the monthly HDDs. Below is how HDDs are calculated. 15
- Maximum (high) Temperature = A Fahrenheit
  Minimum (low) Temperature = B Fahrenheit
  The sum of A and B is C.
  C divided by 2 is D.
  65 D = HDDs.

# 1Q.PLEASE DESCRIBE THE WEATHER DATA UTILIZED FOR THE2ANALYSIS.

3 Black Hills used monthly actual HDD data as published by National Oceanographic A. and Atmospheric Administration ("NOAA") for weather stations in the following cities 4 5 in Kansas: Concordia, Dodge City, Goodland, Topeka, and Wichita. The primary 6 consideration in my selection of these weather stations was to select NOAA stations 7 that are in close geographic proximity to the Company's load centers (the cities the 8 Company serves). The intent of Black Hills is to group the towns around NOAA 9 weather stations where one would expect weather conditions (HDDs) to be similar 10 based on geographic proximity. Black Hills reviewed the location of the weather 11 stations in relationship to its cities to ensure that the use of those weather stations is 12 appropriate.

### 13 Q. HAVE YOU MADE CHANGES TO THE NUMBER OF WEATHER STATIONS

# 14 USED IN THE ANALYSIS AS COMPARED TO THE LAST RATE 15 PROCEEDING?

16 A. No. The weather stations included in the analysis are the same that were used in the17 previous rate proceeding.

### 18 Q. WHAT ARE YOU USING FOR NORMAL HDDs?

A. Black Hills used a 10-year normal based upon the last 10 years of NOAA HDD datafrom its online database.

Q. WHY ARE YOU PROPOSING TO USE A 10-YEAR AVERAGE FOR
 WEATHER NORMALIZATION?

A. Use of a 10-year period provides a reasonable balance between using a sufficiently long
period of time to capture both warmer and colder conditions and giving recognition
that the more recent past is generally a better predictor of the near future. The time
period used should recognize that rates approved in this rate proceeding will be in effect
over the near term.

Q. DID THE COMPANY PROPOSE THE USE OF A 10-YEAR WEATHER

8

9

## NORMALIZATION ADJUSTMENT IN THE LAST RATE PROCEEDING?

10 A. Yes. The Company provided the same support for its 10-year weather normalization
11 adjustment in this Application as it did in Black Hills' last rate proceeding in KCC
12 Docket No. 21-BHCG-418-RTS.

### 13 Q. WHAT VOLUME AND CUSTOMER DATA HAS THE COMPANY USED FOR

# 14 THE CALCULATION OF THE WEATHER NORMALIZATION 15 ADJUSTMENTS?

A. The Company used detailed historical billing records by customer class and rate
 schedule for the period of October 2014 through September 2024 as the source for
 monthly volumetric (usage) and customer data used for the calculation of the weather
 normalization adjustment.

# Q. WERE ACTUAL HEATING SEASON WEATHER CONDITIONS WITHIN THE COMPANY'S SERVICE TERRITORY FOR THE 12-MONTH PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2024, NORMAL?

A. No. Generally, weather conditions during that period of time were warmer than normal.
Based on a comparison of actual HDDs from October 2023 through September 2024
to normal HDDs for the 10-year period ending September 30, 2024, conditions were
warmer than normal. Table EJF-1 below summarizes conditions at the five weather
stations proposed to be used in this rate Application.

9

17

### Table EJF-1: Actual and Normal HDDs

Weather Station	Oct. 2023 through Sept. 2024 HDDs	10-Year Normal HDDs	Percent Warmer than Normal
Concordia	4,290	4,866	12%
Dodge City	4,189	4,623	9%
Goodland	5,273	5,590	6%
Topeka	4,040	4,579	12%
Wichita	3,853	4,139	7%

### 10 These deviations are significant enough that a weather normalization 11 adjustment to reflect normal weather conditions is warranted. 12 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE METHODOLOGY USED TO DETERMINE THE 13 **RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN USAGE AND WEATHER.** 14 A. The Company used multiple linear regression analyses to define the relationship 15 between volumes and variables that represent weather conditions. Multiple linear 16 regression is a statistical approach commonly used to predict the value of a dependent

18 month HDDs and previous month HDDs). In this regard, the goal is to explain the

variable (use per customer) using multiple independent variables (including current

1		dependent variable with reasonable accuracy using as few independent variables as
2		possible.
3		Multiple regression yields an equation of the form:
4		$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{B} + \mathbf{A}1\mathbf{X}1 + \mathbf{A}2\mathbf{X}2 + \dots + \mathbf{A}\mathbf{K}\mathbf{X}\mathbf{K}$
5		where
6		Y is the dependent variable
7		B is the y-intercept (or constant)
8		X1XK are the independent variables
9		A1AK are the regression coefficients
10		With respect to the Company's use of multiple linear regression as a tool in
11		developing adjustments to reflect normal weather conditions, the dependent variable
12		(Y) is monthly use per customer and is calculated by dividing monthly volumes by
13		monthly number of customers. Monthly use per customer is used as the dependent
14		variable instead of total monthly volumes because use per customer reduces the effect
15		of growth or decline in total volumes due to changes in numbers of customers.
16		Independent variables (X1XK) are typically weather variables such as HDDs. The
17		intercept (B) is a monthly constant. The constant represents usage that is not affected
18		by the independent variables. The coefficients (A1AK) are developed from the
19		regression analysis based on the best fit (least squares).
20	Q.	IS THIS THE SAME METHODOLOGY USED BY THE COMPANY IN THE
21		LAST RATE APPLICATION FILING?
22	A.	Yes.

1

2

### Q. WHAT DATA DID THE COMPANY USE IN PERFORMING THE MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS DESCRIBED ABOVE?

A. The analysis was based on actual monthly use per customer (dependent variable), and
 actual monthly HDDs (independent variables). The Company ran separate regression
 analyses on each of the heat sensitive customer classes. The regression analysis
 produced coefficients that the Company used to determine use per customer per HDD.
 FOR WHICH CUSTOMER CLASSES IS THE COMPANY PROPOSING TO

8

### **ADJUST VOLUMES?**

9 A. The Company is proposing to adjust volumes for those classes of customers where it 10 can be demonstrated that their usage is sensitive to changes in winter temperature 11 conditions. These classes of customers use natural gas primarily for space heating. 12 Further, customers who use natural gas for space heating generally use more natural 13 gas when the weather is colder and less when it is warmer. HDDs increase as average 14 temperature decreases. Thus, usage and HDDs should have a positive correlation. The 15 variation in monthly HDDs typically explains most of the variation in volumes used by 16 customers who use natural gas in space heating applications. The customer classes the 17 Company is proposing to adjust are the Residential, Small Commercial, Small Volume 18 Firm, and Large Volume Firm customer classes.

### 19 Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED SEPARATE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS FOR

20

# EACH OF THE CUSTOMER CLASSES?

A. Yes. Coefficients developed in weather normalization for these customer classes are
based upon the regression of monthly customer volumes to HDDs for each of the

1		Residential, Small Commercial, Small Volume Firm, and Large Volume Firm
2		customer classes.
3	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE THE COMPANY'S WEATHER NORMALIZATION
4		REGRESSION RESULTS.
5	A.	To identify anomalies in usage patterns over the ten-year period, regression analyses in
6		decreasing blocks of time (October 2014 - September 2024, October 2015 - September
7		2024, October 2016 - September 2024, etc.) were performed for each of the customer
8		classes. KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-3 summarizes the results of each of the regression
9		analyses. The Company evaluated the results of each of these time periods using four
10		criteria to determine which period should be used to define usage characteristics. These
11		four criteria are as follows:
12		1. Consistency of predicted normal use per customer;
13		2. Average annual HDDs for the period evaluated being near normal;
14		3. R squared - values in the 90% range are common; and
15		4. Obvious changes as reflected in coefficients.
16		KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-3 shows which regression analysis the Company chose
17		for the Residential, Small Commercial, Small Volume, and Large Volume classes.
18		These time periods satisfy the four criteria identified above and also align to the period
19		used in the calculation of normal HDDs. Based on these regression analyses, the
20		Company concluded it is reasonable to base volume adjustment for all the customer
21		classes on a 10-year regression analysis, except as discussed below. Further, Black
22		Hills determined that both the current and previous month's HDD were significant

j. Direct Testimony of Ethan J. Fritel 1

independent variables, except as discussed below.

# 2 Q. HOW DID THE COMPANY DETERMINE THE WEATHER 3 NORMALIZATION ADJUSTMENT APPLICABLE TO THE RESIDENTIAL, 4 SMALL COMMERCIAL, SMALL VOLUME FIRM, AND LARGE VOLUME 5 FIRM CUSTOMER CLASSES?

A. This calculation is shown in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-4 Test Year Weather
Normalization Adjustment. The adjustment per customer is the difference between
normal and actual HDDs multiplied by its respective HDD coefficients (current and
prior months) for each month of the Test Year. The adjustment is determined using
coefficients from KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-3 and the 10-year average HDD.

After the monthly adjustment per customer (i.e., therm/customer) was calculated, the respective number of sales customers for each month of the Test Year was multiplied by each of these figures to determine the total usage (therm) adjustment. The total adjustments by customer class are shown in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-4 and in Table EJF-2 below.

16

Table EJF-2: Weather Normalization Adjustment by Customer Class

Customer Class (Sales)	Total Therms	Therm Adjustment	Percent Adjustment
Residential	61,963,635	1,024,730	1.65%
Small Commercial	12,196,387	212,191	1.74%
Small Volume Firm	12,889,053	97,281	0.75%
Large Volume Firm	3,879,337	46,881	1.21%
Totals	90,928,412	1,381,083	1.52%

1	These adjustments result in an increase in Test Year usage, which is consistent
2	with the degree to which actual conditions were warmer than normal during the Test
3	Year.

4

#### Q. HOW DID THE **COMPANY DETERMINE** THE **WEATHER** 5 **NORMALIZATION REVENUE ADJUSTMENTS?**

- 6 A. The volumetric adjustments shown in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-4, are detailed by 7 customer class and by weather station. For each customer class, the margin adjustment 8 is determined by multiplying the weather normalization volume times the appropriate 9 margin rate. These adjustments result in an increase in Test Year revenues of \$269,391, 10 which is consistent with the conditions being warmer than normal during the Test Year.
- 11 This adjustment can be seen in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-6 on Page 2, line 17 as well as 12 in Adjustment IS-8 and Schedule I-8 of KSG Direct Exhibit SKJ-2.

### 13 **Q**. WILL THE INFORMATION DEVELOPED IN YOUR ANALYSIS IN THE

### 14 CURRENT RATE APPLICATION BE USED FOR THE COMPANY'S WNA

15 **CALCULATION?** 

c.

- 16 Yes. The Company will use the coefficients resulting from the multiple linear A. regression analysis in the calculation of the WNA in future filings. 17
- 18

### **Irrigation Adjustment**

### 19 PLEASE EXPLAIN THE RATIONALE FOR ADJUSTING IRRIGATION Q. 20 **VOLUMES TO REFLECT NORMAL CONDITIONS.**

21 The Company is proposing to adjust irrigation volumes to reflect normal conditions. A. 22 Similar to the weather normalization adjustment discussion above, the intent of this adjustment is so that Test Year volumes reflect sales that would be expected in an
 otherwise "normal" or typical year.

# 3 Q. IS THIS THE SAME METHODOLOGY USED BY THE COMPANY IN THE 4 LAST RATE APPLICATION FILING?

A. Yes. The methodology is the same. However, the Company did lengthen the period to
calculate a ten-year average usage per customer rather than a five-year average usage
per customer. The ten-year period more appropriately reflects the irrigation load that
the Company expects customers to use during a normal year. The ten-year period is
also consistent with the period used for weather normalization.

# 10 Q. DURING THE TEST YEAR, WERE IRRIGATION VOLUMES 11 NORMAL?

A. No. KSG Direct Exhibit No. EJF-5, Line 10 shows that for the Test Year, irrigation volumes were higher than the ten-year average shown on Line 11, even though the number of customers was relatively flat. While several factors can affect irrigation volumes, the higher irrigation usage during the Test Year was likely the result of drier conditions that resulted in the need for increased irrigation. Based on this abnormally high usage level, the Company concluded that an adjustment to irrigation volumes was necessary to reflect more normal or average conditions.

# 19 Q. FOR PURPOSES OF THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED IRRIGATION 20 ADJUSTMENT, HOW IS NORMAL DEFINED?

A. The Company defines normal as the ten-year average usage from October 2014 through
 September 2024. A ten-year average takes into account multiple considerations that

1

2

can affect irrigation usage from year-to-year, including HDDs, localized precipitation, crop rotations, improved efficiency, and various other factors.

# 3 Q. HOW DID THE COMPANY CALCULATE THE IRRIGATION4ADJUSTMENT FOR THE TEST YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 2024?

A. First, the Company calculated the ten-year average usage in therms for the irrigation
customers, as shown in KSG Direct Exhibit No. EJF-5 on Line 11. The Company used
this ten-year average as the basis for "normal." Next, the difference between the tenyear average usage and the actual Test Year usage was calculated, as shown in KSG
Direct Exhibit No. EJF-5 on Line 14. This results in a total volumetric adjustment of
(3,099,240) therms for Irrigation sales, and (1,264,726) therms for Irrigation transport
customers.

# 12 Q. HAS THE COMPANY CALCULATED THE MARGIN IMPACT OF THE 13 PROPOSED IRRIGATION ADJUSTMENT?

- A. Yes, Line 31 on page 2 of KSG Direct Exhibit No. EJF-6 shows the Company's proposed reduction to margin revenue to the Test Year Irrigation sales customers of \$166,677, and Irrigation transport customers of \$68,017, for a total adjustment to Irrigation revenue of \$234,694. This adjustment can also be seen on Adjustment IS-8 and Schedule I-8 of KSG Direct Exhibit SKJ-2.
- 19 d. <u>Other Adjustments</u>

### 20 Q. DID THE COMPANY MAKE ANY OTHER ADJUSTMENTS TO THE 21 BILLING DETERMINANTS OR REVENUES?

- DILLING DETERMINANTS OF REVENUES.
- 22 A. Yes. The Company made two additional adjustments for Incremental Gas System and

1		Reliability Surcharge ("GSRS") and Large Volume Transport Revenue Adjustment.
2	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE ADJUSTMENT FOR INCREMENTAL GSRS
3		REVENUES.
4	A.	This adjustment proposes an incremental increase in GSRS revenue as approved in
5		Docket No. 24-BHCG-727-TAR. The adjustment results in an increase of \$1,390,930,
6		which is included in the total shown on KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-6 Page 2, line 23. This
7		adjustment can also be seen on Adjustment IS-9 and Schedule I-9 of KSG Direct
8		Exhibit SKJ-2.
9	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE ADJUSTMENT FOR CUSTOMER ADDITIONS.
10	A.	The adjustment for customer additions was made to account for the Large Volume
11		Transport ("LVTS") customers that will begin service during the Pro Forma Period.
12		The adjustment of \$419,027 for the tariff rate Large Volume Transport customers can
13		be seen on KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-6 Page 2, Line 16, as well as on Adjustment IS-10
14		and Schedule I-10 of KSG Direct Exhibit SKJ-2. The adjustment of \$91,560 for
15		negotiated rate Large Volume Transport customers can be seen on Adjustment IS-10
16		and Schedule I-10 of KSG Direct Exhibit SKJ-2 and is included in the Negotiated
17		Margin Revenues on line 18 of Table 4 in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13.
18		VI. <u>LOAD FACTOR STUDY</u>
19	Q.	PLEASE DEFINE A LOAD FACTOR.
20	A.	In the context of the CCOSS, the load factor is defined as the customer class's average
21		daily use divided by its peak day use. Load factor is a measure of how effectively a
22		customer class utilizes the capacity needed to serve it. For example, if one customer

class has a load factor of 25%, meaning that its average daily use is 25% of its peak
day use, and another customer class has a load factor of 50%, meaning that its average
daily use is 50% of its peak day use, then the second class is utilizing the capacity
required to serve that class twice as effectively as the first class.

5

Q.

### HOW IS THE LOAD FACTOR USED?

The Company uses customer class load factors in its CCOSS to determine the peak day 6 A. 7 requirements used for the peak day allocation. The load factors used by the Company 8 are shown on KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-8 for the Residential, Small Commercial, Small 9 Volume Firm, and Large Volume Firm customer classes. The load factor for the Small 10 Commercial, Small Volume, and Large Volume customer classes were calculated 11 based on the classes relative winter period usage as a percentage of the adjusted annual 12 volumes. The resulting load factors shown in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-8, line number 13 14 are Small Commercial: 20%, Small Volume: 25%, and Large Volume: 67%. The 14 load factors for the Irrigation classes are set to zero because the peak day is assumed to 15 occur on the coldest winter days when it is not possible to run irrigation pumps. 16 Similarly, the load factor for interruptible classes is also set equal to zero recognizing 17 that the nature of this service is that the Company can interrupt these customers during 18 periods of high demand such as those occurring at the time of system peak.

# 19 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW THE LOAD FACTOR FOR THE RESIDENTIAL 20 CUSTOMER CLASS WAS CALCULATED.

A. In KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-8, the load factor of 27.85% for the Residential customer
class was developed by using the HDD statistical results, the normal annual HDD, and

2       Residential volumes for each weather station to develop a weighted average load         3       for the class.         4       VII. CLASS COST OF SERVICE         5       Q. WHAT IS THE BASIS OF THE CCOSS?         6       A. The class cost of service study is based upon Black Hills gas operations for the tomoth period ended September 30, 2025, as adjusted for known and mea         8       changes. The class cost of service study I sponsor is contained in KSG Direct E         9       EJF-13 and EJF-14. The form and structure of these exhibits are the same as th         10       cost of service studies filed in Docket No. 14-BHCG-502-RTS and Docket No         11       BHCG-418-RTS.         12       Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-13.         13       A. In KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13, Test Year costs are classified, as developed         14       Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional cate         15       KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary         16       base and total cost of service by functional classification of operat         17       classification of rate base. Table 3 shows the functional classification of operat         18       maintenance expenses. Table 4 shows the functional classification of depre         19       expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co         20 <th>1</th> <th>the expected design day peak HDDs for each weather station weighted by the</th>	1	the expected design day peak HDDs for each weather station weighted by the
3       for the class.         4       VII. CLASS COST OF SERVICE         5       Q.       WHAT IS THE BASIS OF THE CCOSS?         6       A.       The class cost of service study is based upon Black Hills gas operations for the tomoth period ended September 30, 2025, as adjusted for known and mean changes. The class cost of service study I sponsor is contained in KSG Direct E         9       EJF-13 and EJF-14. The form and structure of these exhibits are the same as the cost of service studies filed in Docket No. 14-BHCG-502-RTS and Docket No. 14-BHCG-418-RTS.         10       PLEASE DESCRIBE KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-13.         13       A.         14       Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional cate KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the functional classification of operat maintenance expenses. Table 3 shows the functional classification of depret expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Come classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:         10       expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Come classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:         11       gas supply commodity;         12       gas supply commodity;         13       .	2	Residential volumes for each weather station to develop a weighted average load factor
4       VII. CLASS COST OF SERVICE         5       Q. WHAT IS THE BASIS OF THE CCOSS?         6       A. The class cost of service study is based upon Black Hills gas operations for the tomoth period ended September 30, 2025, as adjusted for known and meal changes. The class cost of service study I sponsor is contained in KSG Direct E         9       EJF-13 and EJF-14. The form and structure of these exhibits are the same as the cost of service studies filed in Docket No. 14-BHCG-502-RTS and Docket NO	3	for the class.
5       Q.       WHAT IS THE BASIS OF THE CCOSS?         6       A.       The class cost of service study is based upon Black Hills gas operations for the form onth period ended September 30, 2025, as adjusted for known and mean changes. The class cost of service study I sponsor is contained in KSG Direct E         9       EJF-13 and EJF-14. The form and structure of these exhibits are the same as the cost of service studies filed in Docket No. 14-BHCG-502-RTS and Docket No.         11       BHCG-418-RTS.         12       Q.         PLEASE DESCRIBE KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-13.         13       A.         14       Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional cate         15       KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary         16       base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the functional classification of operat         18       maintenance expenses. Table 4 shows the functional classification of depre         19       expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co         20       classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:         21       gas supply demand;         22       gas supply commodity;         23       transmission demand;         24       transmission commodity;	4	VII. <u>CLASS COST OF SERVICE</u>
<ul> <li>A. The class cost of service study is based upon Black Hills gas operations for the 1 month period ended September 30, 2025, as adjusted for known and mea changes. The class cost of service study I sponsor is contained in KSG Direct E</li> <li>EJF-13 and EJF-14. The form and structure of these exhibits are the same as th cost of service studies filed in Docket No. 14-BHCG-502-RTS and Docket N</li> <li>BHCG-418-RTS.</li> <li>Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-13.</li> <li>A. In KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13, Test Year costs are classified, as developed Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional cate KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the fun classification of rate base. Table 3 shows the functional classification of operat maintenance expenses. Table 4 shows the functional classification of depret expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:</li> <li>gas supply demand;</li> <li>transmission demand;</li> <li>transmission commodity;</li> </ul>	5 Q.	WHAT IS THE BASIS OF THE CCOSS?
<ul> <li>month period ended September 30, 2025, as adjusted for known and mea</li> <li>changes. The class cost of service study I sponsor is contained in KSG Direct E</li> <li>EJF-13 and EJF-14. The form and structure of these exhibits are the same as th</li> <li>cost of service studies filed in Docket No. 14-BHCG-502-RTS and Docket N</li> <li>BHCG-418-RTS.</li> <li>Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-13.</li> <li>A. In KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13, Test Year costs are classified, as developed</li> <li>Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional cate</li> <li>KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary</li> <li>base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the functional</li> <li>classification of rate base. Table 4 shows the functional classification of depret</li> <li>expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co</li> <li>classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:</li> <li>gas supply demand;</li> <li>gas supply commodity;</li> <li>transmission demand;</li> <li>transmission commodity;</li> </ul>	6 A.	The class cost of service study is based upon Black Hills gas operations for the twelve-
<ul> <li>changes. The class cost of service study I sponsor is contained in KSG Direct E</li> <li>EJF-13 and EJF-14. The form and structure of these exhibits are the same as th</li> <li>cost of service studies filed in Docket No. 14-BHCG-502-RTS and Docket N</li> <li>BHCG-418-RTS.</li> <li>Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-13.</li> <li>A. In KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13, Test Year costs are classified, as developed</li> <li>Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional cate</li> <li>KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary</li> <li>base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the functional</li> <li>classification of rate base. Table 3 shows the functional classification of depre</li> <li>expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co</li> <li>classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:</li> <li>gas supply demand;</li> <li>gas supply commodity;</li> <li>transmission demand;</li> <li>transmission commodity;</li> </ul>	7	month period ended September 30, 2025, as adjusted for known and measurable
<ul> <li>9 EJF-13 and EJF-14. The form and structure of these exhibits are the same as the cost of service studies filed in Docket No. 14-BHCG-502-RTS and Docket No. 11</li> <li>11 BHCG-418-RTS.</li> <li>12 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-13.</li> <li>13 A. In KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13, Test Year costs are classified, as developed Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional cate KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the functional classification of operating maintenance expenses. Table 3 shows the functional classification of depret expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:</li> <li>21 gas supply demand;</li> <li>22 gas supply commodity;</li> <li>23 transmission demand;</li> <li>24 transmission commodity;</li> </ul>	8	changes. The class cost of service study I sponsor is contained in KSG Direct Exhibits
10       cost of service studies filed in Docket No. 14-BHCG-502-RTS and Docket N         11       BHCG-418-RTS.         12       Q.       PLEASE DESCRIBE KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-13.         13       A.       In KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13, Test Year costs are classified, as developed         14       Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional cate         15       KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary         16       base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the functional classification of operating         17       classification of rate base. Table 3 shows the functional classification of depret         19       expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co         20       classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:         21       •         21       •         22       gas supply demand;         23       •         24       •	9	EJF-13 and EJF-14. The form and structure of these exhibits are the same as the class
11       BHCG-418-RTS.         12       Q.       PLEASE DESCRIBE KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-13.         13       A.       In KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13, Test Year costs are classified, as developed         14       Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional cate         15       KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary         16       base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the functional classification of operation         17       classification of rate base. Table 3 shows the functional classification of operation         18       maintenance expenses. Table 4 shows the functional classification of depresent expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co         20       classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:         21       gas supply demand;         23       transmission demand;         24       transmission commodity;	0	cost of service studies filed in Docket No. 14-BHCG-502-RTS and Docket No. 21-
12       Q.       PLEASE DESCRIBE KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-13.         13       A.       In KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13, Test Year costs are classified, as developed         14       Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional cate         15       KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary         16       base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the functional classification of operational classification of operational classification of operational classification of depreters, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co         20       classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:         21       gas supply demand;         22       gas supply commodity;         23       transmission demand;         24       transmission commodity;	1	BHCG-418-RTS.
<ul> <li>A. In KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13, Test Year costs are classified, as developed</li> <li>Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional cate</li> <li>KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary</li> <li>base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the functional</li> <li>classification of rate base. Table 3 shows the functional classification of operation</li> <li>maintenance expenses. Table 4 shows the functional classification of depresent</li> <li>expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co</li> <li>classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:</li> <li>gas supply demand;</li> <li>gas supply commodity;</li> <li>transmission demand;</li> <li>transmission commodity;</li> </ul>	2 Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-13.
14Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional cate15KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary16base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the fun17classification of rate base. Table 3 shows the functional classification of operate18maintenance expenses. Table 4 shows the functional classification of depre19expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co20classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:21gas supply demand;23transmission demand;24transmission commodity;	3 A.	In KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13, Test Year costs are classified, as developed in the
<ul> <li>KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary</li> <li>base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the functional</li> <li>classification of rate base. Table 3 shows the functional classification of operational</li> <li>maintenance expenses. Table 4 shows the functional classification of depresent expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co</li> <li>classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:</li> <li>gas supply demand;</li> <li>gas supply commodity;</li> <li>transmission demand;</li> <li>transmission commodity;</li> </ul>	4	Revenue Requirement Study, sponsored by Ms. Johnson, into functional categories.
<ul> <li>base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the functional classification of operat</li> <li>classification of rate base. Table 3 shows the functional classification of operat</li> <li>maintenance expenses. Table 4 shows the functional classification of depre</li> <li>expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co</li> <li>classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:</li> <li>gas supply demand;</li> <li>gas supply commodity;</li> <li>transmission demand;</li> <li>transmission commodity;</li> </ul>	5	KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 consists of four tables. Table 1 shows a summary of rate
<ul> <li>classification of rate base. Table 3 shows the functional classification of operat</li> <li>maintenance expenses. Table 4 shows the functional classification of depre</li> <li>expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co</li> <li>classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:</li> <li>gas supply demand;</li> <li>gas supply commodity;</li> <li>transmission demand;</li> <li>transmission commodity;</li> </ul>	6	base and total cost of service by functional classification. Table 2 shows the functional
<ul> <li>maintenance expenses. Table 4 shows the functional classification of depresent expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Conclusive classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:</li> <li>gas supply demand;</li> <li>gas supply commodity;</li> <li>transmission demand;</li> <li>transmission commodity;</li> </ul>	7	classification of rate base. Table 3 shows the functional classification of operation and
<ul> <li>expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Co</li> <li>classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions: <ul> <li>gas supply demand;</li> <li>gas supply commodity;</li> <li>transmission demand;</li> <li>transmission commodity;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	8	maintenance expenses. Table 4 shows the functional classification of depreciation
<ul> <li>20 classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:</li> <li>21 • gas supply demand;</li> <li>22 • gas supply commodity;</li> <li>23 • transmission demand;</li> <li>24 • transmission commodity;</li> </ul>	9	expenses, taxes other than income taxes, and other operating revenues. Costs are
<ul> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>gas supply demand;</li> <li>gas supply commodity;</li> <li>transmission demand;</li> <li>transmission commodity;</li> </ul>	0	classified in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13 into nine functions:
	1 2 3 4	<ul> <li>gas supply demand;</li> <li>gas supply commodity;</li> <li>transmission demand;</li> <li>transmission commodity;</li> </ul>

1	• distribution demand;
2	• distribution customer;
3	• service lines;
4	• meters and regulators; and
5	• customer accounts.
6	The classification of investment in transmission and distribution mains is based
7	on a detailed study of the Company's investment and the relative capacity of these
8	facilities in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-10. The results of this study are shown in the table
9	below with fixed costs associated with transmission and distribution mains classified
10	as capacity-related, commodity-related, and customer-related.

11

**Table EJF-3: Functional Allocators** 

Functional Allocator	Percent Allocated
Transmission – Demand	12.29%
Transmission – Commodity	6.14%
Distribution – Demand	21.21%
Distribution – Customer	60.36%

- 12 Costs associated with the remaining three functionalized categories, service 13 lines, meters and regulators, and customer accounting, are each categorized as 14 described in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-9.
- 15 Q. BRIEFLY DESCRIBE KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-9.
- A. KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-9 includes a detailed description of how the functional
   classification of transmission and distribution mains was determined and how the
   weighting factors used to assign and allocate service lines, meters and regulators, and
   customer accounting related costs were determined. Further, KSG Direct Exhibits EJF 10 through EJF-12 are discussed and explained in Exhibit EJF-9.

### 1 Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE CONTENTS OF KSG DIRECT EXHIBIT EJF-14.

A. KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-14 sets forth the results of the allocation of functionally
classified costs to customer classes and consists of five tables. Table 1 shows the
calculation of class rates of return under current and proposed rates. Table 2 shows the
allocation of total functional cost of service to customer classes. Table 3 shows the
allocation of rate base to customer classes. Table 4 shows the allocation bases used to
allocate total functional cost of service and rate base to customer classes. Table 5 shows
the unit (\$/therm or \$/bill) functionalized cost of service by customer class.

### 9

10

Q.

### EXHIBIT EJF-14?

HOW ARE THE CUSTOMER CLASSES ORGANIZED IN KSG DIRECT

A. For the allocation of costs, the customer classes are Residential Service, Firm and
 Transportation customers (Small Commercial, Small Volume, and Large Volume),
 Irrigation Sales and Transportation, and the Large Volume Interruptible classes.

### 14 Q. WHICH CUSTOMERS HAVE YOU EXCLUDED FROM THE ALLOCATION

15

### OF COSTS IN THE CCOSS?

16 A. It is most appropriate to treat customers who are served in competitive markets as 17 credits to cost of service. The primary factor in determining the appropriate level of 18 rates for such competitive rate or alternative energy customers is the marketplace. The 19 negotiated margin large volume customers have other energy options and/or other 20 natural gas supply options. Therefore, the price for natural gas service must recognize 21 the pricing of these other competitive options. The marketplace does not care what a 22 cost-of-service study might determine regarding rates. As long as the Company is

1 recovering a margin above its variable costs to serve these customers, the captive 2 customers on the Company's system benefit from the Company maximizing sales and 3 margin from customers served in competitive markets. Therefore, I am not including 4 these customers as a class in the CCOSS; however, the margin revenues of \$2,383,053 5 derived from these customers is credited to the cost of service for the other customer classes, as shown on line 19 of KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13, Table 4. 6 7 IS THIS THE SAME METHODOLOGY USED BY THE COMPANY IN THE Q. 8 LAST RATE APPLICATION FILING? 9 A. Yes. PLEASE DISCUSS THE PRINCIPAL ALLOCATION BASIS YOU USE IN 10 Q. 11 THE CCOSS. 12 Table 4 of KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-14 shows the allocation factors used to allocate A. 13 functionally classified costs to the customer classes. Firm winter peak demand 14 represents estimated class peak day requirements. The peak day requirements for the 15 firm classes are estimated based on the load factor analysis discussed in the prior 16 section of my testimony. Winter period throughput represents Test Year throughput for each class during the months of November through March. The commodity allocation 17 18 basis represents annual Test Year throughput for each class. 19 The distribution-customer, service lines, meters and regulators, and customer 20 accounting allocation bases were developed by weighting average number of 21 customers. The number of customers were weighted by factors that represent the 22 relative cost or investment associated with providing service to each class. The customer weighting factors in the meters and regulators customer weighting factor
 study in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-12 and the service line (and distribution-customer)
 weighting factor study in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-11.

Distribution customer and services cost are allocated to each customer class by the services allocator shown in Table 4, lines 27 and 32, respectively based on the service line (and distribution-customer) weighting factor study. The services (and distribution-customer) weighting factor for each customer class is shown in the following table:

### 9

### Table EJF-4: Services and Distribution-Customer Weighting Factors

Customer Class	Weighting Factor
Residential	1
Small Commercial	1.25
Small Volume	2
Large Volume	4
Irrigation	3

10 The meters and regulators cost shown is allocated to each customer class by the

11 meters and regulator allocator in Table 4, line 37. The meters and regulators allocator

- 12 for each customer class is shown in the following table:
- 13

### Table EJF-5: Meters and Regulators Weighting Factors

Customer Class	Weighting Factor
Residential	1
Small Commercial	2
Small Volume	12
Large Volume	22
Irrigation	9

1 Customer accounting functionalized cost is allocated by the customer 2 accounting allocator shown in Table 4, line 42. The customer accounting allocator for 3 each customer class is shown in the following table:

4

 Table EJF-6: Customer Accounting Weighting Factors

Customer Class	Weighting Factor	
Residential	1	
Small Commercial	2	
Small Volume	4	
Large Volume	20	
Irrigation	2	

### 5 Q. HOW ARE OTHER OPERATING REVENUES FUNCTIONALIZED?

A. Other operating revenues are functionalized by FERC Account, with Forfeited
Discounts functionalized as direct, Miscellaneous Service Revenue functionalized by
Supervised Operations & Maintenance (O&M) and Negotiated Margin revenue
functionalized by the Mains Allocation. Other Operating Revenues are credited back
to the other customers as shown in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-13, Table 1, line 10.

# 11Q.WHAT IS THE NET REVENUE DEFICIENCY/EXCESS FOR EACH12CUSTOMER CLASS?

A. The revenue deficiency by customer class is shown in Table 1, line 11 of KSG Direct
Exhibit EJF-14 and represents the difference between each class's fully allocated cost
of service and revenues under existing base rates. The customer classes have the
following revenue deficiencies (or excess) under current rates:

Customer Class	<b>Revenue Deficiency</b>
Residential	\$16,288,786
Small Commercial	\$1,982,265
Small Volume	\$430,184
Large Volume	(\$2,087,524)
Irrigation	\$594,040
Total	\$17,207,751

### Table EJF-7: Revenue Deficiencies by Customer Class

### 2 Q. WHAT ARE THE PRINCIPAL FINDINGS OF YOUR STUDY?

A. The principal finding is that the overall rate of return on Black Hills Kansas gas utility
operations under current rates equals 3.19 percent based on Kansas jurisdictional rate
base of \$305,947,330.

For purposes of rate design (as discussed in the next section of my testimony),
some of these classes are aggregated. The rate of return under current rates for the
Residential and Small Commercial classes is 1.87 percent, 6.05 percent for the Small
Volume Firm, 15.97 percent for the Large Volume Firm (Transportation full margin)
and Interruptible classes, and for the Irrigation classes is 4.32 percent.

As indicated in the Direct Testimony of Mr. Robert Daniel, current rate revenues associated with service to Black Hills Kansas customers are insufficient to cover costs, including an opportunity for the Company to earn a reasonable return on its investment. For the Company to earn the requested rate of return, current rates should be designed to recover the revenues as set forth in the Company's Application in this proceeding.

1

1		VIII. <u>RATE DESIGN</u>		
2	Q.	WHAT GUIDELINES DID YOU FOLLOW IN THE DESIGN OF PROPOSED		
3		RATES?		
4	A.	The guidelines are as follows:		
5		1. Set rates to recover the overall revenues requested by the Company as set		
6		forth in the Application.		
7		2. The revenues for each class should align with the class cost of service study		
8		to the extent practical.		
9		3. The proposed customer charges should reflect customer related costs to the		
10		extent practical.		
11		4. The delivery charge for the Residential and Small Commercial rates should		
12		be equal maintaining the existing differential.		
13		5. The customer and delivery (non-gas portion) should be the same for the		
14		Firm and Transportation rates within the Small Volume and Irrigation		
15		customer classes, and Firm, Interruptible, and Transportation within the		
16		Large Volume customer class.		
17		6. The Irrigation monthly customer charge should be the same as the Small		
18		Commercial because the Irrigation customers have a significant number of		
19		months of little or no use.		

# Q. HAVE YOU APPLIED ANY OTHER CRITERIA IN ADDITION TO THE GUIDELINES DESCRIBED ABOVE?

3 Yes. No customer class should receive a decrease when other classes receive an A. 4 increase in base rate revenues under the proposed rates. Based on the results of the 5 CCOSS, the Large Volume classes show a rate of return in excess of that requested by the Company and base rates for the Large Volume classes would need to be reduced to 6 7 achieve the requested rate of return. Therefore, I am recommending no change to the 8 base rates for the Large Volume classes and to use the revenue decrease that would 9 otherwise result from reducing their rates be used instead to moderate the Residential 10 customer class increase.

# 11 Q. WHAT IS THE NET REVENUE IMPACT FOR EACH CUSTOMER CLASS 12 UNDER PROPOSED RATES?

A. The impact of the proposed rates by customer class is shown in Table 1, line 14, of
KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-14.

15The impact to each customer class under proposed rates is an annual increase16as follows:

17

### Table EJF-8: Net Revenue Impact by Customer Class

Customer Class	Revenues
Residential	\$13,996,106
Small Commercial	\$2,187,067
Small Volume	\$430,140
Large Volume	\$0
Irrigation	\$593,959
Total	\$17,207,272

# 1Q.PLEASESUMMARIZETHESPECIFICRATESYOUARE2RECOMMENDING.

A. I am recommending the monthly customer charge and delivery charge rates shown
below in Table EJF-9.

	_		
4	۰.		
	-	۰.	
-	_	•	
-			

Table EJF-9: Proposed Rates	able EJF-9: Pro	oposed Rates
-----------------------------	-----------------	--------------

Customer Class	Customer Charge \$/month	Delivery Charge \$/therm
Residential	\$31.50	\$0.20947
Small Commercial	\$49.50	\$0.20947
Small Volume	\$148.00	\$0.11264
Large Volume	\$358.00	\$0.08445
Irrigation	\$49.50	\$0.07847

# 6 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE MONTHLY CUSTOMER CHARGE FOR 7 EACH CUSTOMER CLASS WAS DETERMINED.

A. As described above, the proposed customer charges should reflect customer related
costs. The proposed customer charges are designed to recover customer related costs
including services, meters & regulators, customer accounting, and 50% of customerrelated distribution costs.

12 Q. ARE THESE THE SAME COSTS THE COMPANY PROPOSED TO

13 **RECOVER USING THE MONTHLY CUSTOMER CHARGE IN THE LAST** 

- 14 **RATE APPLICATION FILING?**
- A. No. In the Company's last rate application filing, the Company proposed to recover
   only those customer related costs in services, meters & regulators, and customer
   accounting costs. In the Company's current Application, Black Hills is also proposing
  - DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ETHAN J. FRITEL

1 to recover fifty percent (50%) of the customer-related distribution costs through the 2 monthly customer charge. This proposal is an incremental movement towards 3 recovering more fixed costs through the fixed monthly customer charge, while still 4 enabling customers to control a large portion of their monthly bill by reducing their use 5 of natural gas (delivery plus cost of gas).

### 6 Q. HOW DID YOU DETERMINE THE PROPOSED DELIVERY RATES?

A. The delivery rates are set following the guidelines described above and are adjusted to
recover the portion of the revenue requirement not recovered in the monthly customer
charge.

# 10 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED RATES ON RATE 11 OF RETURN.

A. The recommended rate design produces an overall rate of return of 7.63%. The rate of
return for each class is the following:

### Table EJF-10: Net Revenue Impact by Customer Class

Customer Class	Rate of Return
Residential/Small Commercial	6.97%
Small Volume	7.63%
Large Volume	15.97%
Irrigation	7.63%

15 The rate of return for the Residential and Small Commercial customer classes 16 is based upon the monthly customer charges being set to recover customer-related cost, 17 and then setting the delivery charge at an equal rate based upon the principles described 18 above.

14

### 1 IX. **DEVELOPMENT OF REVENUE UNDER PROPOSED RATES** 2 PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW YOU DEVELOPED THE REVENUES UNDER Q. 3 **PROPOSED RATES.** 4 A. The revenues under proposed rates were developed using the Test Year billing 5 determinants shown in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-6 and the proposed rates for each customer class as shown in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-14. 6 7 The revenues under proposed base rates are shown in Section 5, and the 8 difference between current and proposed base rates in Section 6, of KSG Direct Exhibit 9 EJF-15. The revenues are based upon the billing determinants shown in Section 1 of 10 KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-15 and the proposed rates shown in Section 4. The total of the 11 differences by customer class equals the total revenue deficiency for the Company. 12 X. **CUSTOMER BILL IMPACTS** HAVE YOU PREPARED CUSTOMER BILL IMPACTS BASED UPON THE 13 0. **AVERAGE CUSTOMER BILL FOR EACH CUSTOMER CLASS?** 14 15 Yes. The average customer bill impacts for each customer class are shown in Section A. 16 6 of KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-16. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW YOU DETERMINED THE AVERAGE MONTHLY 17 О. 18 **BILL UNDER CURRENT RATES.** 19 The total average customer bill by customer class was developed by multiplying the A. 20 Test Year billing determinants shown in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-6 by the current rates 21 from the tariff including the current level of rate riders. The current rates include the

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ETHAN J. FRITEL

1 monthly customer charge, GSRS, delivery charge, and current Purchased Gas 2 Adjustment ("PGA"). The WNA Rider rates and Ad Valorem Tax Surcharge 3 ("AVTS") Rider rates are removed from this calculation for simplification as these rate 4 riders are adjusted annually and can result in either a surcharge or a sur-credit from 5 year to year. The fixed monthly customer charge and monthly GSRS are added together 6 for the fixed monthly portion of the average bill, and the other rates are multiplied by 7 the average therms per bill shown on Section 1, line 4 for the volumetric portion of the 8 average bill. For example, the average Residential bill using current rates is shown 9 below in Table EJF-11:

10

 Table EJF-11: Average Monthly Residential Bill Using Current Rates

Billing Component	Usage	Rate	<b>Billed Amount</b>
Monthly Customer Charge		\$18.50	\$18.50
Monthly GSRS Charge		\$2.27	\$2.27
Delivery Charge (therms)	50	\$0.20251	\$10.03
PGA Charge (therms)	50	\$0.64694	\$32.05
Total			\$62.86

### 11 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW YOU DETERMINED THE AVERAGE MONTHLY

### 12 BILL UNDER PROPOSED RATES.

A. The total average customer bill by customer class was developed by multiplying the Test Year billing determinants shown in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-6 by the proposed base rates. The proposed rates shown in Section 4 of KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-16 includes the monthly customer charge, delivery charge, and current PGA. The bill impact under proposed rates does not include the current GSRS as the investment recovered under the current rider is included in the proposed base rates. Similar to the calculation of the average monthly bill under current rates, the WNA Rider and AVTS
Rider rates are also removed from this calculation. The average monthly bill under
proposed rates includes the fixed monthly customer charge, with the other rates being
multiplied by the average therms per bill shown in Section 1, line 4 for the volumetric
portion of the average bill. For example, the average Residential bill using current rates
is shown below in Table EJF-12:

7

Table EJF-12: Average Monthly Residential Bill Using Proposed Rates

Billing Component	Usage	Rate	<b>Billed Amount</b>
Monthly Customer Charge		\$31.50	\$31.50
Monthly GSRS Charge		\$0.00	\$0.00
Delivery Charge (therms)	50	\$0.20947	\$10.38
PGA Charge (therms)	50	\$0.64694	\$32.05
Total			\$73.93

8 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE FIXED MONTHLY PORTION OF THE
9 RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMER BILL WOULD CHANGE UNDER PROPOSED
10 RATES.

A. As shown on KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-16, the fixed portion of Residential customer
bills would increase from \$20.77 to \$31.50 under current and proposed rates,
respectively, for an effective increase of \$10.73 per month.

### 14 Q. WHAT ARE THE AVERAGE CUSTOMER BILL IMPACTS TO CUSTOMERS

- 15 UNDER THE PROPOSED RATES?
- 16 A. The change in average monthly bill by customer class is shown on line 24, Section 6
- 17 of KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-16, with the percentage change shown on line 25. The
- 18 reduction in bill impact for the Large Volume Firm and Large Volume Interruptible

and increase to the Large Volume Transportation average customer bill is due in part
 to the different average use of each customer class and the GSRS being set to zero. The
 overall impact to all Large Volume customers is zero. The change in the average
 monthly bill by customer class are shown below:

5

### Table EJF-13: Change in Average Monthly Bill

Customer Class	Change in Average Monthly Bill
Residential	\$11.07
Small Commercial Sales	\$18.54
Small Commercial Transport	\$19.51
Small Volume Firm	\$25.27
Small Volume Transportation	\$9.88
Large Volume Firm	(\$121.22)
Large Volume Interruptible	(\$93.06)
Large Volume Transportation	\$64.65
Irrigation Sales	\$30.79
Irrigation Transportation	\$27.20

6

### XI. <u>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>

### 7 Q. WHAT ARE YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS?

- 8 A. For the reasons set forth in this testimony, my recommendation is for the Commission
- 9 to approve the CCOSS, weather normalization, rate design, and other proposals in the
- 10 Application of Black Hills.

### 11 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

12 A. Yes.
## **AFFIDAVIT OF ETHAN J. FRITEL**

State of 5D ) ss County of Revuence

I, ETHAN J. FRITEL, being first duly sworn on oath, depose and state that I am the same Ethan J. Fritel identified in the foregoing Direct Testimony; that I have caused the foregoing Direct Testimony to be prepared and am familiar with the contents thereof; and that the foregoing Direct Testimony is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief as of the date of this Affidavit.

than J. Fotob

Subscribed and sworn to before me, A Notary Public, in and for said County and State, this 23rd day of January, 2025.

Notary Public

My Commission expires:



## EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT HISTORY AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

In 2011, I graduated from Minot State University with a bachelor's degree in Energy Economics and Finance. After graduation, I worked for Enbridge Pipelines North Dakota (EPND) in the Shipper Services group working with customers on the logistics of the delivery of crude oil. While in this role, I streamlined many processes that allowed EPND to increase its crude oil deliveries. In 2016, I completed a Master of Business Administration in Energy Leadership from Texas A&M-Texarkana.

In May 2017, I accepted a position as an Associate with Booz Allen Hamilton. In this role, I worked with the Air National Guard (ANG) as a Headquarters Resource Efficiency Manager performing energy audits, creating energy projects, and tracking energy use of ANG installations across the United States. These projects focused on helping the installations reduce energy use and become more resilient.

In September 2020, I began my employment at Black Hills Corporation as Regulatory & Finance Analyst II. In this role, I have (a) prepared and presented complex analyses and modeling, (b) assisted in the preparation of many studies, and (c) performed analyses in support of Black Hills Corporation's regulated electric and gas subsidiaries, including issues on class cost of service studies, rate design, billing determinants and other rate application issues before the Arkansas Public Service Commission, Colorado Public Utilities Commission, Iowa Utilities Commission, Kansas Corporation Commission, and the Wyoming Public Service Commission.

In May 2023, I received a Graduate Certificate in Public Utility Regulation and Economics from New Mexico State University.

Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Normal - Based Upon Rolling 10 Years October 2014 - September 2024 KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-2 Page 1 of 2

	А	В	С	D	Е	F
Line No.	Month	Concordia	Dodge City	Goodland	Topeka	Wichita
1	October	289	270	408	265	207
2	November	621	607	710	608	553
3	December	939	905	1015	874	826
4	January	1074	982	1080	1037	948
5	February	893	820	929	851	781
6	March	604	573	712	551	490
7	April	330	324	456	289	253
8	May	110	114	208	86	72
9	June	1	3	14	0	1
10	July	0	0	0	0	0
11	August	0	1	4	0	0
12	September	25	25	55	18	10
13	Total	4,886	4,623	5,590	4,579	4,139

Weather Station	Annual HDD
Concordia	4,886
Dodge City	4,623
Goodland	5,590
Topeka	4,579
Wichita	4,139

## Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Test Year HDDs

For the Test Year Ended September 30, 2024

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G
Line							
No.	Month	Year	Concordia	Dodge City	Goodland	Topeka	Wichita
1	September	2023	1	13	29	1	0
2	October	2023	272	282	429	244	223
3	November	2023	531	539	662	586	551
4	December	2023	799	792	904	746	747
5	January	2024	1230	1134	1250	1188	1118
6	February	2024	604	606	734	575	565
7	March	2024	557	519	706	468	454
8	April	2024	243	245	376	204	175
9	May	2024	45	46	183	25	16
10	June	2024	0	0	3	0	0
11	July	2024	0	0	0	0	0
12	August	2024	1	9	10	0	0
13	September	2024	8	17	16	4	4
14	Total CHDD		4,290	4,189	5,273	4,040	3,853
15	Total PHDD		4,283	4,185	5,286	4,037	3,849

Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Statistical Results 10 Years (October 2014-September 2024)													
А		в	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K	L	М
Description Line No 1 2 Particularia			10 Years 2014-2024	9 Years 2015-2024	8 Years 2016-2024	7 Years 2017-2024	6 Years 2018-2024	5 Years 2019-2024	4 Years 2020-2024	3 Years 2021-2024	2 Years 2022-2024	1 Year 2023-2024	Comments
Cessionnai           Weather Station - Concordia           4         Constant (Base Use)           5         CHDD           6         PHDD           7         Adj R Square           8         F           9         10-Year Average	HDDs	4,886	7.57516 (0.00310) 0.02612 0.97 1,864	7.65842 (0.00299) 0.02606 0.97 1,603	7.96293 (0.00279) 0.02589 0.97 1,488	8.16272 (0.00282) 0.02599 0.97 1,208	7.88470 (0.00245) 0.02564 0.97 1,100	8.08028 (0.00236) 0.02539 0.96 791	8.08598 (0.00236) 0.02525 0.96 620	7.99624 (0.00247) 0.02531 0.96 402	7.71492 (0.00296) 0.02559 0.95 242	7.36309 (0.00441) 0.02686 0.97 171	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar.
10         Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms           11         Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms           12         Load Factor           13         Time Period Used			203 2.00 27.88% xxxxx	205 2.01 27.96%	208 2.02 28.30%	211 2.03 28.51%	208 2.02 28.18%	209 2.02 28.47%	209 2.01 28.54%	208 2.00 28.45%	203 1.97 28.20%	198 1.95 27.85%	L4 x 12 + (L5 x L6)) * Column B, L9 (L4 x 12") / 365 + (L5 * Note(1) x L6 * Note(1)) L10 / 365 / L11
14         Weather Station - Dodge City           15         Constant (Base Use)           16         CHDD           17         PHDD           18         Adj R Square           19         F           20         I/V Star Auroration	UDD-	4 (22	9.64830 0.00759 0.01549 0.97 2,296.23	9.69379 0.00781 0.01531 0.98 2,277.37	9.69207 0.00785 0.01524 0.98 2,089.50	9.68054 0.00795 0.01514 0.98 1,825.72	9.64021 0.00805 0.01513 0.98 1,718.60	9.54820 0.00808 0.01504 0.98 1,492.91	9.24349 0.00817 0.01492 0.98 1,088.23	9.07997 0.00789 0.01496 0.98 734.54	9.07420 0.00783 0.01513 0.97 412.79	8.82439 0.00898 0.01436 0.97 198.02	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar.
20         10-Year AVerage           21         Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms           22         Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms           23         Load Factor           24         Time Period Used	NDD8 4,025	4,623	222 2.07 29.43% xxxxx	223 2.08 29.46%	223 2.07 29.47%	223 2.07 29.46%	223 2.08 29.37%	221 2.07 29.30%	218 2.06 28.97%	215 2.04 28.89%	215 2.04 28.84%	214 2.06 28.38%	L15 x 12 + (L16 x L17)) * Column B, L20 (L15 x 12") / 365 + (L16 * Note(1) x L17 * Note(1)) L21 / 365 / L22
25     Weather Station - Goodland       26     Constant (Base Use)       27     CHDD       28     PHDD       29     Adj R Square       30     F			12.01153 0.00434 0.02290 0.98 3,491	12.03592 0.00441 0.02296 0.98 3,340	11.88941 0.00434 0.02295 0.99 3,144	12.01648 0.00428 0.02282 0.98 2,656	11.85981 0.00441 0.02282 0.98 2,124	11.47744 0.00465 0.02270 0.98 1,849	11.22677 0.00476 0.02258 0.98 1,277	10.76488 0.00452 0.02289 0.98 766	10.48213 0.00480 0.02300 0.97 403	11.20439 0.00776 0.01856 0.98 249	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar.
31     10-Year Average       32     Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms       33     Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms       34     Load Factor       35     Time Period Used	HDDs	5,590	296 2.27 35.70% xxxxx	297 2.28 35.67%	295 2.27 35.57%	296 2.27 35.76%	295 2.27 35.57%	291 2.26 35.16%	288 2.26 34.93%	282 2.24 34.46%	281 2.26 34.04%	282 2.18 35.32%	L26 x 12 + (L27 x L28)) * Column B, L31 (L26 x 12") / 365 + (L27 * Note(1) x L28 * Note(1)) L32 / 365 / L33
36         Weather Station - Topeka           37         Constant (Base Use)           38         CHDD           39         PHDD           40         Adj R Square           41         F           42         IO Yana Alumana	HDDs	4 570	5.79000 0.00477 0.01809 0.96 1,368	5.94498 0.00505 0.01760 0.96 1,254	6.06082 0.00536 0.01729 0.96 1,108	6.26430 0.00544 0.01721 0.96 919	6.38676 0.00564 0.01672 0.96 829	6.95574 0.00554 0.01631 0.96 690	6.97977 0.00565 0.01593 0.96 502	7.69905 0.00567 0.01532 0.95 322	8.41094 0.00610 0.01532 0.94 174	5.53636 0.00537 0.01661 0.97 181	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar.
42 10-16a Average     43 Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms     44 Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms     45 Load Factor     46 Time Period Used	IIDDs	4,379	174 1.79 26.65% xxxxx	175 1.78 26.93%	176 1.78 27.08%	179 1.79 27.36%	179 1.77 27.63%	184 1.76 28.59%	183 1.74 28.74%	189 1.72 29.98%	199 1.78 30.70%	167 1.72 26.60%	L37 x 12 + (L38 x L39)) * Column B, L42 (L37 x 12") / 365 + (L38 * Note(1) x L39 * Note(1)) L43 / 365 / L44
47     Weather Station - Wichita       48     Constant (Base Use)       49     CHDD       50     PHDD       51     Adj R Square       52     For the second s	UDD	4 120	6.89448 0.00646 0.01730 0.96 1,582	6.91069 0.00670 0.01696 0.96 1,438	6.99428 0.00700 0.01672 0.97 1,318	6.94356 0.00713 0.01670 0.96 1,127	6.92905 0.00740 0.01630 0.97 1,058	7.19672 0.00734 0.01604 0.97 904	6.78329 0.00743 0.01592 0.97 766	6.98756 0.00673 0.01625 0.97 549	7.09544 0.00651 0.01645 0.96 316	6.21168 0.00724 0.01653 0.96 150	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar.
5.5         10-Year Average           54         Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms           55         Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms           56         Load Factor           57         Time Period Used	HDDs	4,139	181 1.97 25.14% xxxxx	181 1.97 25.20%	182 1.97 25.28%	182 1.98 25.18%	181 1.97 25.21%	183 1.95 25.66%	178 1.94 25.15%	179 1.92 25.55%	180 1.92 25.70%	173 1.95 24.28%	L48 x 12 + (L49 x L50)) * Column B, L53 (L48 x 12") / 365 + (L49 * Note(1) x L50 * Note(1)) L54 / 365 / L55

## Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Statistical Results

Of Varsi (Cobier 2014-September 2024)													
А		в	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	1	K	L	М
Description			10 Years 2014-2024	9 Years 2015-2024	8 Years 2016-2024	7 Years 2017-2024	6 Years 2018-2024	5 Years 2019-2024	4 Years 2020-2024	3 Years 2021-2024	2 Years 2022-2024	1 Year 2023-2024	Comments
No 58 Small Commercial													
59 Weather Station - Concordia													
60 Constant (Base Use) 61 CHDD			4.74839	4.76398	4.48745	4.03662	3.47285	4.31449	4.68976	4.54212	4.88740	3.99861	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are
62 PHDD			0.04139	0.04068	0.04012	0.03973	0.03823	0.03738	0.03737	0.03759	0.03840	0.04108	similar.
63 Adj R Square			0.93	0.93	0.94	0.93	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.93	0.96	
64 F 65 10-Vear Average	HDDe	4 886	837	736	718	577	603	485	395	259	155	125	
66 Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms	TIDD3	4,000	227	227	223	218	206	211	214	213	216	205	L60 x 12 + (L61 x L62)) * Column B, L65
67 Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms			2.81	2.80	2.78	2.76	2.67	2.62	2.61	2.61	2.62	2.57	(L60 x 12") / 365 + (L61 * Note(1) x L62 * Note(1))
68 Load Factor 69 Time Period Used			22.20%	22.23%	21.99%	21.57%	21.13%	22.08%	22.48%	22.32%	22.68%	21.83%	L66 / 365 / L67
07 Time Period Used			*****										
<ul> <li>Weather Station - Dodge City</li> <li>Constant (Base Use)</li> </ul>			0.75631	1.02761	1.33571	1.43449	1.38876	1.56055	1.91142	1.91698	2,70232	2,48052	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Souare
72 CHDD			0.01338	0.01387	0.01414	0.01461	0.01490	0.01446	0.01413	0.01373	0.01468	0.01795	prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are
73 PHDD			0.04024	0.04033	0.04040	0.04002	0.03991	0.04033	0.04149	0.04271	0.04288	0.04046	similar.
74 Adj K Square 75 F			1.252	1.242	1.159	0.96 991	0.96	0.96	630	431	280	138	
76 10-Year Average	HDDs	4,623	-,	-,	-,								
77 Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms			257	263	268	270	270	272	280	284	299	300	L71 x 12 + (L72 x L73)) * Column B, L76
78 Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms 79 Load Factor				4.15	4.19	4.20	4.21	4.22	4.29	4.35	4.46	4.52	(L/1 x 12") / 365 + (L/2 * Note(1) x L/3 * Note(1)) L77 / 365 / L78
80 Time Period Used			xxxxx	17.5 170	17.5170	17.0070	11.5770	17.0070	11.0770	11.0770	10.5570	10.1770	21113037210
81 Weather Station - Goodland													
82 Constant (Base Use)			16.51739	17.61658	18.96173	21.19665	22.79326	24.76645	28.40168	30.66274	35.38971	39.69813	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square
83 CHDD 84 PHDD			0.00360	0.00370	0.00347	0.00317	0.00369	0.00392	0.00313	0.00290	0.00316	0.00855	prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar
85 Adj R Square			0.05420	0.05405	0.05474	0.05428	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.05541	0.96	0.97	sinner.
86 F			1,654	1,625	1,418	1,190	939	792	647	493	267	174	
<ol> <li>10-Year Average</li> <li>Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms</li> </ol>	HDDs	5,590	522	537	553	576	594	616	660	694	750	782	182 x 12 + (183 x 184)) * Column B 187
<ol> <li>Predicted Pormal Annual OsciCustoniel - therms</li> <li>Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms</li> </ol>			4.54	4.60	4.64	4.66	4.71	4.76	4.87	5.03	5.17	5.08	$(L82 \times 12") / 365 + (L83 * Note(1) \times L84 * Note(1))$
00 Load Factor			31.51%	31.98%	32.65%	33.83%	34.57%	35.52%	37.10%	37.78%	39.69%	42.19%	L88 / 365 / L89
91 Time Period Used			XXXXX										
2 Weather Station - Topeka			c 10.000	6 707	( 22.45	( 53.65	( 73350	7.00700	0.740	11 50405	10.05001	0.14563	10.12 1 11.19.12 1 11.1.1.P
95 Constant (Base Use) 94 CHDD			5.42522 0.00661	5.78745	0.00768	0.00812	6.73320	7.29738	8.76853	0.00904	13./5296 0.01042	8.14581	10 1 cars nas a high r-value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are
95 PHDD			0.03894	0.03869	0.03844	0.03848	0.03750	0.03774	0.03824	0.03773	0.03818	0.04219	similar.
96 Adj R Square			0.94	0.93	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.92	0.95	
9/ F 98 10-Year Average	HDDs	4.579	869	746	714	621	550	418	321	216	137	99	
99 Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms	110105		274	278	287	292	294	301	320	352	388	328	L93 x 12 + (L94 x L95)) * Column B, L98
00 Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms			3.37	3.38	3.44	3.48	3.48	3.50	3.57	3.65	3.85	3.78	(L93 x 12") / 365 + (L94 * Note(1) x L95 * Note(1))
01 Load Pactor 02 Time Period Used			22.27% xxxxx	22.54%	22.89%	22.99%	23.14%	23.34%	24.54%	26.42%	27.55%	23.73%	L997 3037 L100
03 Weather Station - Wichita													
104 Constant (Base Use)			(3.45524)	(3.32516)	(2.42949)	(2.13604)	(1.69984)	(0.55086)	0.34336	1.24562	1.01307	(0.73254)	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square
05 CHDD			0.01534	0.01560	0.01627	0.01695	0.01764	0.01659	0.01637	0.01629	0.01604	0.01781	prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are
06 PHDD 07 Adi R Square			0.03631	0.03619	0.03624	0.03586	0.03463	0.03525	0.03633	0.03726	0.03816	0.03887	similar.
08 F			819	718	732	632	602	495	420	316	194	86	
09 10-Year Average	HDDs	4,139											
<ol> <li>Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms</li> <li>Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms</li> </ol>			172	174	188	193	196	208	222	237	236	226	$L104 \ge 12^{+}(L105 \ge L106) \ge Column B, L109$ (L104 \x 12")/365 + (L105 \ne Note(1) \x L106 \ne Note(1))
12 Load Factor			12.82%	12.93%	13.64%	13.87%	14.18%	15.02%	15.67%	16.30%	4.02	4.14	L110/365/L111
113 Time Period Used			xxxxx										

Blaci Stati 10 Ye	Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Statistical Results 10 Years (October 2014-September 2024)																
	A		в	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	I	J	K	L	М			
				10 Years	9 Years	8 Years	7 Years	6 Years	5 Years	4 Years	3 Years	2 Years	1 Year				
Line	Description			2014-2024	2015-2024	2016-2024	2017-2024	2018-2024	2019-2024	2020-2024	2021-2024	2022-2024	2023-2024	Comments			
No 114	Small Volume Firm																
115 116 117 118 119 120	Weather Station - Concordia Constant (Base Use) CHDD PHDD Adj R Square F			(11.27857) (0.01170) 0.05608 0.16 12	(7.32939) (0.00779) 0.03715 0.10 7	(7.40624) (0.01091) 0.04214 0.10 7	(7.58391) (0.01354) 0.04826 0.12 7	(9.52296) (0.01574) 0.05665 0.14 7	5.47188 (0.00326) 0.02202 0.06 3	0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00 0.00	0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00 0.00	0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00 0.00	0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00 0.00	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar.			
121 122 123 124 125	10-Year Average Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms Load Factor Time Period Used	HDDs	4,886	82 3.00 7.44% xxxxx	56 1.99 7.64%	64 2.13 8.19%	79 2.39 9.01%	86 2.80 8.39%	157 1.61 26.84%	- #DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	- #DIV/0!	L116 x 12+ (L117 x L118)) * Column B, L121 (L116 x 12") / 365 + (L117 * Note(1) x L118 * Note(1)) L122 / 365 / L123			
126 127 128 129 130 131 132	Weather Station - Dodge City Constant (Base Use) CHDD PHDD Adj R Square F 10-Year Average	HDDs	4,623	268.94087 0.07736 0.20950 0.97 1,673	269.81383 0.07917 0.21078 0.97 1,625	265.19128 0.08403 0.20758 0.97 1,504	255.71597 0.09183 0.20110 0.97 1,372	243.28492 0.09128 0.20139 0.97 1,339	243.19212 0.08405 0.20739 0.97 1,122	251.40624 0.07595 0.21815 0.98 1,045	246.37727 0.08247 0.21983 0.98 827	243.66265 0.08349 0.22691 0.98 565	233.38888 0.10467 0.21219 0.98 283	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar.			
133 134 135 136	Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms Load Factor Time Period Used		.,	4,554 30.64 40.71% xxxxx	4,578 30.91 40.58%	4,531 30.88 40.19%	4,423 30.67 39.51%	4,273 30.24 38.71%	4,266 30.14 38.77%	4,377 30.62 39.16%	4,354 31.07 38.39%	4,359 31.60 37.79%	4,266 31.75 36.80%	L127 x 12 + (L128 x L129)) * Column B, L132 (L127 x 12') / 365 + (L128 * Note(1) x L129 * Note(1)) L133 / 365 / L134			
137 138 139 140 141 142 143	Weather Station - Goodland Constant (Base Use) CHDD PHDD Adj R Square F I O. Voar Avanson	HDDs	5 590	211.20365 0.07239 0.14883 0.91 593	206.33460 0.05836 0.16205 0.92 636	199.19842 0.05856 0.16271 0.92 557	194.23224 0.06461 0.15817 0.92 460	192.78900 0.07279 0.15261 0.91 357	182.79384 0.06901 0.15798 0.91 312	191.73296 0.06227 0.16086 0.90 218	178.19718 0.07544 0.15305 0.93 217	157.60818 0.06874 0.16425 0.96 308	147.78145 0.05721 0.15995 0.99 677	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar.			
143 144 145 146 147	Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms Load Factor Time Period Used	HDDs 5,590	3,771 22.21 46.52% xxxxx	3,708 21.99 46.19%	3,627 21.82 45.55%	3,576 21.76 45.03%	3,573 21.89 44.72%	3,462 21.67 43.77%	3,548 21.70 44.80%	3,416 21.62 43.27%	3,194 21.26 41.16%	2,987 19.84 41.25%	L138 x 12 + (L139 x L140)) * Column B, L143 (L138 x 12") / 365 + (L139 * Note(1) x L140 * Note(1)) L144 / 365 / L145				
148 149 150 151 152 153 154	Weather Station - Topeka Constant (Base Use) CHDD PHDD Adj R Square F IO-Yoar Average	HDDs	4.579	339.16310 0.04794 0.23137 0.88 432	347.93529 0.05003 0.22811 0.87 355	354.42766 0.05657 0.22226 0.86 299	351.36766 0.06351 0.21761 0.85 240	344.84577 0.06948 0.20838 0.84 185	351.95386 0.06133 0.21395 0.81 126	382.09689 0.05915 0.21443 0.79 88	398.47596 0.08129 0.19818 0.75 54	442.95468 0.09671 0.18153 0.68 25	327.64508 0.04820 0.25503 0.98 325	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar.			
155 156 157 158	Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms Load Factor Time Period Used	HDDs 4,579	HDDs 4,579	HDDs 4,57	HDDs 4,579	HDDs 4,579	5,349 30.70 47.73% xxxxx	5,449 30.91 48.30%	5,530 31.17 48.60%	5,504 31.23 48.28%	5,410 30.79 48.15%	5,484 30.84 48.72%	5,838 31.71 50.43%	6,061 32.66 50.84%	6,589 34.04 53.04%	5,320 32.00 45.55%	L149 x 12 + (L150 x L151)) * Column B, L154 (L149 x 12") / 365 + (L150 * Note(1) x L151 * Note(1)) L155 / 365 / L156
159 160 161 162 163 164 165	Weather Station - Wichita Constant (Base Use) CHDD PHDD Adj R Square F I0-Year Average	HDDs	4,139	205.88820 0.10137 0.24946 0.94 961	210.98448 0.10351 0.24786 0.94 848	213.06568 0.11241 0.24262 0.94 796	206.71276 0.12107 0.23662 0.94 670	198.33717 0.12329 0.22484 0.96 815	203.08866 0.10971 0.23363 0.96 675	211.78936 0.10696 0.24197 0.97 685	211.44321 0.11467 0.24576 0.97 616	215.26679 0.11564 0.24874 0.97 375	217.34046 0.12079 0.24896 0.97 213	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar.			
166 167 168 169	Predicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms Predicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms Load Factor Time Period Used		.,/	3,923 32.55 33.01% xxxxx	3,986 32.76 33.33%	4,026 33.10 33.33%	3,961 33.09 32.80%	3,821 32.11 32.60%	3,858 31.91 33.12%	3,986 32.61 33.49%	4,029 33.44 33.01%	4,091 33.86 33.10%	4,138 34.32 33.03%	L160 x 12 + (L161 x L162)) * Column B, L165 (L160 x 12") / 365 + (L161 * Note(1) x L162 * Note(1)) L166 / 365 / L167			

Black Hills/Kansas	Gas U	tility Con	ipany, L	L
--------------------	-------	------------	----------	---

Black Hills/K Statistical Res 10 Years (Oct	ansas Gas Utility Company, LLC sults tober 2014-September 2024)													KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-3
	А		в	С	D	Е	F	G	н	I	J	K	L	М
Descrip Line No 170 Large N	ption Volume Firm			10 Years 2014-2024	9 Years 2015-2024	8 Years 2016-2024	7 Years 2017-2024	6 Years 2018-2024	5 Years 2019-2024	4 Years 2020-2024	3 Years 2021-2024	2 Years 2022-2024	1 Year 2023-2024	Comments
171 Enge 171 We 172 Co 173 CF 174 PH 175 Ad 176 F 177 10- 178 Pre 179 Pre 180 Loo 181 Tin	eather Station - Concordia sostant (Base Use) IDD IDD Jj R Square -Year Average edicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms edicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms ad Factor me Period Used	HDDs	4,886	121.60955 0.07946 (0.04821) 0.01 1 1,612 6.37 69.29% xxxxx	133.90292 0.08839 (0.05304) 0.01 1 1,780 7.09 68.77%	154.75585 0.09603 (0.05875) 0.01 1 2,039 7.92 70.53%	181.51666 0.11007 (0.07037) 0.01 1 2,372 8.98 72.33%	210.68863 0.12937 (0.08234) 0.01 1 2.758 10.50 71.96%	239.20830 0.15925 (0.09482) 0.02 2 3,185 12.76 68.39%	303.16617 0.19150 (0.11216) 0.02 2 4,026 16.00 68.94%	381.17839 0.28682 (0.27313) 0.06 2 4,641 13.57 93.68%	483.76854 0.29478 (0.28747) 0.01 1 5,841 16,46 97.22%	747.95274 0.30417 (0.46341) (0.04) 1 8,197 12.49 179.84%	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar. L172 x 12 + (L173 x L174)) * Column B, L177 (L172 x 12 <sup>+</sup> ) / 365 + (L173 * Note(1) x L174 * Note(1)) L178 / 365 / L179
182         We           183         Co           184         CF           185         PH           186         Add           187         F           188         100           189         Pre           190         Pre           191         Loo           192         Tir	eather Station - Dodge City onstant (Base Use) HDD HDD HDD HJJ HJ HJ HV HV HV HV HV HV HV HV HV HV	HDDs	4,623	6,696.80 1.67883 0.89373 0.16 12 92,256 415.68 60.80% xxxxx	6,332.58 1.79804 0.92567 0.16 11 88,584 415.20 58,45%	5,952.16 1.91705 0.91464 0.16 10 84,518 410.90 56.35%	3,449.83 2.79505 0.76579 0.28 17 57,861 384.04 41.28%	2,492.62 1.22430 1.47313 0.54 43 42,383 286.95 40.47%	2,254.98 0.72703 1.95342 0.58 41 39,452 277.85 38.90%	2,598.57 0.48008 2.18126 0.54 28 43,487 287.69 41.41%	2,647.28 0.32335 2.68937 0.58 25 45,696 316.00 39.62%	3,118.24 (0.07197) 3.03207 0.49 12 51,105 327.49 42.75%	2,317.48 (0.21462) 3.20665 0.91 59 41,643 303.58 37.58%	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar. L183 x 12 + (L184 x L185)) * Column B, L188 (L183 x 12") / 365 + (L184 * Note(1) x L185 * Note(1)) L189 / 365 / L190
193         We           194         Co           195         CF           196         PH           197         Ad           198         F           199         10.           200         Pre           201         Pre           202         Loc           203         Tir	eather Station - Goodland wistant (Base Use) IDD IDD IJ R Square -Year Average edicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms edicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms ad Factor me Period Used	HDDs	5,590	57.44136 0.16489 (0.13892) 0.05 4 834 3.68 62.12% xxxxx	46.05168 0.05787 (0.05839) 0.00 1 550 1.48 101.90%	0.00000 0.00000 0.0000 0 0 - #DIV/0!	0.00000 0.00000 0.00 0 0 - #DIV/0!	0.00000 0.00000 0.00 0 0 - #DIV/0!	0.00000 0.00000 0.00 0 0 - #DIV/0!	0.00000 0.00000 0.0000 0 0 - - #DIV/0!	0.00000 0.00000 0.0000 0 0 - #DIV/0!	0.00000 0.00000 0.00 0 0 - #DIV/0!	0.00000 0.00000 0.0000 0 0 - #DIV/0!	10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar. L194 x 12+ (L195 x L196)) * Column B, L199 (L194 x 12") / 365 + (L195 * Note(1) x L196 * Note(1)) L200 / 365 / L201
204         Wd           205         Co           206         CF           207         PH           208         Add           209         F           210         10-           211         Pre           212         Pred           213         Loc           214         Tir	eather Station - Topeka mstant (Base Use) HDD JDD Jj R Square -Year Average edicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms edicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms ad Factor me Period Used	HDDs	4,579	2,499.19 0.24872 1.99022 0.86 379 40,242 238.89 46.15% xxxxx	2,419.78 0.20510 2.00620 0.86 330 39,162 234.35 45.78%	2,374.76 0.19494 2.00097 0.85 270 38,551 231.79 45.57%	2,212.10 0.19754 1.99480 0.85 231 36,583 226.19 44.31%	2,091.35 0.10760 1.99774 0.86 215 34,736 216.13 44.03%	2,005.97 0.10282 2.12010 0.86 186 34,249 221.55 42.35%	1,855.31 0.24985 2.03766 0.91 228 32,737 221.12 40.56%	1,520.07 0.31033 2.20407 0.93 221 29,753 225.98 36.07%	1,333.18 0.20845 2.24504 0.91 113 27,232 215.57 34.61%	1,834.24 0.47115 1.89539 0.98 347 32,846 225.96 39.83%	<ul> <li>10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar.</li> <li>L205 x 12 + (L206 x L207)) * Column B, L210 (L205 x 12" / 365 + (L206 * Note(1) x L207 * Note(1)) L211 / 365 / L212</li> </ul>
215 We 216 Co 217 CH 218 PH 219 Ad 220 F 221 10 222 Pre 223 Pre 224 Lo 225 Tin	eather Station - Wichita mstant (Base Use) HDD HDD JDD JJJ Square -Year Average edicted Normal Annual Use/Customer - therms edicted Peak Day Use/Customer - therms ad Factor me Period Used	HDDs	4,139	1,845.80 0.15815 3.90416 0.90 535 38,962 359,26 29,71%	1,859.90 0.34599 3.84465 640 39,663 369.16 29.44%	1,946.64 0.39263 3.81294 0.92 547 40,765 373.11 29.93%	1,992.34 0.43235 3.74674 0.91 447 41,204 372.66 30.29%	1,757.65 0.65594 3.52516 0.96 795 38,396 365.10 28.81%	1,771.83 0.48453 3.78870 0.97 1,038 38,948 372.33 28.66%	1,737.18 0.40266 3.88734 0.97 822 38,601 372.43 28.40%	1,601.18 0.52610 3.74177 0.97 514 36,878 366.33 27.58%	1,504.60 0.63328 3.49807 431 35,154 353.12 27.27%	1,620.52 0.81479 3.52670 0.97 200 37,414 372.38 27.53%	<ul> <li>10 Years has a high F-Value and a high Adjusted R-Square prefer to use a longer period of time when statistics are similar.</li> <li>L216 x 12+(L217 x L218)) * Column B, L221 (L216 x 12") / 365 + (L217 * Note(1) x L218 * Note(1)) L222 / 365 / L223</li> </ul>

Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Statistical Results 10 Years (October 2014-September 2024)													KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-3
А		в	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J	К	L	М
Description Line			10 Years 2014-2024	9 Years 2015-2024	8 Years 2016-2024	7 Years 2017-2024	6 Years 2018-2024	5 Years 2019-2024	4 Years 2020-2024	3 Years 2021-2024	2 Years 2022-2024	1 Year 2023-2024	Comments
No Notes: (1) Peak HDD used to calculate load factor:													
Maximum HDD													
Weather Station	Current	Previous											
AKRON	76	76											
ASPEN	76	76											
BURLINGTON	69	69											
CASTLE ROCK	70	70											
DURANGO	73.5	73.5											
FORT COLLINS	67	67											
GLENWOOD SPRINGS	63	63											
LA JUNTA	72.5	72.5											
LAKE GEORGE	82	82											
MONTROSE	65.5	65.5											
TELLURIDE	76.5	76.5											

Line         Weather Station         HDD Current Month Actual         HDD Previous Month Actual         Per Cut. Ag: Normal (1)         Per Cut. Ag: For Autal         Volumetric Ag: For Autal         For Autal		А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J
No.         Customer Class         Weather Station         Month         Actual         Normal (1)         Horm         Horm         #         Horms           1         Image         HID	Line				HDD Currer	nt Month	HDD Previ	ous Month	Per Cust. Adj.		Volumetric Adj.
Image: biology         HDD         HDD        HDD         HDD         <	No.	Customer Class	Weather Station	Month	Actual	Normal (1)	Actual	Normal (1)	Therm / Cust.	# of Cust.	Therms
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					HDD	HDD	HDD	HDD	therm/cust.		therms
Residential         Concordia         Concordia <thconcordia< th=""> <thconcordia< th=""> <t< td=""><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>[H]x[I]</td></t<></thconcordia<></thconcordia<>	1										[H]x[I]
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	2										
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	3	Residential	Concordia			-		0.02612			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	4			October	272	289	8	25	0.45	360	164
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	5			November	531	621	272	289	0.45	359	160
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	6			December	799	939	531	621	2.36	360	848
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	7			January	1,230	1,074	799	939	3.65	360	1,314
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	8			February	604	893	1,230	1,074	(4.09)	361	(1,476)
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	9			March	557	604	604	893	7.54	364	2,743
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	10			April	243	330	557	604	1.23	365	450
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	11			May	45	110	243	330	2.28	363	829
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	12			June	-	1	45	110	1.70	362	614
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	13			July	-	0	-	1	0.02	364	7
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	14			August	1	0	-	0	0.00	361	1
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	15			September	8	25	1	0	(0.02)	360	(7)
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	16			Total	4,290	4,886	4,290	4,886	15.57	362	5,646
Residential         Dodge City         October $282$ $270$ $17$ $25$ $0.03$ $34,400$ $919$ 20         November $539$ $607$ $282$ $270$ $0.33$ $34,922$ $11,363$ 21         December $792$ $905$ $539$ $607$ $1.90$ $35,047$ $66,79$ 23         January $1,134$ $982$ $792$ $905$ $0.59$ $35,246$ $(25,71)$ 24         April $245$ $324$ $519$ $573$ $606$ $820$ $3.72$ $35,246$ $(13,164)$ 25         April $245$ $324$ $519$ $573$ $616$ $820$ $3.72$ $35,246$ $(31,064)$ 26         Mary $46$ $114$ $245$ $324$ $1.74$ $35,012$ $61,146$ 28         July         -         0         - $3$ $0.05$ $35,022$ $1,554$ 29         1         0.077 <t< td=""><td>17</td><td>D 11 21</td><td>D. I. Ch</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.00750</td><td></td><td>0.01.540</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	17	D 11 21	D. I. Ch			0.00750		0.01.540			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	18	Residential	Dodge City	0.1	202	0.00/59	17	0.01549	0.02	24.400	010
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	19			October	282	270	17	25	0.03	34,400	919
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	20			November	539	607	282	270	0.33	34,922	11,363
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	21			December	792	905	539	607	1.90	35,047	66,749
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	22			January	1,134	982	192	905	0.59	35,185	20,906
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	23			February	606	820	1,134	982	(0.73)	35,285	(25,/13)
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	24			March	519	5/3	606	820	3./2	35,246	131,064
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	25			April	245	324	519	573	1.44	35,2/1	50,754
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	26			May	46	114	245	324	1./4	35,102	61,146
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	27			June	-	3	46	114	1.08	34,981	37,808
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	28			July	-	0	-	3	0.05	35,022	1,654
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	29			August	9	1	-	0	(0.06)	34,948	(2,067)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	30			September	1/	25	4 100	1 (22	(0.07)	34,/94	(2,279)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	31			1 otai	4,189	4,623	4,189	4,623	10.02	35,017	352,303
33       Residential $0.00474$ $0.002290$ $0.02290$ $0.02290$ $34$ October $429$ $408$ 16 $55$ $0.79$ $2.308$ $1.821$ $35$ November $662$ $710$ $429$ $408$ $(0.28)$ $2.320$ $(644)$ $36$ December $904$ $1.015$ $662$ $710$ $1.59$ $2.323$ $3.693$ $37$ January $1.250$ $1.080$ $904$ $1.015$ $1.80$ $2.328$ $4.195$ $38$ February $734$ $929$ $1.250$ $1.080$ $(3.04)$ $2.330$ $(7.093)$ $39$ March $706$ $712$ $734$ $929$ $4.49$ $2.331$ $10.468$ $40$ April $376$ $456$ $706$ $712$ $0.48$ $2.336$ $1,123$ $41$ May $183$ $208$ $376$ $456$ $1.94$ $2.326$ $4.514$ $42$ June $3$ $14$ $183$ $208$ $0.6$	32	Pasidantial	Goodland			0.00434		0.02200			
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	33	Residential	Goodiand	October	420	408	16	0.02290	0.70	2 208	1 821
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	25			November	423	710	10	408	(0.28)	2,308	(644)
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	35			December	002	1 015	423	710	(0.28)	2,320	2 602
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	30			Jonuory	1 250	1,015	002	1 015	1.39	2,323	5,095
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	28			Fahruary	724	1,080	1 250	1,015	(2.04)	2,528	(7,002)
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	20			Marah	706	712	1,230	1,080	(3.04)	2,330	(7,093)
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	40			April	276	/12	734	712	4.49	2,331	1 1 2 2
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	40			Mov	183	208	276	/12	1.04	2,550	1,125
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	42			June	105	208	183	208	0.61	2,520	1 301
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	42			July	5	14	105	208	0.01	2,292	1,391
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	45			August	10	0	5	14	(0.02)	2,512	(41)
Total         573         590         863         235         37	45			September	16	55	- 10	4	0.02)	2,294	(41)
	46			Total	5 273	5 590	5 273	5 590	8.63	2,205	20.050

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J
Line			N 4	HDD Currer	nt Month	HDD Previo	ous Month	Per Cust. Adj.	" (C )	Volumetric Adj.
NO.	Customer Class	weather Station	Month	Actual	Normal (1)	Actual	Normal (1)	Therm / Cust.	# of Cust.	Inerms
4.5				HDD	HDD	HDD	HDD	therm/cust.		therms
4/		T 1			0.00477		0.01000			
48	Residential	Горека	0.1	244	0.00477	4	0.01809	0.25	22.740	11.2(0
49			October	244	265	4	18	0.35	32,740	11,360
50			November	586	608	244	265	0.48	32,834	15,/66
51			December	/46	8/4	586	608	1.00	32,912	32,993
52			January	1,188	1,037	/46	8/4	1.59	33,059	52,572
53			February	5/5	851	1,188	1,037	(1.41)	33,043	(46,594)
54			March	468	551	575	851	5.39	33,075	178,334
55			April	204	289	468	551	1.90	33,028	62,912
56			May	25	86	204	289	1.83	33,008	60,337
57			June	-	0	25	86	1.10	33,034	36,458
58			July	-	-	-	0	0.01	33,419	242
59			August	-	-	-	-	0.00	33,147	-
60			September	4	18	-	-	0.07	32,706	2,135
61			Total	4,040	4,579	4,040	4,579	12.31	33,000	406,517
62										
63	Residential	Wichita			0.00646		0.01730			
64			October	223	207	4	10	0.00	34,794	92
65			November	551	553	223	207	(0.27)	34,988	(9,401)
66			December	747	826	551	553	0.54	35,147	18,936
67			January	1,118	948	747	826	0.26	35,270	9,154
68			February	565	781	1,118	948	(1.55)	35,340	(54,856)
69			March	454	490	565	781	3.97	35,354	140,367
70			April	175	253	454	490	1.12	35,433	39,524
71			May	16	72	175	253	1.70	35,430	60,297
72			June	-	1	16	72	0.97	35,357	34,199
73			July	-	-	-	1	0.01	35,369	490
74			August	-	-	-	-	0.00	35,262	-
75			September	4	10	-	-	0.04	35,234	1,411
76			Total	3,853	4,139	3,853	4,139	6.79	35,248	240,213
77										
78	Small Commercial	Concordia			-		0.04139			
79			October	272	289	8	25	0.72	44	32
80			November	531	621	272	289	0.71	45	32
81			December	799	939	531	621	3.73	45	168
82			January	1,230	1,074	799	939	5.78	45	260
83			February	604	893	1,230	1,074	(6.48)	45	(291)
84			March	557	604	604	893	11.94	44	525
85			April	243	330	557	604	1.95	44	86
86			May	45	110	243	330	3.62	44	159
87			June	-	1	45	110	2.69	44	118
88			July	-	0	-	1	0.03	44	1
89			August	1	0	-	0	0.00	45	0
90			September	8	25	1	0	(0.03)	45	(1)
91			Total	4,290	4,886	4,290	4,886	24.67	45	1,089
92										

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J
Line				HDD Currer	nt Month	HDD Previo	ous Month	Per Cust. Adj.		Volumetric Adj.
No.	Customer Class	Weather Station	Month	Actual	Normal (1)	Actual	Normal (1)	Therm / Cust.	# of Cust.	Therms
				HDD	HDD	HDD	HDD	therm/cust.		therms
93	Small Commercial	Dodge City			0.01338		0.04024			
94			October	282	270	17	25	0.15	3,853	565
95			November	539	607	282	270	0.42	3,917	1,632
96			December	792	905	539	607	4.24	3,969	16,810
97			January	1,134	982	792	905	2.50	3,985	9,970
98			February	606	820	1,134	982	(3.24)	3,988	(12,931)
99			March	519	573	606	820	9.32	4,004	37,303
100			April	245	324	519	573	3.24	3,996	12,940
101			May	46	114	245	324	4.09	3,981	16,294
102			June	-	3	46	114	2.79	3,938	10,981
103			July	-	0	-	3	0.12	3,945	482
104			August	9	1	-	0	(0.10)	3,932	(405)
105			September	17	25	9	1	(0.22)	3,878	(849)
106			Total	4,189	4,623	4,189	4,623	23.29	3,949	92,790
107	G 11 G 11	0 11 1			0.002(0		0.05426			
108	Small Commercial	Goodland	Ostahar	420	0.00360	16	0.05426	2.01	216	626
109			Nevember	429	408	10	109	(0.08)	221	(215)
110			December	002	1 015	429	408	(0.98)	321	(313)
111			Jopuory	1 250	1,015	002	1 015	5.03	320	1 772
112			Fabruary	724	1,080	1 250	1,015	(8.52)	328	(2 702)
113			March	706	712	734	1,080	(0.52)	326	3 456
115			April	376	456	706	712	0.60	320	200
116			May	183	208	376	456	4 43	323	1 432
117			June	3	14	183	208	1.15	321	439
118			July	-	0	3	14	0.58	322	186
119			August	10	4	-	0	(0.00)	322	(0)
120			September	16	55	10	4	(0.20)	321	(63)
121			Total	5,273	5,590	5.273	5,590	18.33	324	5,936
122				- ,	- ,	-,	- ,		-	- ,
123	Small Commercial	Topeka			0.00661		0.03894			
124			October	244	265	4	18	0.83	2,155	1,788
125			November	586	608	244	265	1.13	2,170	2,449
126			December	746	874	586	608	2.59	2,214	5,723
127			January	1,188	1,037	746	874	3.12	2,200	6,858
128			February	575	851	1,188	1,037	(2.37)	2,207	(5,224)
129			March	468	551	575	851	12.22	2,201	26,904
130			April	204	289	468	551	4.47	2,195	9,819
131			May	25	86	204	289	4.24	2,190	9,275
132			June	-	0	25	86	2.46	2,200	5,403
133			July	-	-	-	0	0.02	2,201	35
134			August	-	-	-	-	0.00	2,188	-
135			September	4	18	-	-	0.18	2,176	399
136			Total	4,040	4,579	4,040	4,579	28.88	2,191	63,430
137	I	I	I	I	I		I	I		

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J
Line				HDD Currer	nt Month	HDD Previo	ous Month	Per Cust. Adj.		Volumetric Adj.
No.	Customer Class	Weather Station	Month	Actual	Normal (1)	Actual	Normal (1)	Therm / Cust.	# of Cust.	Therms
				HDD	HDD	HDD	HDD	therm/cust.		therms
138	Small Commercial	Wichita			0.01534		0.03631			
139			October	223	207	4	10	0.03	3,056	100
140			November	551	553	223	207	(0.63)	3,096	(1,944)
141			December	747	826	551	553	1.12	3,139	3,530
142			January	1,118	948	747	826	0.88	3,173	2,799
143			February	565	781	1,118	948	(3.96)	3,217	(12,749)
144			March	454	490	565	781	9.17	3,190	29,267
145			April	175	253	454	490	2.47	3,227	7,961
146			May	16	72	175	253	3.87	3,224	12,466
147			June	-	1	16	72	2.25	3,182	7,153
148			July	-	-	-	1	0.03	3,204	103
149			August	-	-	-	-	0.00	3,153	-
150			September	4	10	-	-	0.08	3,128	260
151			1 otal	3,855	4,139	3,853	4,139	15.32	3,100	48,946
152	Constl Malance Elim	Concentio					0.05(00			
155	Small volume Firm	Concordia	October	272	- 280	8	0.03608	0.02	0	
155			November	531	621	272	25	1.90	0	
155			December	700	021	531	621	5 50	0	
157			January	1 230	1 074	799	939	3 53	0	
158			February	604	893	1 230	1 074	(2.44)	ů	
159			March	557	604	604	893	12.24	0	-
160			April	243	330	557	604	3.07	0	-
161			May	45	110	243	330	4.39	0	-
162			June	-	1	45	110	2.62	0	-
163			Julv	-	0	-	1	0.03	0	-
164			August	1	0	-	0	(0.01)	0	-
165			September	8	25	1	0	0.20	0	-
166			Total	4,290	4,886	4,290	4,886	31.96	0	-
167										
168	Small Volume Firm	Dodge City			0.07736		0.20950			
169			October	282	270	17	25	0.15	544	80
170			November	539	607	282	270	0.42	547	228
171			December	792	905	539	607	4.24	543	2,300
172			January	1,134	982	792	905	2.50	544	1,361
173			February	606	820	1,134	982	(3.24)	548	(1,777)
174			March	519	573	606	820	9.32	545	5,077
175			April	245	324	519	573	3.24	547	1,771
176			May	46	114	245	324	4.09	546	2,235
177			June	-	3	46	114	2.79	549	1,531
178			July	-	0	-	3	0.12	547	67
1/9			August	9	1	-	0	(0.10)	54/	(56)
100			Total	1/	4 6 2 2	4 100	4 622	(0.22)	544	(119)
181			Total	4,189	4,023	4,189	4,023	25.29	546	12,097
102	I	1	I	I	1		I	I		

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J
Line				HDD Currer	nt Month	HDD Previo	ous Month	Per Cust. Adj.		Volumetric Adj.
No.	Customer Class	Weather Station	Month	Actual	Normal (1)	Actual	Normal (1)	Therm / Cust.	# of Cust.	Therms
				HDD	HDD	HDD	HDD	therm/cust.		therms
183	Small Volume Firm	Goodland			0.07239		0.14883			
184			October	429	408	16	55	1.26	44	56
185			November	662	710	429	408	(0.21)	44	(9)
186			December	904	1,015	662	710	3.43	44	151
187			January	1,250	1,080	904	1,015	2.19	44	96
188			February	734	929	1,250	1,080	(4.23)	45	(190)
189			March	706	712	734	929	7.92	44	349
190			April	376	456	706	712	1.31	43	56
191			May	183	208	376	456	3.55	44	156
192			June	3	14	183	208	1.13	42	47
193			July	-	0	3	14	0.43	42	18
194			August	10	4	-	0	(0.07)	42	(3)
195			September	16	55	10	4	0.27	42	11
196			Total	5,273	5,590	5,273	5,590	16.99	43	738
197	C HALL F.	T 1			0.04704		0.00107			
198	Small Volume Firm	Горека	Ostahar	244	0.04/94	4	0.23137	4.17	280	1 167
200			Nevember	596	203	244	10	4.17	280	1,107
200			December	746	008	596	203	11.16	273	2 114
201			Lonvorti	1 1 9 9	1 027	380	008	22.20	279	5,114
202			Fabruary	575	851	1 1 8 8	1 027	(21.63)	278	(5 000)
203			March	468	551	1,100	1,057	(21.03)	277	(3,990)
204			April	204	289	468	551	23.26	200	6 442
205			May	204	86	204	289	22.59	279	6 301
200			June	2.5	0	201	86	14.11	280	3 951
208			July	-	-	-	0	0.09	200	26
209			August	-	-	-	-	0.00	282	-
210			September	4	18	-	-	0.66	278	183
211			Total	4,040	4,579	4,040	4,579	150.43	279	42,008
212				í í	<i>,</i>	· · · · ·	· · · · ·			<i>,</i>
213	Small Volume Firm	Wichita			0.10137		0.24946			
214			October	223	207	4	10	(0.10)	415	(40)
215			November	551	553	223	207	(3.86)	412	(1,590)
216			December	747	826	551	553	8.42	415	3,493
217			January	1,118	948	747	826	2.33	416	971
218			February	565	781	1,118	948	(20.59)	418	(8,608)
219			March	454	490	565	781	57.53	420	24,164
220			April	175	253	454	490	16.72	413	6,906
221			May	16	72	175	253	24.99	417	10,423
222			June	-	1	16	72	13.95	414	5,776
223			July	-	-	-	1	0.20	417	83
224			August	-	-	-	-	0.00	413	-
225			September	4	10	-	-	0.63	412	259
226			Total	3,853	4,139	3,853	4,139	100.23	415	41,837
227		I	I	I			I			

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J
Line				HDD Currer	nt Month	HDD Previo	ous Month	Per Cust. Adj.		Volumetric Adj.
No.	Customer Class	Weather Station	Month	Actual	Normal (1)	Actual	Normal (1)	Therm / Cust.	# of Cust.	Therms
				HDD	HDD	HDD	HDD	therm/cust.		therms
228	Large Volume Firm	Concordia			0.07946		-			
229			October	272	289	8	25	1.36	1	-
230			November	531	621	272	289	7.17	1	-
231			December	799	939	531	621	11.10	1	-
232			January	1,230	1,074	799	939	(12.44)	1	-
233			February	604	893	1,230	1,074	22.92	1	-
234			March	557	604	604	893	3.75	1	-
235			April	243	330	557	604	6.94	1	-
236			May	45	110	243	330	5.16	1	-
237			June	-	1	45	110	0.06	1	-
238			July	-	0	-	1	0.01	1	-
239			August	1	0	-	0	(0.06)	1	-
240			September	8	25	1	0	1.38	1	-
241			Total	4,290	4,886	4,290	4,886	47.36	1	-
242	T TALE	D I G			1 (7002		0.00272			
243	Large Volume Firm	Dodge City	Ostaban	202	1.6/883	17	0.893/3	(12 (0)	10	(120)
244			Nevember	282	270	1/	23	(13.00)	10	(130)
245			December	702	007	202	270	240.62	9	920
240			Jonuary	1 1 2 4	903	702	007	(152.99)	9	(1.221)
247			Fahrmary	1,134	902	1 1 2 4	903	(133.88)	0	(1,231)
240			March	519	573	606	820	281.80	10	2,000
250			April	245	324	519	573	181.07	8	1 449
251			May	46	114	245	324	185.27	11	2 038
252			June		3	46	114	66.08	11	2,030
252			July		0	40	3	2.85	11	31
254			August	9	1		0	(13.34)	11	(147)
255			September	17	25	9	1	5 78	11	64
256			Total	4,189	4.623	4.189	4.623	1,117.52	10	10.792
257			1000	.,,	1,025	.,,	1,025	1,117.02	10	10,772
258	Large Volume Firm	Goodland			0.16489		-			
259			October	429	408	16	55	(3.51)	0	-
260			November	662	710	429	408	7.98	0	-
261			December	904	1,015	662	710	18.29	0	-
262			January	1,250	1,080	904	1,015	(28.02)	0	-
263			February	734	929	1,250	1,080	32.15	0	-
264			March	706	712	734	929	0.96	0	-
265			April	376	456	706	712	13.21	0	-
266			May	183	208	376	456	4.04	0	-
267			June	3	14	183	208	1.75	0	-
268			July	-	0	3	14	0.07	0	-
269			August	10	4	-	0	(1.02)	0	-
270			September	16	55	10	4	6.35	0	-
271			Total	5,273	5,590	5,273	5,590	52.24	0	-
272										

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J
Line				HDD Curre	nt Month	HDD Previ	ous Month	Per Cust. Adj.		Volumetric Adj.
No.	Customer Class	Weather Station	Month	Actual	Normal (1)	Actual	Normal (1)	Therm / Cust.	# of Cust.	Therms
				HDD	HDD	HDD	HDD	therm/cust.		therms
273	Large Volume Firm	Topeka			0.24872		1.99022			
274			October	244	265	4	18	32.44	14	454
275			November	586	608	244	265	46.82	13	609
276			December	746	874	586	608	75.12	13	977
277			January	1,188	1,037	746	874	216.47	12	2,598
278			February	575	851	1,188	1,037	(231.23)	13	(3,006)
279			March	468	551	575	851	570.32	13	7,414
280			April	204	289	468	551	186.13	13	2,420
281			May	25	86	204	289	184.32	13	2,396
282			June	-	0	25	86	121.30	14	1,698
283			July	-	-	-	0	0.80	14	11
284			August	-	-	-	-	0.00	14	-
285			September	4	18	-	-	3.41	14	48
286			Total	4,040	4,579	4,040	4,579	1,205.90	13	15,618
287										
288	Large Volume Firm	Wichita			0.15815		3.90416			
289			October	223	207	4	10	21.64	18	390
290			November	551	553	223	207	(62.96)	17	(1,070)
291			December	747	826	551	553	19.46	18	350
292			January	1,118	948	747	826	279.92	18	5,039
293			February	565	781	1,118	948	(631.08)	19	(11,990)
294			March	454	490	565	781	849.69	18	15,294
295			April	175	253	454	490	150.87	19	2,867
296			May	16	72	175	253	311.76	18	5,612
297			June	-	1	16	72	217.20	18	3,910
298			July	-	-	-	1	3.12	17	53
299			August	-	-	-	-	0.00	17	-
300			September	4	10	-	-	0.98	18	18
301			Total	3,853	4,139	3,853	4,139	1,160.60	18	20,470

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J
	]		Sales			Transportation			Total	
Line			Avg. Annual	Use Per		Avg. Annual	Use Per		Avg. Annual	Use Per
No.	Year	Volume	Customers	Customer	Volume	Customers	Customer	Volume	Customers	Customer
				-				therms		Therms/Cust
	<b>Historical</b>									
1	Period 01	25,939,048	15,656	1,657	7,070,054	4,997	1,415	33,009,102	20,653	1,598
2	Period 02	24,765,850	15,865	1,561	6,447,209	4,812	1,340	31,213,059	20,677	1,510
3	Period 03	26,189,357	15,728	1,665	6,015,570	4,534	1,327	32,204,927	20,262	1,589
4	Period 04	27,479,945	15,770	1,743	5,677,305	4,490	1,264	33,157,250	20,260	1,637
5	Period 05	21,714,562	15,723	1,381	5,474,740	4,514	1,213	27,189,302	20,237	1,344
6	Period 06	30,696,999	15,995	1,919	7,217,950	4,442	1,625	37,914,949	20,437	1,855
7	Period 07	29,498,877	15,913	1,854	6,699,251	4,317	1,552	36,198,128	20,230	1,789
8	Period 08	38,803,968	16,125	2,406	7,416,693	4,135	1,794	46,220,661	20,260	2,281
9	Period 09	28,195,412	16,052	1,757	6,079,896	4,000	1,520	34,275,308	20,052	1,709
10	Period 10	31,586,269	16,095	1,962	7,860,659	4,123	1,907	39,446,928	20,218	1,951
11	10-yr Average	28,487,029	15,892	1,790	6,595,933	4,436	1,496	35,082,961	20,329	1,726
12	8-yr Average	29,270,674	15,925	1,836	6,555,258	4,319	1,525	35,825,932	20,245	1,769
13	5-yr. Average	31,756,305	16,036	1,980	7,054,890	4,203	1,679	38,811,195	20,239	1,917
14	10-yr Adjustment	(3,099,240)	16,095	(193)	(1,264,726)	4,123	(307)	(4,363,967)	20,218	(216)
15	8-yr Adjustment	(2,315,595)	16,095	(144)	(1,305,401)	4,123	(317)	(3,620,996)	20,218	(179)
16	5-yr. Adjustment	170,036	16,095	11	(805,769)	4,123	(195)	(635,733)	20,218	(31)

#### Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Test Year Revenues Under Existing Rates For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	ì	К	L
Line	Description	Total Company	Pasidantial	Small	Small Commercial	Small Volume	Small Volume	Large Volume	Large Volume	Irrigation (Interruptible)	Irrigation	Large Volume
140.	Description	Total Company	Residential	Commerciai	mansportation	1 Film	Transportation	1 IIII	Transportation	(interruptione)	Transportation	interruptione
1	1. Number of Bills											
2	Test Period											
3	Sales Service	1.419.577	1.271.308	116.091		15,397		505		16.095		181
4	Distribution Transportation Service	13.515			2,452		5,511		1.429		4.123	
5	Customer Additions	36	0	0					36			
6	Total Test Period	1,433,128	1,271,308	116,091	2,452	15,397	5,511	505	1,465	16,095	4,123	181
_												
7	Average Number of Monthly Bills	119,427	105,942	9,674	204	1,283	459	42	122	1,341	344	15
8	2. Volumes - therms											
9	Test Period											
10	Sales Service	124,924,845	61,963,635	12,196,387		12.889.053		3,879,337		31,586,269		2,410,164
11	Distribution Transportation Service	74,926,273		, ,	604,152	,,	6,600,794	- , ,== .	59,860,668	- ,,	7.860.659	, ., •••
12	Customer Additions	5,118,400					.,,		5,118,400		.,,	
13	Weather Normalization	1.381.083	1.024.730	212,191		97.281		46,881	-, -,			
14	Irrigation Adjustment	(4,363,967)	,,	,-,-				,		(3,099,240)	(1,264,726)	
15	Total Test Period Volumes	201,986,634	62,988,365	12,408,578	604,152	12,986,334	6,600,794	3,926,218	64,979,068	28,487,029	6,595,933	2,410,164
16	Weather Normalized		505	1 202	2.057	10.101	14.252	02.207		21.220	10.107	150 500
17	Average Annual Therms per Customer		595	1,283	2,957	10,121	14,373	93,296	532,252	21,239	19,197	159,790
18	Average Therms per Bill		50	107	246	843	1,198	7,775	44,354	1,770	1,600	13,316
19	Winter Volumes											
20	November thru March	101,525,163	46,550,706	9,612,556	447,881	8,909,615	4,686,534	2,745,358	23,750,718	2,991,783	631,807	1,198,205
21	Customer Additions	2,132,667	0	0					2,132,667			
22	Weather Normalization	742,982	555,850	114,197		49,955		22,980				
23	Irrigation Adjustment	(395,207)								(293,553)	(101,653)	
24	Total	104,005,605	47,106,556	9,726,753	447,881	8,959,570	4,686,534	2,768,338	25,883,385	2,698,230	530,154	1,198,205
25	Number of Winter Bills	597 755	530 143	48 573	1.027	6.418	2316	204	610	6 712	1 730	72
26	Average Therms per Winter Bill	571,155	89	200	436	1,396	2,024	13,570	42,432	402	306	16.642
-	e ,					-,	_,	,	,			
27	Summer Volumes											
28	April thru October	98,325,955	15,412,929	2,583,831	156,271	3,979,438	1,914,260	1,133,979	36,109,950	28,594,486	7,228,852	1,211,959
29	Customer Additions	2,985,733	0	0					2,985,733			
30	Weather Normalization	638,101	468,880	97,995		47,326		23,901				
31	Irrigation Adjustment	(3,968,760)								(2,805,687)	(1,163,073)	
32	Total	97,981,029	15,881,809	2,681,826	156,271	4,026,764	1,914,260	1,157,880	39,095,683	25,788,799	6,065,779	1,211,959
33	Number of Summer Bills	835.373	741.165	67.568	1.425	8.979	3,195	301	855	9.383	2.393	109
34	Average Therms per Summer Bill	,070	21	40	110	448	599	3.847	45.726	2.748	2.535	11.119

#### Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Test Year Revenues Under Existing Rates For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

Total Test Period Revenue - \$

1,180,071

588,871

Α в С D Е F G Н Ι J Κ L Small Small Volume Large Volume Large Volume Line Small Commercial Small Volume Large Volume Irrigation Irrigation No. Description Total Company Residential Commercial Transportation Firm Transportation Firm Transportation (Interruptible) Transportation Interruptible 1 3. Current Rates Gas Cost Adjustment \$0.64694 \$0.64694 \$0.64694 \$0.64694 \$0.38660 \$0.37099 2 Delivery Charge \$0.20251 \$0.20251 \$0.15606 \$0.07937 \$0.05378 \$0.07937 3 Transport Delivery Charge \$0.20251 \$0.15606 \$0.07937 \$0.05378 4 5 Monthly Charge \$18.50 \$28.00 \$28.00 \$70.00 \$70.00 \$355.00 \$355.00 \$45.00 \$45.00 \$355.00 6 4. Revenues Under Current Rates Cost of Gas - \$ Gas Cost Adjustment 71,930,625 8.338.444 2,509,698 12.211.252 40.086.754 7.890.331 894,147 8 Customer Additions 9 0 0 0 10 Weather Normalization 893,478 662,939 137,275 62,935 30,329 11 Irrigation Adjustment (1,198,166) (1,198,166) 12 Total Test Period Cost of Gas - \$ 71,625,936 40,749,693 8,027,606 8,401,379 2,540,027 11,013,085 894,147 0 0 0 0 Volumetric Charge - \$ 13 Delivery Charge 14 19,227,519 12,548,256 2,469,890 2,011,466 307,903 1,698,710 191,295 15 Transport Delivery Charge 6,326,354 122,347 1,030,120 4,751,141 422,746 16 Customer Additions 406,247 406,247 17 Weather Normalization Adjustment 269,391 207,518 42,971 15,182 3,721 Irrigation Adjustment 18 (234,694) (166.677) (68.017) Total Test Period Volumetric Charge - \$ 12,755,774 122,347 1.030.120 311,624 5,157,389 191.295 19 25,994,818 2,512,861 2.026.647 1,532,032 354,729 Monthly Charge - \$ 20 21 Monthly Charge - Sales 28,815,341 23,519,198 3,250,548 1,077,790 179,275 724,275 64,255 Monthly Charge - Transportation 1,147,256 68,656 385,770 185,535 22 507,295 23 Monthly Charge - GSRS 4,377,415 2.969.297 442,734 9,442 257.021 93,190 86,746 251.689 188,315 48,606 30,375 24 Customer Additions 12.780 12.780 Total Test Period Monthly Revenue- \$ 25 34,352,792 26,488,495 3,693,282 78,098 1,334,811 478,960 266,021 771,764 912,590 234,141 94,630 26 Total Test Period Revenue- \$ 60,347,610 39,244,269 6,206,143 200,445 3,361,458 1,509,080 577,644 5,929,153 2,444,623 588,871 285,924 27 Total Revenue - \$ 131,824,511 79,123,505 14,053,503 11,684,721 3,083,622 14,822,551 1,180,071 28 Test Period 200,445 1,509,080 5,510,126 656,888 29 Customer Additions 419,027 0 0 419,027 30 Weather Normalization 1,162,869 870,457 180,246 78,116 34,050 (1,432,860) 31 Irrigation Adjustment (1,364,843) (68,017)32 79,993,962 3.117.672

200,445

11.762.837

1,509,080

5,929,153

13,457,708

14,233,749

## Black Hills Kansas, Inc. Revenue Synchronization For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	Ι	J
Line No.	Description	Customer Charge Revenue	Delivery Charge Revenue	GSRS	Total 12-Month Period Ending September 30, 2024	Weather Normalization Adjustment	Irrigation Adjustment	Customer Additions	Incremental GSRS	Total 12-Month Period Ending September 30, 2025
1	Billing Determinants	\$29,962,597	\$25,553,873	\$2,986,484	\$58,502,955	\$269,391	(\$234,694)	\$419,027	\$1,390,931	\$60,347,610
2	Booked Revenue				\$58,366,048					
3	Synchronization Adjustment				\$136,907					
4	Statement I				\$58,502,955	\$269,391	(\$234,694)	\$419,027	\$1,390,931	\$60,347,610

# Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Load Factor Analysis

For the Test Year Ended September 30, 2024

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G
Line No	Weather Station	Therms	WNA Therms	Total Therms	Percent of Total	Load Factor	Weighted Average
110.	weather Station	Therms	with Themis	Total Therms	Therms	Loud I detoi	Loud I dotoi Li
1	<u>Residential</u>						
2	Concordia	207,618	5,646	213,264	0.34%	27.88%	0.09%
3	Dodge City	21,491,891	352,303	21,844,194	34.68%	29.43%	10.21%
4	Goodland	1,635,757	20,050	1,655,807	2.63%	35.70%	0.94%
5	Topeka	17,867,630	406,517	18,274,147	29.01%	26.65%	7.73%
6	Wichita	20,760,739	240,213	21,000,952	33.34%	26.65%	8.88%
7	Total	61,963,635	1,024,730	62,988,365	100.0%		27.85%
8	<u>Commercial</u>	SC	SV	LV	Winter Period	5	months
9	Adjusted Usage	13,012,730	19,587,128	71,315,450	Total	12	months
10	Winter Period Usage	10,174,634	13,646,104	29,849,928		41.67%	
11	Winter/Annual	78.19%	69.67%	41.86%			
12	Ratio to Average	1.88	1.67	1.00			
13	Peak to Average	5.00	4.00	1.50			
14	Load Factor - Use	20%	25%	67%			

# BLACK HILLS/KANSAS GAS UTILITY COMPANY, LLC/

# **DBA BLACK HILLS ENERGY**

# MAINS CLASSIFICATION AND CUSTOMER WEIGHTING FACTOR STUDY

The purpose of this document is to describe the development of the mains classification and customer weighting factors for Black Hills Kansas gas operations. In this study the following relationships are analyzed:

- 1. Meters and Regulators Accounts 381 through 385 Development of weighting factors that recognize the relative cost of the combined meter and regulator installation for each customer class.
- 2. Services Account 380 Development of weighting factors that recognize the relative cost of service lines for each customer class.
- 3. Mains Account 367 and Account 376 Development of the classification of mains investment between capacity, commodity, and customer related cost.
- 4. Customer Accounting Development of weighting factors that recognize the relative cost of providing customer accounting, meter reading, billing, and customer service for each customer class.

The data underlying these analyses are through September 30, 2024. The mains classification and weighting factors developed in this study are intended to be used in the class cost of service study performed in connection with Black Hills 2025 Kansas rate review which is based on a test year ended September 30, 2024 as adjusted for known and measurable adjustments.

Throughout these analyses, relative relationships are developed based on original costs restated to current cost levels (2024). The original cost levels are restated using Handy-Whitman cost indices for the North Central Region. By developing relationships based on current cost levels, inflationary impacts do not affect the analyses and more stable relationships result over time since the timing of renewals and replacements do not distort the analyses.

The analyses are based on detailed plant accounting data. The exhibits to the Direct Testimony of Ethan J. Fritel summarize the detailed analyses of the Company's plant accounting and customer data.

The attachments to this memorandum are as follows:

- 1. KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-12 Analysis of Meters and Regulators Accounts 381-385
- 2. KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-11 Analysis of Services Account 380
- 3. KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-10 Analysis of Mains Accounts 367 and 376

# Meters and Regulators

For purposes of cost allocation, the meters and regulators FERC Accounts 381 through 385 are combined. There are several reasons why this approach is reasonable. Typically, the meters and regulators are installed as a set and the assignment of the labor costs and the various piping components may be distributed through Accounts 381 through 384. In some cases, the cost of these installations may be split or allocated between Accounts 382 and 384; sometimes these accounts may not be used at all and these installation costs are booked to either Account 381 or 383. The approaches differ between utilities and may change over time within the same company (especially if the company is an amalgamation of acquisitions). Further, the accounting label of "industrial" for Account 385 is vague in the FERC Uniform System of Accounts especially compared to the definition of industrial that may be used in the development of rates. Furthermore, rates change over time and customers migrate between rates over time, but the plant accounting is not adjusted for this, nor would it be practical to do so. Finally, meters and regulators are fungible. Unlike piping, meters and regulators are commonly removed, rehabilitated or repaired, and then reinstalled in a different location. Based on all of these factors, it is most reasonable to treat Accounts 381 through 385 as a group and assign cost responsibility based on the installed cost of the entire meter and regulator set for each customer class regardless of where a customer's specific meter may be booked.

Plant investment in meters and regulators (Accounts 381 - 385) is allocated to customer classes on the basis of the number of customers weighted to recognize relative differences in the unit investment cost of the different types and sizes of meter and regulator sets used to connect customers in that class.

The analysis primarily relies upon the data contained in the Company's customer billing system and property records which provides an inventory and original cost of each type and size of meter and regulator. For the same reasons discussed below regarding mains and service lines, the original cost data should be restated in terms of current cost using Handy-Whitman indices for meters and regulators. The Company's plant accounting records contain sufficient detail to determine which meters are used for each class of customer. Handy-Whitman indices are used to restate the original cost of this data into current cost. Dividing the total current cost by the number of meters for each customer class provides a unit cost per customer. The regulator size data is similar to the size information available for service lines and is also restated to current cost. The meter and regulator set also includes an encoder-receiver-transmitter ("ERT") that is part of the automated meter reading system. This cost is also included in the estimated unit cost of each meter and regulator set for each class. The Large Volume customers are assigned a cost of \$2,200 to account for the additional materials and equipment, such as flow computers, needed to serve these large customers. The total unit cost for each customer class is the summation of each of these components. The relative unit cost is calculated for each class as the ratio of that class's unit cost relative to the unit cost of a Residential customer. These ratios are then used to develop weighting factors for each customer class, again with consideration also given to the relative size of a typical customer in each customer class.

KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-12 shows the calculations and the resulting class meters and regulators weighting factors are as follows:

Customer Class	2020	2024
Residential	1	1
Small Commercial	2	2
Small Volume	10	12
Large Volume	25	22
Irrigation	9	9

These weighting factors are applied to the number of customers for each class in the CCOSS to determine the meters and regulators allocation basis for each class. For example, a weighting factor of 10 means that the relative unit cost for that class is 10 times that of a Residential customer. The primary difference between the weighting factors used in the Company's last rate review in 2020 and the present case results from the significant increase in the investment in regulator equipment in Account 383. This unit cost of this investment was relatively uniform across customer classes thus increasing the relative unit cost of the installation for residential and small commercial customers relative to the larger customer classes, thus the decline in weighting factors.

## **Services**

We allocate plant investment in service lines to customer classes based on number of customers weighted to recognize relative differences in the unit investment cost in service lines used to connect customers in that class. The investment incurred to connect customers is a function of 1) the average service line length and 2) the unit cost per foot. The unit cost per foot is primarily a function of the diameter of the service required.

The analyses are summarized in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-11. As shown in KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-11, the first step is to determine the current cost of service lines by pipe diameter for service lines of 1-inch diameter or less and service lines greater than 1-inch from information in the Company's property records. The smaller service lines are primarily used for Residential and Small Commercial customers. Next, the unit cost of each of the service line diameters was determined using the number of service lines contained in the DOT reports for each size.

As is generally the case, the number of service lines contained in the DOT report is less than the total number of customers. This is since some customers, primarily Residential, share one service line. For example, on a multi-unit residential customer, it is common that the combined

unit will have one service line that splits into multiple meter and regulator sets, one for each unit. Therefore, I assume that the number of services lines for the Small Commercial, Small Volume, Large Volume, and Irrigation customer classes are equal to the number of customers with the number of Residential service lines being the remainder. The information shown at the top of KSG Direct Exhibit EJF-11 is summarized from the Company's detailed plant accounting records. Information from the Company's 2024 Annual Report to the Department of Transportation is summarized. The trended original cost is developed using trend factors based on the Handy Whitman Index for Accounts 380 for the North Central Region. Steel and Plastic services are shown separately because Handy Whitman develops separate indices for steel and plastic service lines.

Combining the property record data with the DOT reported information, we show the calculated average service line length and the calculated trended per foot cost. From these values we calculate the average cost of service lines by size of services reported.

The next step is to allocate each size of service line to each customer class based on the following assumptions:

- 1. All the Residential service lines are 1-inch or less; and
- 2. The remainder of the 1-inch or less service lines are assigned to the Small Commercial class (which is less than the total number of Small Commercial total service lines) and the remainder of the Small Commercial are assigned to the greater than 1-inch to 2-inch;
- 3. Small Volume service lines are greater than 1-inch to 2-inch;
- 4. Large Volume service lines are greater than 2-inch.
- 5. The remainder of the greater than 1-inch to 2-inch and greater than 2-inch are assigned to the Irrigation class.

Next, the number of services lines allocated to each customer class is multiplied by the applicable unit cost for each size service line, and the result is divided by the number of customers in each customer class to determine an average unit cost for a service line per customer for each class. A relative unit cost for each class is calculated as the ratio of that class's unit cost relative to the unit cost of a Residential customer. These ratios are then used to assign weighting factors to each class considering the relative size (use per customer) of a typical customer in each of the customer classes.

Customer Class	2020	2024
Residential	1	1
Small Commercial	1.25	1.25
Small Volume	2	2
Large Volume	4	4
Irrigation	3	3

The resulting class service line weighting factors are as follows:

These weighting factors are applied to the number of customers for each class in the CCOSS to determine the service line and customer component of mains allocation bases for each class. For example, a weighting factor of four means that the relative unit cost for that class is four times that of a Residential customer. The results of the 2020 and 2024 studies are unchanged.

# Mains

There are three components of cost associated with service from a gas distribution system. These cost components are capacity (peak), energy (commodity or throughput), and customer related. Investment in mains is related to all three of these cost components. We generally consider transmission mains to serve capacity and energy functions, and distribution mains to serve customer<sup>1</sup> and capacity functions.

As a functional classification, transmission (from an engineering, cost allocation perspective) represents the movement of natural gas from sources of supply to general areas of consumption. The distribution function on the other hand represents the movement of gas within general areas of consumption to individual customers.

The definition of the transmission and distribution function is not the same things as the FERC Uniform System of Accounts Definition of transmission and distribution. As indicated above, the transmission function for cost allocation purposes includes facilities that move gas from sources of supply to general areas of consumption. This function is generally served by higher diameter, higher pressure mains that only directly serve very large customers. Facilities that are booked to both the transmission mains account (primarily Account 367) and distribution mains (primarily Account 376) serve this function. Therefore, higher diameter, higher pressure distribution mains also serve a transmission function.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The customer-related function is not the same at the customer-related cost component. Within the distribution function primary accounts are the services, meters, and regulators which are for the most part used to serve individual customers. Costs associated with these items are considered customer related. There is also a customer component of distribution mains which recognizes the cost implications of the distance between individual customers or customer density on the cost of distribution mains.

The allocation of investment in facilities serving a transmission function should recognize that these facilities are used to meet both peak and annual requirements of customers. These facilities, though sized to meet system peak requirements, are also influenced by annual requirements. To recognize this dual nature, the cost of these facilities should be allocated on a basis that recognizes both peak and annual use of the facilities. A variety of methods have been used to recognize the dual nature of these facilities. For the purpose of allocating transmission-related costs on the BH Kansas Gas system, we have historically used a weighting of 2/3 peak and 1/3 annual responsibility.

The allocation of investment in facilities serving a distribution function should recognize that the cost of these facilities is driven by two principal factors. First is the cost of extending the system to connect individual customers. Second is the cost associated with the capacity (peak day) requirements of the customers connected. Though facilities serving a distribution function are also used to meet customers' annual requirements, due to the local nature of the facilities and their customer specific cost, we do not allocate any cost associated with the distribution function on the basis of annual throughput. By allocating costs of facilities, which are functionally classified as distribution on the basis of number of customers and peak period requirements, reasonable results are achieved.

We use a classification/allocation basis for transmission and distribution mains that recognizes the functional use (transmission/distribution) of these facilities by classifying costs on a basis that recognizes the customer, capacity, and commodity related components of cost embedded in the transmission and distribution mains investment. We develop this classification in two steps. First, we define what facilities serve a transmission function (regardless of which mains FERC account is used). This definition is based on mains larger than a certain size (usually 6- or 8-inches) that serve a transmission function. In the second step we determine how the remaining investment (distribution function) should be split between customer and capacity. We typically develop this split based on examination of relative capacity and cost relationships.

In evaluating what facilities serve a distribution function, we examine the relative capacity provided by various pipe sizes. Pipeline flow formulas generally suggest that the capacity of a pipeline is proportional to its diameter to something on the order of the 2.5 power. Raising the diameter to the 2.5 power and multiplying by distance results in an indication of the relative capacity of the system. Typically, the break point between the transmission and distribution function falls at approximately the midpoint of the cumulative relative capacity, such that half of the capacity is assigned to transmission and half to distribution.

In Exhibit EJF-10, we show the analysis of mains. The original cost (Column C) and length (Column D) are summarized from the Company's detailed property accounting records. The trended original cost (Column G) is developed using trend factors based on the Handy Whitman Index for Accounts 367 and 376 for the North Central Region. The relative capacity (as discussed above) is shown in Column E. The trended original cost per foot is shown in Column H and

trended original cost per unit of relative capacity is shown in Column I. Account 367 Transmission Mains are summarized in Lines 1 through 17 and Account 376 Distribution Mains are summarized in Lines 24 through 41. The sum of the transmission and distribution mains is shown in Lines 44 through 54.

As shown in the cumulative relative capacity (Column F), 50 percent of the system capacity falls between 8- and 10-inch mains. Therefore, classifying mains that are 8 inches in diameter as distribution results in approximately 49 percent of the total system capacity being classified as distribution and 51 percent as transmission. Based on the trended original cost, 18.43 percent of the mains investment is for mains over 8 inches in diameter and 81.57 percent of the mains investment is for mains 8 inches in diameter or less.

Of the mains classified as transmission (18.43 percent of cost), we classify two-thirds as capacity related and one-third as commodity related. As shown on Lines 57 and 58, this results in 12.29 percent of mains (combined Accounts 367 and 376) being classified at Transmission-Capacity and 6.14 percent as Transmission-Commodity.

The mains classified as distribution (81.57 percent of cost), we classify between capacity and customer. The portion we classify as capacity is based on the unit cost of capacity of the 8-inch mains (the largest distribution function mains) which equals \$0.39 per unit of capacity (feet times diameter to the 2.5 power). This results in 26.00 percent of the investment in distribution mains being classified as capacity related and 74.00 percent as customer related. Applying these percentages to the 81.57 percent of cost that is distribution related results in 21.21 percent of mains being classified as Distribution – Capacity and 60.36 percent as Distribution Customer related. These calculations are shown in Lines 61 through 66 of Exhibit EJF-10.

	2020	2024
Allocation		
Transmission – Capacity	10.70%	12.29%
Transmission – Commodity	5.35%	6.14%
Distribution – Capacity	31.95%	21.21%
Distribution – Customer	52.00%	60.36%

The functionalization of transmission and distribution mains is shown below:

The differences between the 2020 and 2024 studies are primarily driven by the investment and retirements that have occurred since the last rate case. Generally, most of the investment has been made in smaller diameter pipe, the largest increase being in two-inch mains. The table below compares the booked cost and length in feet of transmission and distribution mains by size. As discussed above, the mains with a diameter of 8 inches and less are classified as distribution for functionalization. Investment in 2-inch mains increased by \$22,036,631 and 423,071 feet. These smaller diameter distribution mains primarily serve a customer function. As such, if the investment in smaller diameter mains increases relative to the investment in higher diameter mains, the relative percentage of mains serving a customer function should increase and the percentage serving commodity and capacity functions should decline.

	2020		2024				
	Booked		Booked				
Diameter	Cost	Length	Cost	Length			
Inches	\$	Feet	\$	Feet			
1	\$3,238,458	350,273	\$3,150,019	350,017			
2	\$57,019,182	7,905,464	\$79,055,813	8,328,535			
3	\$1,886,135	715,950	\$1,786,268	656,127			
4	\$30,873,342	2,974,397	\$43,998,475	3,247,861			
6	\$21,821,393	1,587,216	\$27,260,823	1,582,972			
8	\$9,662,638	358,399	\$16,536,414	435,143			
10	\$5,821,085	391,649	\$5,765,858	390,243			
12	\$9,730,165	368,673	\$18,989,523	453,436			
14	\$79,798	638	\$79,798	638			
16	\$371,927	76,589	\$220,633	45,276			
Total	\$140,504,122	14,729,248	\$196,843,924	15,490,248			

## **Customer Accounting**

The Customer Accounting cost function includes operation and maintenance expenses booked to FERC Accounts 901 through 916 which include Customer Accounts Expenses, Customer Service and Information Expenses, and Sales Expenses. The customer accounting weighting factors used reflect the relative cost of reading meters, customer accounting and billing, collections, and customer service for each of the customer classes. I recommend using the same weighting factors for the current study with the Irrigation class weighting factor set at the same as the Small Commercial class.

Customer Class	2020	2024
Residential	1	1
Small Commercial	2	2
Small Volume	4	4
Large Volume	20	20
Irrigation	2	2

The following customer accounting weighting factors are used in the CCOSS:

The weighting factors used in the current case are the same as those used in prior rate cases.

Black I	Hills Kansas Gas, LLC								KSG Dir	ect Exhibit EJF-10
Test V	classification Study									
Test I	[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]	[E]	[F]	[G]	[H]	[I]	[1]
	1	1	-	1		Cumulative	Trended	Trended	TOC per	Cumulative
Line			Original		Relative	Relative	Original	Cost per	Capacity	Trended
No.	Description	Diameter	Cost	Length	Capacity	Capacity	Cost	Foot	Unit	Original Cost
	!ł	Inches	\$	Feet			\$	\$/ft		0
					(1)			(2)	(3)	
1	Transmission Mains - Account 367									
2	Plastic	1	17,544	4,906	4,906	0.49%	33,233	6.77	\$6.77	2.10%
3	Plastic	2	486,101	50,719	286,910	28.91%	1,013,966	19.99	\$3.53	64.10%
4	Plastic	4	265,771	17,648	564,736	56.91%	451,144	25.56	\$0.80	28.52%
5	Plastic	8	57,722	750	135,765	13.68%	83,601	111.47	\$0.62	5.28%
6	Subtotal Transmission	_	827,138	74,023	992,316	100%	1,581,944			
7	Steel	1	151,396	11,236	11,236	0.00%	918,562	81.75	\$81.75	0.32%
8	Steel	2	503,398	95,297	539,081	0.10%	3,582,811	37.60	\$6.65	1.25%
9	Steel	3	99,718	22,747	354,591	0.07%	1,283,346	56.42	\$3.62	0.45%
10	Steel	4	4,473,054	551,792	17,657,344	3.26%	25,792,828	46.74	\$1.46	8.97%
11	Steel	6	14,273,141	1,101,487	97,130,920	17.95%	120,093,751	109.03	\$1.24	41.76%
12	Steel	8	10,853,293	281,080	50,880,915	9.40%	23,045,620	81.99	\$0.45	8.01%
13	Steel	10	4,054,399	335,824	106,196,873	19.62%	40,288,664	119.97	\$0.38	14.01%
14	Steel	12	17,986,742	444,942	221,950,699	41.01%	72,013,581	161.85	\$0.32	25.04%
15	Steel	14	61,403	169	123,939	0.02%	145,923	863.45	\$1.18	0.05%
16	Steel	16	220,633	45,276	46,362,624	8.57%	429,200	9.48	\$0.01	0.15%
17	Subtotal Transmission		52,677,178	2,889,850	541,208,222	100%	287,594,287			
18 19	Total Transmission Mains - Account 367		53,504,316	2,963,873	542,200,539		289,176,231			
20	Classification of Transmission (Account 367)									
21	Capacity						50.00%			
22	Commodity						50.00%			
23	Distribution Mains - Account 376									
24	Plastic	1	2,550,028	250,423	250,423	0.22%	4,965,547	19.83	\$19.83	2.74%
25	Plastic	2	69,299,115	5,829,215	32,975,020	28.35%	113,420,207	19.46	\$3.44	62.51%
26	Plastic	3	823,691	287,821	4,486,685	3.86%	2,472,472	8.59	\$0.55	1.36%
27	Plastic	4	31,832,725	1,883,178	60,261,696	51.81%	50,083,611	26.60	\$0.83	27.60%
28	Plastic	6	7,267,610	169,894	14,981,530	12.88%	9,928,151	58.44	\$0.66	5.47%
29	Plastic	8	817,137	7,787	1,409,598	1.21%	538,284	69.13	\$0.38	0.30%
30	Plastic	10	14,309	6,155	1,946,382	1.67%	21,697	3.53	\$0.01	0.01%
31	Subtotal Distribution		112,604,614	8,434,473	116,311,333	100%	181,429,970			
32	Steel	1	431,051	83,452	83,452	0.07%	1,254,212	15.03	\$15.03	0.54%
33	Steel	2	8,767,199	2,353,304	13,312,298	11.29%	96,444,428	40.98	\$7.24	41.46%
34	Steel	3	862,860	345,559	5,386,732	4.57%	12,688,183	36.72	\$2.36	5.45%
35	Steel	4	7,426,925	795,243	25,447,776	21.59%	58,783,412	73.92	\$2.31	25.27%
36	Steel	6	5,720,072	311,591	27,476,603	23.31%	31,419,198	100.83	\$1.14	13.51%
37	Steel	8	4,808,562	145,526	26,343,020	22.34%	17,275,594	118.71	\$0.66	7.43%
38	Steel	10	1,697,150	48,264	15,262,417	12.95%	11,419,409	236.60	\$0.75	4.91%
39	Steel	12	1,002,780	8,494	4,237,067	3.59%	2,972,920	350.00	\$0.70	1.28%
40	Steel Subtatel Distribution	14	18,394	469	545,948	0.29%	309,878	/88.65	\$1.08	0.16%
41	Subiotal Distribution		50,754,994	4,091,902	11/,095,512		232,027,233			

12,526,375

414,057,203

143,339,608

42 Total Distribution Mains - Account 376

#### Black Hills Kansas Gas, LLC Mains Classification Study

Test Year Ending September 30, 2024

	[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]	[E]	[F]	[G]	[H]	[I]	[J]
Line			Original		Relative	Cumulative Relative	Trended Original	Trended Cost per	TOC per Capacity	Cumulative Trended
No.	Description	Diameter	Cost	Length	Capacity	Capacity	Cost	Foot	Unit	Original Cost
	N N. C.	Inches	\$	Feet			\$	\$/ft		
43	Net Mains					0.050/			<b>**</b> *	
44	Plastic & Steel	1	3,150,019	350,017	350,017	0.05%	/,1/1,553	20.49	\$20.49	1.04%
45	Plastic & Steel	2	/9,055,815	8,528,535	4/,115,509	0.11%	214,401,411	25.75	\$4.55	31.99%
40	Plastic & Steel	3	1,/80,208	030,12/	10,228,008	7.43%	10,444,002	25.06	\$1.01	54.5/%
4/	Plastic & Steel	4	43,998,473	5,247,601	105,951,552	20.8270	155,110,990	41.00	\$1.50	35.6/70
40	Plastic & Steel	0	27,200,623	1,362,972	78 760 207	58.80% 48.04%	20 460 010	70.00	\$1.10	//.1/70 81 570/
49	Plastic & Steel	8	57(5.959	455,145	122,405,(72)	48.9470	51,720,770	122.56	\$0.39	81.3770
50	Plastic & Steel	10	3,/03,838	390,243	125,405,072	04.84%	51,729,770	152.50	\$0.42 \$0.22	89.04%
51	Steel	12	10,969,323	455,450	220,187,707	93.97%	/4,980,301	103.37	\$0.55 \$1.10	99.80%
53	Steel	14	220 633	45 276	46 362 624	100.00%	429 200	0.47	\$0.01	100.00%
54	Total Distribution	10_	196 843 924	15 / 90 2/8	776 405 184	100.0070	692 750 344	7.40	\$0.01	100.0070
54	1 otal Distribution		170,045,724	15,490,240	//0,405,104		072,750,544			
55	Classification of Distribution									
56	Total 10 inches and Over - Transmission Function			889,593	396,423,950		127,661,273			18.43%
57	Canacity Assignment			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	66.67%				-	12.29%
58	Commodity Assignment				33.33%					6.14%
	, .									
59	Total 8 inches and Less - Distribution			14,600,655	379,981,235		565,089,071			81.57%
60	Distribution Capacity/Customer Assignment								=	
61	Relative Capacity of less than 10 inches				379,981,235	Column E, Line 56				
62	Unit TOC per Capacity of 8 inch				0.39	Column I, Line 47				
63	TOC of less than 10 inch that is Capacity Related		146,938,371 Line 58 times Line 59							
64	TOC of less than 10 inches				565,089,071	Sum on Column G, Line	es 42 through 47			
65	Capacity Assignment				26.00%	Line 60 / Line 61				21.21%
66	Customer Assignement				74.00%	1 minus Line 62				60.36%
67	Overall Asssignment									
68	Commodity				6.14%	Column J, Line 55				
69	Canacity				33 50%	Column I Line 54 plus	Column I Line 62			

60.36% Column J Line 63

Capacity Customer 70

(1) Diameter (Column B) to the 2.5 power times length (Column D)
 (2) Trended Original Cost (Column G) divided by length (Column D).
 (3) Trended Original Cost (Column G) divided by relative capacity (Column E).

Exhibit EJF-10

lack ervic est Y	Hills Kansas Gas, LLC e Lines Weighting Factor Study ear Ending September 30, 2024									K	SG Direct Exhibit EJF-
	[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]	[E]	[F]	[G]	[H]	[1]	[1]	[K]
ine											
lo. 1	Property Data										
2	Company	Diam	Quantity	Book Cost	тос	Ave Cost/Foot					
2	Black Hills Kansas Gas, LLC	1" or less	8,547,099	\$89,906,694	\$160,983,775	\$18.83	)				
3	Black Hills Kansas Gas, LLC	>1" thru 2"	364,304	\$5,024,826	\$7,792,172	\$21.39					
4	Black Hills Kansas Gas, LLC	>2" thru 4"	76,065	\$922,035	\$1,872,075	\$24.61					
5		Totals	8,987,468	95,853,555	170,648,022	\$18.99	ļ				
6 7 8	2024 DOT Report - Number of Services				2024 DOT Report S	ummary					
-			DOT Number of			DOT Number of	ן				
9	Company	Diam	Services		Diameter	Service Lines		2024 PHMSA	Report		
0	Black Hills Kansas Gas, LLC	Unknown	0		1" or less	100,573	j	Total Services	-	106,281	
1		1" or less	100,573		>1" thru 2"	4,884	)	Avg Serv Lengt	th	75	
2		>1" thru 2"	4,884		> 2"	824		Number of feet		7,971,075	
3		>2" thru 4"	814		Total	106,281					
4		>4" thru 8"	10		Unknown	0	Į				
5					Total w/Unknown	106,281	ļ				
.7 18 19		Average Cost					r	Average	Relative	Relative	
						Ave Cost per		Cost/	Cost per	Cost per	Use for
20		Diameter	Quantity - ft	Quantity - #	TOC	Foot	Average Length	Service	Foot	Service	Services
21		1" or less	8 547 099	100 573	160 983 775	\$18.83	85	\$1 600 67	1 000	1.00	1.00
2		>1" thru 2"	364,304	4,884	7,792,172	\$21.39	75	\$1,595.45	1.14	1.00	1.50
3		> 2"	76,065	824	1.872.075	\$24.61	92	\$2,271.94	1.31	1.42	2.00
Δ		Totals	8 987 468	106 281	\$170 648 022			. ,			
5 6 7		Adjusted Data	6,767,700	100,201	\$170,040,022						
8		Diameter	Quantity - ft	Quantity - #	тос	Ave Cost per	Average Length	Average Cost/			
29		1" or less	7 844 694	100 573	147 715 588	\$18.83	78	\$1,468.74			
0		>1" thru 2"	537,240	4.884	15,174.344	\$28.25	110	\$3,106.95			
1		> 2"	123,600	824	4,654,776	\$37.66	150	\$5,649.00			
2		Totals	8,505,534	106,281	\$167,544,708						
3			· · · ·		· · · · ·	·					
4 5	Customer Class Weighting Factors	[	Average Cost/ Customer	\$1,468.74	\$3,106.95	\$5,649.00	]				
		Number of	Number of Service				Unit Cost/	<b>Relative Unit</b>	Weighting		
6	Customer Class	Customers (1)	Lines	1" or less	>1" thru 2"	> 2"	Customer	Cost	Factor		
7	Residential	105,942	92,800	92,800			\$1,469	1.00	1.00		
38	Small Commercial	9,879	9,879	7,773	2,106		\$1,818	1.24	1.25		
39	Small Volume	1,742	1,742		1,742		\$3,107	2.12	2.00		
10	Large Volume	175	175			175	\$5,649	3.85	4.00		
41	Irrigation	1,685	1,685		1,036	649	\$4,086	2.78	3.00		
+2	Totals	119,423	106,281	100,573	4,884	824	1				

### Black Hills Kansas Gas, LLC Meters Weighting Factor Study Test Year Ending September 30, 2024

	Α	В	С	D	Ε	F	G	Н
Line No.	Customer Class	Meters	тос	Ave TOC/Meter	Regulators	Total Meters & Regulators	Relative Use Factors	Use
1	Residential	105,050	18,978,385	\$181	\$449	\$629	1.0	1.0
2	Small Commercial	9,807	4,312,759	\$440	\$1,092	\$1,532	2.4	2.0
3	Small Volume Firm & Transportation	1,765	3,921,779	\$2,222	\$5,518	\$7,740	12.3	12.0
4	Large Volume Firm, Transport & Interruptible	419	1,701,053	\$4,060	\$10,082	\$14,141	22.5	22.0
5	Irrigation	1,809	2,881,336	\$1,593	\$3,955	\$5,548	8.8	9.0
6		118,850	\$31,795,312					
7								
8								
9	Retirement Unit	Quantity	TOC					
10	Meter Bar Regulator Assembly-<2"	58,473	62,563,248					
11	Meter Bar Regulator Assembly-2"	48	87,486					
12	Regulator, Gas - Less Than 2"	105,011	11,856,349					
13	Regulator, Gas - 2"	1,148	2,393,194					
14	Regulator, Gas - >=3"	19,479	2,046,828					
15	Regulator, Gas - Not Available	35	10,152					
16	Totals	184,194	\$78,957,257					
17		*						
18	Regulator as a Percent of Meter		248.33%					

#### Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Functional Classification of Cost of Service and Rate Base For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J	K	L	М	Ν
			Total								Meters			
Line	Acct.		Gas Utility	Gas Si	upply	Transm	ission	Distrib	ution		and	Customer		
Number	No.	Description	Adjusted	Demand	Commodity	Demand	Commodity	Demand	Customer	Services	Regulators	Accounts	Direct	Allocation Basis or Reference
			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
1	Summa	ry												
2		Rate Base	305,947,330	2,662,837	0	20,419,870	10,618,242	35,240,476	100,288,312	72,284,806	58,434,216	5,998,571	0	Table 2 Line 62
3		Rate of Return	7.63%	7.63%	7.63%	7.63%	7.63%	7.63%	7.63%	7.63%	7.63%	7.63%	7.63%	
4		Total Cost of Service												
5		Operation & Maintenance Expenses	32,351,842	0	0	1,447,802	1,717,362	2,498,607	7,110,603	6,524,077	5,395,897	7,657,494	0	Table 3 Line 81
6		Depreciation Expenses	12,746,995	0	0	695,081	360,188	1,199,567	3,413,760	2,753,666	2,225,063	2,099,670	0	Table 4 Line 9
7		Taxes Other Than Income Taxes	8,963,372	0	0	577,893	314,706	997,323	2,838,209	2,097,988	1,700,573	436,680	0	Table 4 Line 14
8		Return	23,343,781	203,174	0	1,558,036	810,172	2,688,848	7,651,998	5,515,331	4,458,531	457,691	0	Line 2 x Line 3
9		Income Taxes	3,528,847	30,714	0	235,526	122,473	406,469	1,156,742	833,745	673,990	69,188	0	Rate Base
10		Other Operating Revenues	(3,379,475)	0	0	(323,929)	(170,585)	(559,035)	(1,590,918)	(139,947)	(115,751)	(145,696)	(333,613)	Table 4 Line 19
11		Total Cost of Service	77,555,361	233,888	0	4,190,408	3,154,316	7,231,779	20,580,394	17,584,859	14,338,303	10,575,027	(333,613)	Sum of Lines 5 thru 10
## Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Functional Classification of Rate Base For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	Α	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J	K	L	М	Ν
Line	Acct		Total Gas Utility	Gas Su	pply	Transm	ission	Distri	bution		Meters and	Customer		
Number	No.	Description	Adjusted	Demand	Commodity	Demand	Commodity	Demand	Customer	Services	Regulators	Accounts	Direct	Allocation Basis or Reference
		•	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	•
1	Gas P	lant in Service												
2	201	Intangible Plant	196 022	0	0	0.750	6.944	15 114	42 011	20.460	22 (45	41.001	0	Several of M
5	301	Organization	186,932	0	0	8,/58	6,844	15,114	43,011	39,469	32,645	41,091	0	Supervised O&M
4	202	Franchises & Consents Miscellaneous Intengible Plant	2 246 828	0	0	3,515	2,745	262 514	747.071	15,834	567.018	10,484	0	Supervised O&M
5	505	Total Intangible Plant	3 508 760	0	0	164 383	128 457	202,514	807 337	740 850	612 759	771 283	0	Sum of Lines 3 thru 5
5		Total mangiole I lan	5,500,700	0	0	104,505	120,457	205,071	007,557	/40,050	012,755	//1,205	0	Sun of Lines 5 und 5
5		Production & Gathering Plant												
5	336	Purification Equipment	0			0	0	0	0					Mains Allocation
5		Total Product. & Gather. Plant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Sum of Line 5
6		Transmission Plant												
7	365	Land & Land Rights	737,239			90,607	45,266	156,368	444,997					Mains Allocation
8	366	Structures & Improvements	261,735			32,167	16,071	55,514	157,983					Mains Allocation
9	367	Mains	61,180,956			7,519,140	3,756,511	12,976,481	36,928,825					Mains Allocation
10	368	Compressor Station Equipment	2,475			304	152	525	1,494					Mains Allocation
11	369	Measuring & Reg. Station Eq.	5,388,010			662,186	330,824	1,142,797	3,252,203					Mains Allocation
12	3/1	Tetal Transmission Plant	106,238	0	0	13,057	6,523	22,533	64,125	0	0	0	0	Mains Allocation
15		Total Transmission Plant	07,070,033	0	0	8,317,401	4,155,547	14,554,218	40,849,628	0	0	0	0	Sum of Lines / thru 12
14		Distribution Plant												
15	374	Land & Land Rights	979 307			120 357	60 129	207 711	591 110					Mains Allocation
16	375	Structures & Improvements	1.188.888			146.114	72.998	252,163	717.613					Mains Allocation
17	376	Mains	165,607,324			20.353.140	10,168,290	35,125,314	99,960,581					Mains Allocation
18	377	Compressor Station Equipment	175,304			21,545	10,764	37,182	105,813					Mains Allocation
19	378	Meas. & Reg. Sta. Equip.	10,654,248			1,309,407	654,171	2,259,766	6,430,904					Mains Allocation
20	379	Meas. & Reg. Sta. Equip CG	61,111			7,510	3,752	12,962	36,886					Mains Allocation
21	380	Services	106,525,531							106,525,531				Services
22	381	Meters	24,534,672								24,534,672			Meters and Regulators
23	382	Meter Installations	4,871,135								4,871,135			Meters and Regulators
24	383	House Regulators	53,543,483								53,543,483			Meters and Regulators
25	385	Indust. Meas. & Reg. Sta. Equip.	2,962,366								2,962,366			Meters and Regulators
26	387	Other Equipment	115,909			14,245	7,117	24,584	69,963					Mains Allocation
27		Total Distribution Plant	371,219,276	0	0	21,972,319	10,977,220	37,919,681	107,912,869	106,525,531	85,911,655	0	0	Sum of Lines 15 thru 26
20		Conorol Plant												
20	380	Land & Land Rights	856 543	0	0	40 129	31 358	69 254	197.084	180 853	149 584	188 282	0	Supervised O&M
30	390	Structures and Improvements	13 423 778	0	0	628 896	491 449	1 085 344	3 088 701	2 834 335	2 344 287	2 950 767	0	Supervised O&M
31	391	Office Furniture & Equipment	1 784 950	0	0	83 624	65 348	144 317	410 702	376 879	311 718	392 361	0	Supervised O&M
32	392	Transportation Equipment	12,927,430	0	Ő	605,642	473,277	1.045.213	2,974,495	2,729,535	2.257.606	2.841.661	0	Supervised O&M
33	393	Stores Equipment	55,274	0	0	2,590	2,024	4,469	12,718	11,671	9,653	12,150	0	Supervised O&M
34	394	Tools & Work Equipment	4,896,920	0	0	229,418	179,278	395,927	1,126,741	1,033,950	855,183	1,076,423	0	Supervised O&M
35	395	Laboratory Equipment	11,714	0	0	549	429	947	2,695	2,473	2,046	2,575	0	Supervised O&M
36	396	Power Operated Equipment	1,099,514	0	0	51,512	40,254	88,898	252,989	232,154	192,016	241,691	0	Supervised O&M
37	397	Communication Equipment	1,221,839	0	0	57,242	44,732	98,789	281,135	257,983	213,378	268,580	0	Supervised O&M
38	398	Misc. Equipment	32,417	0	0	1,519	1,187	2,621	7,459	6,845	5,661	7,126	0	Supervised O&M
39		General Plant	36,310,377	0	0	1,701,118	1,329,334	2,935,779	8,354,720	7,666,678	6,341,131	7,981,617	0	Sum of Lines 29 thru 38
40	118	Other Utility Plant (Allocated on Customer Count)	277,554	-	-		508 0C -					277,554	-	Customer Accounts
41	118	Other Utility Plant (Allocated on Blended Ratio)	16,307,851	0	0	764,013	597,035	1,318,528	3,752,303	3,443,287	2,847,952	3,584,734	0	Supervised O&M
			16,585,405	0	0	/64,013	597,035	1,318,528	3,/52,303	3,443,287	2,847,952	3,862,288	0	
42		Total Plant in Service	495,300,471	0	0	32,919,294	17,187,393	56,811,897	161,676,856	118,376,345	95,713,498	12,615,188	0	Sum of Lines 5, 5, 13, 27 and 39

## Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Functional Classification of Rate Base For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	Ι	J	K	L	М	Ν
			Total								Meters			
Line	Acct.		Gas Utility	Gas S	upply	Transmi	ission	Distrib	ution		and	Customer		
Number	No.	Description	Adjusted	Demand	Commodity	Demand	Commodity	Demand	Customer	Services	Regulators	Accounts	Direct	Allocation Basis or Reference
			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
43	Accum	ulated Depreciation												
44		Intangible	(2,856,240)	0	0	(133,813)	(104,568)	(230,934)	(657,197)	(603,075)	(498,805)	(627,848)	0	Intangible Plant
45		Production & Gathering	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prod. & Gathering Plant
46		Transmission	(16,209,075)	0	0	(1,992,095)	(995,237)	(3,437,945)	(9,783,797)	0	0	0	0	Transmission Plant
47		Distribution	(103,784,334)	0	0	(6,142,953)	(3,068,977)	(10,601,467)	(30,169,945)	(29,782,078)	(24,018,914)	0	0	Distribution Plant
48		General	(9,276,564)	0	0	(434,601)	(339,618)	(750,032)	(2,134,461)	(1,958,680)	(1,620,030)	(2,039,141)	0	General Plant
49		Other Utility Plant (Allocated on Customer Count)	(97,596)									(97,596)		Customer Accounts
50		Other Utility Plant (Allocated on Blended Ratio)	(6,532,545)	0	0	(306,046)	(239,158)	(528,171)	(1,503,085)	(1,379,300)	(1,140,823)	(1,435,961)	0	Supervised O&M
51		Total Accumulated Depreciation	(138,756,353)	0	0	(9,009,508)	(4,747,558)	(15,548,549)	(44,248,486)	(33,723,133)	(27,278,572)	(4,200,546)	0	Sum of Lines 44 thru 48
52		Net Plant	356,544,118	0	0	23,909,786	12,439,834	41,263,349	117,428,370	84,653,212	68,434,925	8,414,642	0	Line 42 - Line 51
53	Other F	Rate Base Items												
54		Materials & Supplies	2,899,107	0	0	192,684	100,602	332,533	946,332	692,884	560,233	73,840	0	Plant in Service
55		Gas Storage	2,662,837	2,662,837										Gas Supply - Demand
56		Prepayments	52,303	0	0	3,507	1,825	6,053	17,226	12,418	10,039	1,234	0	Net Plant
57		Customer Advances	(506,945)	0	0	(23,750)	(18,559)	(40,988)	(116,644)	(107,038)	(88,531)	(111,435)	0	Supervised O&M
58		Customer Deposits	(1,090,806)									(1,090,806)		Customer Accounts
59		Other Rate Base Tax Items	(54,613,284)	0	0	(3,662,357)	(1,905,459)	(6,320,472)	(17,986,972)	(12,966,670)	(10,482,450)	(1,288,904)	0	Net Plant
60		Total Other Rate Base Items	(50,596,788)	2,662,837	0	(3,489,916)	(1,821,592)	(6,022,873)	(17,140,058)	(12,368,406)	(10,000,710)	(2,416,071)	0	Sum of Lines 54 thru 59
61														
62		Total Rate Base	305,947,330	2,662,837	0	20,419,870	10,618,242	35,240,476	100,288,312	72,284,806	58,434,216	5,998,571	0	Line 52 + Line 60

# Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Functional Classification of Operation and Maintenance Expenses For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J	К	L	М	Ν
			Total								Meters			
Line	Acct.		Gas Utility	Gas S	Supply	Transn	nission	Distrib	oution		and	Customer		
Numbe	r No.	Description	Adjusted	Demand	Commodity	Demand	Commodity	Demand	Customer	Services	Regulators	Accounts	Direct	Allocation Basis or Reference
			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
1	0 & M	Expenses												
2	0.00	Transmission Expenses												
3		Operation												
4	850	Supervision & Engineering	181,374			22,291	11,136	38,469	109,478					Mains Allocation
5	851	Sys. Control & Load Dispatch.	1,550				1,550							Transmission - Commodity
6	852	Communication System Expenses	1,239			152	76	263	748					Mains Allocation
7	856	Mains Expenses	215,672			26,506	13,242	45,744	130,180					Mains Allocation
8	857	Meas. & Reg. Sta. Expenses	8,010			984	492	1,699	4,835					Mains Allocation
9	859	Other Expenses	232,030			28,516	14,247	49,214	140,053					Mains Allocation
10	860	Rents	19,709			2,422	1,210	4,180	11,896					Mains Allocation
11		Total Operation	659,584	0	0	80,872	41,953	139,569	397,190	0	0	0	0	Sum of Lines 4 thru 9
12		Maintonanaa												
12	861	Supervision & Engineering	24.448			3 005	1 501	5 186	14 757					Maine Allocation
15	862	Supervision & Engineering Structures & Improvements	24,440			5,003	261	5,180	2 562					Mains Allocation
14	863	Mains	6 246			768	383	1 325	3,770					Mains Allocation
15	864	Compressor Station Equipment	0,240			,00	0	1,525	5,770					Mains Allocation
16	865	Meas. & Reg. Sta. Equip.	1.628			200	100	345	983					Mains Allocation
	866	Communication Equipment	5 366			659	329	1 138	3 239					Mains Allocation
17	867	Other Equipment	0			0	0	0	0					Mains Allocation
18		Total Maintenance	41,932	0	0	5,153	2,575	8,894	25,310	0	0	0	0	Sum of Lines 13 thru 17
19		Total Transmission Expenses	701,517	0	0	86,026	44,528	148,463	422,500	0	0	0	0	Line 11 + Line 18
20		Distribution Expenses												
21	070	Operation	1 007 147			112 100	5( 250	102 (14	550.002	(27.779	256 216			4
22	870	Supervision & Engineering	1,907,147			112,188	56,259	195,014	550,992	037,778	330,310			Accounts 8/1 - 880
23	8/1	Commences Station Exmanses	1,550				1,550							Transmission - Commodity
24	874	Maine & Services	2 221 080			240.976	120 200	415 875	1 182 510	1 261 227				Accounts 376 and 380
25	875	Measuring & Regulating Sta Equip - General	411 639			50 590	25 275	87 309	248 466	1,201,237				Account 378
20	876	Measuring & Regulating Sta. Equip, - General	25 985			50,590	23,275	07,505	240,400		25 985			Meters and Regulators
28	877	Measuring & Regulating Stat. Equip, - Inc.	138.853			17.065	8.526	29.451	83.812		25,765			Account 379
29	878	Meters & House Regulators	878,442			- ,,	-,				878,442			Meters and Regulators
30	879	Customer Installation Expenses	579,715							579,715				Services
31	880	Other Expenses	1,744,926			103,281	51,599	178,242	507,247	500,726	403,830			Distribution Plant
32	881	Rents	16,633			985	492	1,699	4,835	4,773	3,850			Distribution Plant
33		Total Operation	8,926,103	0	0	525,086	263,311	906,190	2,578,862	2,984,230	1,668,423	0	0	Sum of Lines 22 thru 32
24		Meintenan												
34	005	Maintenance	84.013	0	^	4.251	2 174	7.500	21.2/7	11.070	26 725	0		A
35	885	Supervision & Engineering	84,013	0	0	4,351	2,1/4	/,508	21,367	11,8/8	36,/35	0	U	Accounts 886 - 894
30	880 897	Maine	770 470	0	0	05 707	47 850	165 226	470 488	0	0	0	0	Account 375
20	00/	Main Of Commences Stor For	76 212			93,797	47,039	16 196	4/0,400					Account 370
39	889	Meas & Reg Sta Eq Gen	126 214			15 512	7 750	26 770	76 183					Mains Allocation
40	890	Meas. & Reg. Sta. Eq Ind.	85,702			10,012	7,750	20,770	/0,105		85,702			Meters and Regulators
41	891	Meas, & Reg. Sta. Eq City Gate	306,644								306,644			Meters and Regulators
42	892	Services	320,489							320,489	,			Services
43	893	Meters & House Regulators	645,990								645,990			Meters and Regulators
44	894	Other Equipment	71,953			4,259	2,128	7,350	20,917	20,648	16,652			Distribution Plant
45		Total Maintenance	2,496,788	0	0	129,297	64,596	223,140	635,017	353,016	1,091,723	0	0	Sum of Lines 35 thru 44
														_
46		Total Distribution	11,422,890	0	0	654,383	327,907	1,129,330	3,213,878	3,337,245	2,760,147	0	0	Line 33 + Line 45

# Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Functional Classification of Operation and Maintenance Expenses For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J	К	L	М	Ν
Line	Acct.		Total Gas Utility	Gas	Supply	Transm	ission	Distrib	ution		Meters and	Customer		
Numbe	r No.	Description	Adjusted	Demand	Commodity	Demand	Commodity	Demand	Customer	Services	Regulators	Accounts	Direct	Allocation Basis or Reference
		1 1	\$	\$	s	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	š	\$	\$	
47	001	Customer Accounts Expenses	207 710									207 710		Contractor Accounts
48	901	Supervision	206,719									206,719		Customer Accounts
49	902	Customer Reading Expenses	390,348									390,348		Customer Accounts
50	903	Uncellectible Accounts	2,010,115									2,010,115		Customer Accounts
51	904	Misselleneous	56 207									56 207		Customer Accounts
52	903	Total Customer Accounts Expanses	4 128 270	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4 138 270	0	Sum of Lines 48 thru 52
55		Total Customer Accounts Expenses	4,138,279	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,136,279	0	Sum of Lines 48 unu 52
54		Customer Service & Inform. Exp.												
55	907	Supervision	53,612				26,806					26,806		50% Trans Com., 50% Cust Acets.
56	908	Customer Assistance Expenses	129,645				64,822					64,822		50% Trans Com., 50% Cust Accts.
57	909	Information & Instruction Exp.	19,596				9,798					9,798		50% Trans Com., 50% Cust Accts.
58	910	Miscellaneous	377				188					188		50% Trans Com., 50% Cust Acets.
59		Total Cust. Service & Inf. Exp.	203,229	0	0	0	101,615	0	0	0	0	101,615	0	Sum of Lines 55 thru 58
60		Sales Expenses												
61	911	Supervision	0				0					0		50% Trans Com., 50% Cust Accts.
62	912	Demonstrating & Selling Exp.	202,029				101,014					101,014		50% Trans Com., 50% Cust Accts.
63	913	Advertising Expenses	6,498				3,249					3,249		50% Trans Com., 50% Cust Accts,
64	916	Miscellaneous	0				0					0		50% Trans Com., 50% Cust Accts.
65		Total Sales Expenses	208,527	0	0	0	104,263	0	0	0	0	104,263	0	Sum of Lines 61 thru 64
66		Administrative & Consel Evenness												
67		Administrative & General Expenses												
68	020	A & G Salarias	7 200 040	0	0	241 576	266 024	589.490	1 677 587	1 520 422	1 272 260	1 602 670	0	Supervised O&M
69	920	Office Supplies & Expenses	1 686 722	0	0	79.022	61 751	136 375	388 101	356 139	294 564	370 769	0	Supervised O&M
70	922	Transfere	(1 488 431)	0	0	(69,732)	(54 492)	(120,343)	(342 476)	(314 272)	(259,935)	(327,182)	0	Supervised O&M
71	923	Outside Services Employed	843 059	Ő	ů	39 497	30.865	68 163	193 981	178.006	147 229	185 318	ů	Supervised O&M
72	924	Property Insurance	19 713	0	0	1 322	688	2 281	6 4 9 3	4 680	3 784	465	0	Net Plant
73	925	Injuries & Damages	1 137 339	Ő	ů	53 284	41 638	91 957	261 692	240 141	198 621	250.006	Ő	Supervised O&M
74	926	Employee Pensions & Benefits	2.647.511	0	ő	124.034	96.926	214.057	609.171	559.003	462.353	581.967	0	Supervised O&M
75	928	Regulatory Commission Expense	586 604		-	,	586 604		,		,	,	-	Transmission - Commodity
76	929	Duplicate Charges - Credit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Supervised O&M
77	930	Miscellaneous	458.027	0	ő	21.458	16.769	37.033	105.388	96.709	79.988	100.682	0	Supervised O&M
78	931	Rents	804,552	0	0	37,693	29.455	65,050	185,121	169,876	140,505	176.854	ő	Supervised O&M
79	932	Maintenance of General Plant	1 691 353	õ	0	79 239	61 921	136 750	389 166	357 117	295 373	371 787	0	Supervised O&M
80	,,,,	Total A & G Expenses	15,677,400	0	0	707,393	1,139,049	1,220,814	3,474,225	3,186,832	2,635,751	3,313,337	0	Sum of Lines 68 thru 78
81		Total Operation & Maintenance	32,351,842	0	0	1,447,802	1,717,362	2,498,607	7,110,603	6,524,077	5,395,897	7,657,494	0	Sum of Lines 19,46,53,59,65,80
82		-												
83		Supervised O & M before General	15,783,018	0	0	739,424	577,821	1,276,094	3,631,543	3,332,472	2,756,297	3,469,367	0	Lines 19 + 46 - 32 + 53 - 51 + 59 + 65

## Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Functional Classification of Other Cost of Service Components For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J	К	L	М	Ν
			Total								Meters			
Line	Acct.		Gas Utility	Gas S	upply	Transn	nission	Distrib	oution		and	Customer		
Number	No.	Description	Adjusted	Demand	Commodity	Demand	Commodity	Demand	Customer	Services	Regulators	Accounts	Direct	Allocation Basis or Reference
			\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	s	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
1	Deprec	iation Expense												
2		Intangible	106,944	0	0	5,010	3,915	8,647	24,607	22,580	18,676	23,508	0	Intangible Plant
3		Production & Gathering	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Prod. & Gathering Plant
4		Transmission	1,007,900	0	0	123,871	61,885	213,776	608,368	0	0	0	0	Transmission Plant
5		Distribution	8,875,446	0	0	525,334	262,453	906,618	2,580,078	2,546,909	2,054,054	0	0	Distribution Plant
6		General	872,286	0	0	40,866	31,935	70,526	200,706	184,177	152,333	191,743	0	General Plant
7		Other Utility Plant (Allocated on Customer Count)	1,884,420									1,884,420	0	Customer Accounts
8		Other Utility Plant (Allocated on Blended Ratio)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Supervised O&M
9		Total Depreciation Expense	12,746,995	0	0	695,081	360,188	1,199,567	3,413,760	2,753,666	2,225,063	2,099,670	0	Sum of Lines 2 thru 6
10	Taxes (	Other Than Income Taxes												
11		Property Taxes	7,815,966	0	0	524,137	272,699	904,553	2,574,201	1,855,722	1,500,193	184,461	0	Net Plant
12		Payroll Taxes	969,408	0	0	45,416	35,490	78,379	223,053	204,684	169,294	213,092	0	Supervised O&M
13		Miscellaneous	177,999	0	0	8,339	6,517	14,392	40,956	37,583	31,085	39,127	0	Supervised O&M
14		Total Taxes Other than Income Taxes	8,963,372	0	0	577,893	314,706	997,323	2,838,209	2,097,988	1,700,573	436,680	0	Sum of Lines 11 thru 13
15	Other (	Distring Revenues												
16	487	Forfeited Discounts	333.613										333.613	Direct
17	488	Misc. Service Revenues	662,809	0	0	31.052	24,266	53,590	152,507	139,947	115,751	145.696	0	Supervised O&M
18	489	Negotiated Margin Revenues	2,383,053			292,877	146,319	505,446	1,438,411					Mains Allocation
19		Total Other Operating Revenues	3,379,475	0	0	323,929	170,585	559,035	1,590,918	139,947	115,751	145,696	333,613	Sum of Lines 16 thru 18

## Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Rate of Return Under Current and Traditional Rate Design For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	1
		Total		Fin	n and Transportati	on	Irrig	ation	Interruptible	
Line		Gas Utility	Residential	Small	Small	Large	0		Large	
Number	Description	Adjusted	Service	Commercial	Volume	Volume	Sales	Transportation	Volume	Basis of Allocation or Reference
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
	D. H. D. C. D.									
1	Return Under Existing Rates	205 047 220	210 020 670	21 697 520	21 480 275	10 105 812	11 212 554	2 861 277	660 104	Table 2 Line 19
2	Kate Base	305,947,530	218,829,078	31,087,339	21,480,275	19,105,815	11,515,554	2,801,277	009,194	Table 5 Line 18
3	Sales Revenues	131,973,547	79.993.962	14.434.194	13.271.917	9.046.825	13.457.708	588.871	1.180.071	Exhibit EJE-6
4	Cost of Gas	71,625,936	40,749,693	8,027,606	8,401,379	2,540,027	11,013,085	0	894,147	Exhibit EJF-6
5	Sales Revenues Excluding Gas Cost	60,347,610	39,244,269	6,406,589	4,870,538	6,506,797	2,444,623	588,871	285,924	Line 3 - Line 4
	č									
6	Net Cost of Service	77,555,361	55,533,054	8,388,854	5,300,723	4,530,043	2,896,502	731,032	175,154	Table 2 Line 19
7	Revenue Deficiency	17,207,751	16,288,786	1,982,265	430,184	(1,976,754)	451,879	142,161	(110,770)	Line 6 - Line 5
0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8	Additional Customer Charge Revenues from Negotiated LV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Not applicable w/o LV rate change
9	Net Revenue Deficiency	17 207 751	16 288 786	1 982 265	430 184	(1.976.754)	451 879	142 161	(110.770)	
10	Percent	13.04%	20 36%	13 73%	3 24%	-21 85%	3 36%	24 14%	-9 39%	Line 9 / Line 3
10		1510170	2013070	15.7570	5.2170	2110570	515670	2	,,	Entry / Entry
11	Rebalancing	0	(2,087,524)			1,976,754			110,770	
12	Net Revenue Deficiency	17,207,751	14,201,261	1,982,265	430,184	0	451,879	142,161	0	
13	Percent	13.04%	17.75%	13.73%	3.24%	0.00%	3.36%	24.14%	0.00%	
	T TI D DD		12 00 0 10 0		120.110	17 404		100.055	(18.605)	
14	Increase Under Proposed Rates	17,207,272	13,996,106	2,187,067	430,140	17,586	484,904	109,055	(17,585)	Line 14 / Line 2
15	Percent	15.04%	17.30%	13.13%	5.24%	0.19%	5.60%	18.32%	-1.49%	Line 147 Line 3
16	Increase Under Proposed Rates (Incl LV Credit)	17.207.272	13,996,106	2,187,067	430,140	17,586	484,904	109.055	(17,585)	
	1 ( )	.,, .		,,	,	.,	- ,	,	( ), ))	
17	Incremental Taxes at 21.00%	3,613,527	2,939,182	459,284	90,329	3,693	101,830	22,902	(3,693)	Line 16 x 21.00%
18	Incremental Return	13,593,745	11,056,924	1,727,783	339,811	13,893	383,074	86,154	(13,892)	Line 16 - Line 17
19	Return Under Current Rates	9,749,658	3,828,564	851,770	1,299,099	3,019,409	506,240	106,008	138,568	(Line 2 X 7.63%) - Line 7 X (100 - 21.00%)
20	Pata of Patum Under Cument Pates	2 109/	1 759/	2 60%	6.05%	15 200/	4 479/	2 70%	20.719/	Line 10 / Line 2
20	Rate of Return Older Cultent Rates	5.19%	1./3%	2.09%	0.05%	15.60%	4.4/70	5.70%	20.71%	Line 177 Line 2
21	Return Under Proposed Rates	23,343,403	14.885.488	2,579,552	1,638,910	3.033.302	889,314	192,162	124,676	Line 18 + Line 19
	·-F		,,	_,,	-,,-10	-,,- /2	,		,570	
22	Rate of Return Under Proposed Rates	7.63%	6.80%	8.14%	7.63%	15.88%	7.86%	6.72%	18.63%	Line 21 / Line 2

21	Rate of Return Under Current Rates Rate of Return Under Proposed Rates								
22	Residential + Small Commercial	1.87%	Residential + Small Commercial	6.97%					
23	Small Volume (Firm + Full Margin Trans.)	6.05%	Small Volume (Firm + Full Margin Trans.)	7.63%					
24	Large Volume (Firm + Interruptible + Full Margin Trans.)	15.97%	Large Volume (Firm + Interruptible + Full Margin Trans.)	15.97%					
25	Irrigation (Firm + Full Margin Trans.)	4.32%	Irrigation (Firm + Full Margin Trans.)	7.63%					
26	Total	3.19%	Total	7.63%					

#### Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Allocation of Cost of Service For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	н	Ι	1
		Total		Firm	and Transportation	on	Irrig	ation	Interruptible	
Line		Gas Utility	Residential	Small	Small	Large			Large	1
Number	Description	Adjusted	Service	Commercial	Volume	Volume	Sales	Transportation	Volume	Basis of Allocation or Reference
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
1	Total Cost of Service									
2	Gas Supply					(				
3	Demand	233,888	164,271	33,685	29,595	6,337	0	0	0	50% Peak (Sales), 50% Firm Winter Period Sales
4	Commodity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Annual Sales
5	Total Gas Supply	233,888	164,271	33,685	29,595	6,337	0	0	0	Line 3 + Line 4
6	Transmission									
7	Demand	4 190 408	2 137 902	459.014	581 718	986 863	0	0	24 911	50% Peak 50% Winter Period Throughput
8	Commodity	3 154 316	983 655	203 213	305 882	1 076 056	444 866	103 005	37 638	Annual Throughput
ő	Total Transmission	7 344 724	3 121 557	662 227	887.600	2 062 919	444 866	103,005	62 549	Line 7 + Line 8
,	Total Halishission	7,544,724	5,121,557	002,227	007,000	2,002,717	444,000	105,005	02,547	Enic / · Enic o
10	Distribution									
11	Demand	7,231,779	3,689,577	792,163	1,003,925	1,703,121	0	0	42,992	50% Peak, 50% Winter Period Throughput
12	Customer	20,580,394	17,094,401	1,992,457	562,271	105,957	649,255	166,317	9,735	Distribution - Customer
13	Total Distribution	27,812,173	20,783,978	2,784,621	1,566,196	1,809,078	649,255	166,317	52,727	Line 11 + Line 12
14	Services	17,584,859	14,606,263	1,702,450	480,431	90,535	554,754	142,109	8,318	Services
15	Meters and Regulators	14,338,303	9,166,568	1,709,472	1,809,046	312,496	1,044,454	267,554	28,712	Meters & Regulators
16	Customer Accounting	10,575,027	8,024,029	1,496,400	527,854	248,678	203,171	52,046	22,848	Customer Accounting
17	Direct									
18	Forfeited Discounts	(333,613)	(333,613)							Direct - Residential
	<b>T</b> 10 10 10			0.000.05	5 000 <b>5</b> 0-	4 530 0	a			
19	Total Cost of Service	77,555,361	55,533,054	8,388,854	5,300,723	4,530,043	2,896,502	731,032	175,154	Sum of Lines 5,9,13,14,15,16 and 18

#### Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Allocation of Rate Base For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	1
		Total		Firm	n and Transportati	on	Irrig	ation	Interruptible	
Line		Gas Utility	Residential	Small	Small	Large	0		Large	
Number	Description	Adjusted	Service	Commercial	Volume	Volume	Sales	Transportation	Volume	Basis of Allocation or Reference
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
1	Rate Base									
2	Gas Supply	2 ((2 827	1 970 245	292 612	226 029	72 142	0	0	0	500( Deals (Color) 500( Einer Winter Denied Color
3	Commodito	2,002,837	1,870,245	383,312	330,938	/2,142	0	0	0	50% Peak (Sales), 50% Firm winter Period Sales
4	Commodity Tatal Cas Sumple	2 ((2 827	1.870.245	292.512	226.028	72.142	0	0	0	Annual Sales
3	Total Gas Supply	2,002,837	1,870,245	383,312	330,938	72,142	0	0	0	Line 3 + Line 4
6	Transmission									
7	Demand	20,419,870	10.418.002	2,236,776	2.834.715	4.808.985	0	0	121.392	50% Peak, 50% Winter Period Throughput
8	Commodity	10.618.242	3.311.238	684,067	1.029.676	3,622,284	1,497,536	346,742	126,700	Annual Throughput
9	Total Transmission	31,038,113	13,729,239	2,920,843	3,864,391	8,431,269	1,497,536	346,742	248,092	Line 7 + Line 8
10	Distribution									
11	Demand	35,240,476	17,979,318	3,860,214	4,892,131	8,299,314	0	0	209,498	50% Peak, 50% Winter Period Throughput
12	Customer	100,288,312	83,301,061	9,709,250	2,739,947	516,328	3,163,822	810,465	47,439	Distribution - Customer
13	Total Distribution	135,528,788	101,280,378	13,569,464	7,632,079	8,815,643	3,163,822	810,465	256,938	Line 11 + Line 12
14	Samuras	72 284 806	60 040 905	6 998 136	1 974 872	372 154	2 280 288	584 150	24 102	Samirae
14	Savies	72,284,800	00,040,905	0,998,150	1,974,072	572,154	2,280,588	564,159	54,195	Stivites
15	Meters and Regulators	58,434,216	37,357,366	6,966,768	7,372,575	1,273,545	4,256,562	1,090,389	117,011	Meters & Regulators
	c									C C
16	Customer Accounting	5,998,571	4,551,545	848,817	299,420	141,060	115,247	29,522	12,960	Customer Accounting
17	Direct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Direct
18	Total Rate Base	305,947,330	218,829,678	31,687,539	21,480,275	19,105,813	11,313,554	2,861,277	669,194	Sum of Lines 5,9,13,14,15,16 and 17

#### Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Class Allocation Bases For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

43 Use per Customer

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J
		Total		Firm	and Transportatio	n	Irrig	ation	Interruptible	
Line		Gas Utility	Residential	Small	Small	Large			Large	
Number	Description	Adjusted	Service	Commercial	Volume	Volume	Sales	Transportation	Volume	Basis of Allocation or Reference
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
1	Allocation Bases									
2	Firm Winter Peak Demand	oad Factor	20.68%	20.00%	25.00%	67.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Load Factor Study
3	Peak Day - therms/Day	1,509,156	834,482	178,257	214,653	281,764	0	0	0	Line 15 / 365 / Line 2
4	Allocation Factor	100.0000%	55.2946%	11.8117%	14.2234%	18.6703%	0.0000%	0.0000%	0.0000%	Line 3 / Line 3 Column B
5	Firm Winter Peak Demand - Sales Only									
6	Peak Day - therms/Day	1,162,833	834,482	169,981	142,316	16,055	0	0	0	Line 18 / 365 / Line 2
7	Allocation Factor	100.0000%	71.7628%	14.6178%	12.2387%	1.3807%	0.0000%	0.0000%	0.0000%	Line 6 / Line 6 Column B
8	Winter Period Throughput									
9	Winter (Nov-Mar) Throughput - therms	100,777,221	47,106,556	10.174.634	13,646,104	28.651.723	0	0	1,198,205	Exhibit EJF-6
10	Allocation Factor	100.0000%	46.7433%	10.0962%	13.5409%	28.4308%	0.0000%	0.0000%	1.1890%	Line 9 / Line 9 Column B
11	Firm Winter Period Sales									
12	Winter (Nov-Mar) Sales - therms	68,561,217	47,106,556	9,726,753	8,959,570	2,768,338	0	0	0	Line 9 excluding interruptible and transportation
13	Allocation Factor	100.0000%	68.7073%	14.1870%	13.0680%	4.0378%	0.0000%	0.0000%	0.0000%	Line 12 / Line 12 Column B
14	Commodity									
14	Annual Throughput therms	201 986 634	62 088 365	13 012 730	10 587 128	68 005 286	28 487 020	6 505 033	2 410 164	Exhibit EIE 6
16	Allocation Factor	100.0000%	31.1844%	6.4424%	9.6972%	34.1138%	14.1034%	3.2655%	1.1932%	Line 15 / Line 15 Column B
17	Commodity - Firm Sales									
18	Annual Sales - therms	92,309,495	62,988,365	12,408,578	12,986,334	3,926,218	0	0	0	Line 15 excluding interruptible and transportation
19	Allocation Factor	100.0000%	68.2361%	13.4424%	14.0683%	4.2533%	0.0000%	0.0000%	0.0000%	Line 18 / Line 18 Column B
20	Commodity Solar									
20	Annual Sales - therms	123 206 687	62 988 365	12 408 578	12 986 334	3 926 218	28 487 029	0	2 410 164	Exhibit EIE-6
22	Allocation Factor	100 0000%	51 1241%	10 0714%	10 5403%	3 1867%	23 1213%	0.0000%	1 9562%	Line 21 / Line 21 Column B
		1001000070	511121170	1010/11/0	1010 10070	51100770	251121570	01000070	1.550276	
23	Distribution - Customer									
24	Average Number of Customers	119,427	105,942	9,879	1,742	164	1,341	344	15	Exhibit EJF-6
25	Weighting Factor		1	1.25	2	4	3	3	4	Weighting Factor Study
26	Weighted Number of Customers	127,547	105,942	12,348	3,485	657	4,024	1,031	60	Line 24 x Line 25
27	Allocation Factor	100.0000%	83.0616%	9.6813%	2.7321%	0.5148%	3.1547%	0.8081%	0.0473%	Line 26 / Line 26 Column B
28	Services									
29	Average Number of Customers	119.427	105,942	9.879	1.742	164	1.341	344	15	Exhibit EJF-6
30	Weighting Factor		1	1.25	2	4	3	3	4	Weighting Factor Study
31	Weighted Number of Customers	127,547	105,942	12,348	3,485	657	4,024	1,031	60	Line 29 x Line 30
32	Services Cost Allocator	100.0000%	83.0616%	9.6813%	2.7321%	0.5148%	3.1547%	0.8081%	0.0473%	Line 31 / Line 31 Column B
22										
33 34	Average Number of Customers	110 427	105 942	9.879	1 742	164	1 341	311	15	Exhibit EIE-6
35	Weighting Factor	117,42/	105,942	2,072	1,/=2	22	1,541	9	22	Weighting Factor Study
36	Weighted Number of Customers	165.715	105,942	19,757	20,908	3.612	12.071	3.092	332	Line 34 x Line 35
37	Meters & Regulators Cost Allocator	100.0000%	63.9306%	11.9224%	12.6169%	2.1795%	7.2844%	1.8660%	0.2002%	Line 36 / Line 36 Column B
	5									
38	Customer Accounting									
39	Average Number of Customers	119,427	105,942	9,879	1,742	164	1,341	344	15	Exhibit EJF-6
40	Weighting Factor	120 /24	1	2	4	20	2	2	20	Weighting Factor Study
41	Weighted Number of Customers	139,624	105,942	19,757	6,969	3,283	2,683	687	302	Line 39 x Line 40 Line 41 / Line 41 Column P
42	Customer Accounts Cost Allocator	100.00%	/3.9%	14.2%	5.0%	2.4%	1.9%	0.5%	0.2%	Line 41 / Line 41 Column B

1,317 11,242 419,728

21,239

19,197

159,790 Line 15 / Line 24

1,691

595

#### Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Unit Cost of Service For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J
		Total		Fin	m and Transportatio	on l	Irrio	ation	Interruptible	
Line		Gas Utility	Residential	Small	Small	Large			Large	-
Number	Description	Adjusted	Service	Commercial	Volume	Volume	Sales	Transportation	Volume	Basis of Allocation or Reference
		S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	
		Ψ	9	9	9	9	ý.	Ψ	9	
1	Other Gas Supply									
2	Demand - \$	233,888	164,271	33,685	29,595	6,337	0	0	0	Line 3 ,Table 2
3	\$/therm	0.00116	0.00261	0.00259	0.00151	0.00009	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	Line 2 / Line 15 , Table 4
4	Commodity - \$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Line 4 ,Table 2
5	\$/therm	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	0.00000	Line 4 / Line 15 , Table 4
6	Customer - Related									
7	Services	17,584,859	14,606,263	1,702,450	480,431	90,535	554,754	142,109	8,318	Line 14 ,Table 2
8	\$/month		11.49	14.36	22.98	45.96	34.47	34.47	45.96	Line 7 / Line 39 ,Table 4
9	Meters & Regulators	14,338,303	9,166,568	1,709,472	1,809,046	312,496	1,044,454	267,554	28,712	Line 15 ,Table 2
10	\$/month		7.21	14.42	86.52	158.63	64.89	64.89	158.63	Line 9 / Line 39 ,Table 4
11	Customer Accounting	10,241,414	7,690,416	1,496,400	527,854	248,678	203,171	52,046	22,848	Line 16 ,Table 2
12	\$/month		6.05	12.62	25.25	126.23	12.62	12.62	126.23	Line 11 / Line 39 ,Table 4
13	Distribution - Customer	20,580,394	17,094,401	1,992,457	562,271	105,957	649,255	166,317	9,735	Line 12 ,Table 2
14	\$/bill/month	14.36	13.45	16.81	26.89	53.79	40.34	40.34	53.79	Line 13 / Line 15 ,Table 4
15	Trans/Distr - Demand	11,422,187	5,827,479	1,251,177	1,585,644	2,689,984	0	0	67,903	Line 7 + Line 11, Table 2
16	\$/therm	0.05655	0.09252	0.09615	0.08095	0.03904	0.00000	0.00000	0.02817	Line 15 / Line 15, Table 4
			000 655		205.002					
17	Transmission - Commodity	3,154,316	983,655	203,213	305,882	1,076,056	444,866	103,005	37,638	Line 8, Table 2
18	\$/therm	0.01562	0.01562	0.01562	0.01562	0.01562	0.01562	0.01562	0.01562	Line 177 Line 15, Table 4
19	Customer Costs - \$	62 744 971	48 557 649	6 900 778	3 379 603	757 666	2 451 635	628 027	69.613	Line $6 + Line 9 + Line 11 + Line 13$
20	Demand Costs - \$	11.656.075	5.991.750	1.284.863	1.615.238	2.696.321	2,101,000	020,027	67.903	Line $2 + Line 15$
21	Commodity Costs - \$	3 154 316	983 655	203 213	305 882	1 076 056	444 866	103 005	37 638	Line 17
22	Total Cost of Service - \$	77,555,361	55,533,054	8.388.854	5.300.723	4.530.043	2.896.502	731.032	175,154	Sum of Lines 19 thru 21
		,	,,	0,000,000	-,,	.,	_,		,	
23	Calculated Unit Rates									
24	Customer Costs - \$/bill.month		38.20	58.21	161.64	384.60	152.32	152.32	384.60	Line 8 + Line 10 + Line 12 + Line 14
25	Demand Costs - \$/therm		0.09512	0.09874	0.08246	0.03913	0.00000	0.00000	0.02817	Line 3 + Line 16
26	Commodity Costs - \$/therm		0.01562	0.01562	0.01562	0.01562	0.01562	0.01562	0.01562	Line 18
27	Calculated Cost of Service Rates									
28	Customer Costs - \$/bill.month		38.20	58.21	161.64	384.60	152.32	152.32	384.60	Line 23
29	Commodity Costs - \$/therm		0.11074	0.11436	0.09808	0.05475	0.01562	0.01562	0.04379	Line 25 + Line 26
20	Duonosad Datas									
30	Customer Costs S/bill month		31.50	49.50	148.00	358.00	49.50	49.50	358.00	
22	Custonici Costs = 3/011.1101111		0 20047	47.30	0.11264	0.09445	49.30	49.30	0.08445	Eyhihit DIE 15
32	Commounty Costs - \$/therm		0.2094/	0.2094/	0.11204	0.08445	0.07487	0.07487	0.08445	EXHIOR EJF-10

# Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Revenues Under Current and Proposed Rates For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J	К	L	М
				Small Co	ommercial	Small	Volume		Large Volume		Irrig	gation	
Line		Total	-						_				
Numbe	1 Description	Company	Residential	Sales	Transportation	Firm	Transportation	Firm	Interruptible	Transportation	Sales	Transportation	Reference
1	1 Billing Determinants												
2	Average Number of Monthly I	119 427	105 942	9 674	204	1 283	459	42	15	122	1 341	344	Exhibit EIE-6
3	Total Test Period Volumes	201,986,634	62,988,365	12,408,578	604,152	12,986,334	6,600,794	3,926,218	2,410,164	64,979,068	28,487,029	6,595,933	Exhibit EJF-6
4	2. Current Rates												
5	Customer Charge - \$/month		18.50	28.00	28.00	70.00	70.00	355.00	355.00	355.00	45.00	45.00	Current Tariff
6	Delivery Charge - \$/therm		0.20251	0.20251	0.20251	0.15606	0.15606	0.07937	0.07937	0.07937	0.05378	0.05378	Current Tariff
7	Cost of Gas - \$/therm		0.64694	0.64694	-	0.64694	-	0.64694	0.37099	-	0.38660	-	Exhibit EJF-6
8	3 Revenue Under Current Rates												
9	Customer Charge - \$	34,352,792	26,488,495	3,693,282	78,098	1,334,811	478,960	266,021	94,630	771,764	912,590	234,141	Exhibit EJF-6
10	Delivery Charge - \$	25,994,818	12,755,774	2,512,861	122,347	2,026,647	1,030,120	311,624	191,295	5,157,389	1,532,032	354,729	Exhibit EJF-6
11	Margin - \$	60,347,610	39,244,269	6,206,143	200,445	3,361,458	1,509,080	577,644	285,924	5,929,153	2,444,623	588,871	Line 9 + Line 10
12	Cost of Gas - \$	71,625,936	40,749,693	8,027,606	-	8,401,379	-	2,540,027	894,147	-	11,013,085	-	Exhibit EJF-6
13	Total - \$	131,973,547	79,993,962	14,233,749	200,445	11,762,837	1,509,080	3,117,672	1,180,071	5,929,153	13,457,708	588,871	Line 11 + Line 12
14	4 Proposed Rates												
15	Customer Charge - \$/month		31.50	49 50	49 50	148.00	148.00	358.00	358.00	358.00	49 50	49 50	
16	Delivery Charge - \$/therm		0.20947	0.20947	0.20947	0.11264	0.11264	0.08445	0.08445	0.08445	0.07487	0.07487	
17	Cost of Gas - \$/therm		0.64694	0.64694	-	0.64694	-	0.64694	0.37099	-	0.38660	-	
18	5. Revenue Under Proposed Rates												
19	Customer Charge - \$	50,779,314	40,046,202	5,746,505	121,374	2,278,756	815,628	180,790	64,798	524,470	796,703	204,089	Line 15 x Line 2 x 12
20	Delivery Charge - \$	26,775,569	13,194,173	2,599,225	126,552	1,462,781	743,513	331,573	203,541	5,487,550	2,132,824	493,837	Line 16 x Line 3
21	Margin - \$	77,554,882	53,240,375	8,345,729	247,926	3,741,537	1,559,141	512,363	268,339	6,012,020	2,929,526	697,926	Line 19 + Line 20
22	Cost of Gas - \$	71 625 936	40 749 693	8 027 606	_	8 401 379	_	2 540 027	894 147	_	11 013 085	_	Line 12
23	Total - \$	149,180,819	93.990.068	16.373.335	247.926	12.142.915	1.559.141	3.052.390	1.162.486	6.012.020	13.942.612	697.926	Line 21 + Line 22
		,,			, , ,	,,	-,	e,e,	-,,	•,• • = ,• = •		••••	
24	6. Difference												
25	Customer Charge - \$	16,426,521	13,557,707	2,053,222	43,276	943,945	336,668	(85,231)	(29,832)	(247,294)	(115,888)	(30,053)	Line 19 - Line 9
26	Delivery Charge - \$	780,751	438,399	86,364	4,205	(563,867)	(286,606)	19,949	12,246	330,161	600,791	139,108	Line 20 - Line 10
27	Cost of Gas - \$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		Line 22 - Line 12
28	Total - \$ (2)	17,207,272	13,996,106	2,139,586	47,481	380,078	50,062	(65,281)	(17,585)	82,867	484,904	109,055 S	um of Lines 25 through 27
20	Paraant Difference												
29	Customer Charge %	17 804	51 204	55 60/	55 404	70 7%	70 294	32 0%	21 5%	22.0%	12 7%	12.8%	
31	Delivery Charge - %	3.0%	3.4%	3 4%	3.4%	-27.8%	-27.8%	-52.0%	-51.5%	-52.0%	-12.7%	39.2%	
32	Cost of Gas - %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	n/a	0.0%	n/a	0.0%	0.0%	n/a	0.0%	n/a	
33	Total - %	13.0%	17.5%	15.0%	23.7%	3.2%	3.3%	-2.1%	-1.5%	1.4%	3.6%	18.5%	
	Net Revenue Deficiency		16,183,526			430,184		0			594,040		
	Customer Charge - \$		15,654,205			1,280,613		(362,356)			(145,941)		

# Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC Average Customer Bill Impacts Under Current and Proposed Rate Design For the Pro Forma Period Ending September 30, 2025

	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J	Κ	L
Lina	Description	Residential	Small Commercial		Small Volume		Large Volume			Irrigation		·
No.			Sales	Transportation	Firm	Transportation	Firm	Interruptible	Transportation	Sales	Transportation	Reference
1	1 Billing Determinants											
2	Ava Number of Monthly Pills	105 042	0.674	204	1 282	450	42	15	122	1 2 4 1	244	Exhibit FIF 6
3	Total Test Period Volumes	62 988 365	12 408 578	604 152	12 086 334	6 600 794	3 026 218	2 410 164	64 070 068	28 487 020	6 505 033	Exhibit EIE 6
4	Average Therms per Bill	50	12,408,578	246	843	1 198	7 775	13 316	44 354	1 770	1 600	EXHIBIT EJI-0
•	riverage merms per Din	20	107	2.0	015	1,170	,,,,,	10,010		1,770	1,000	
5	2. Current Rates											
6	Customer Charge - \$/month	\$18.50	\$28.00	\$28.00	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$355.00	\$355.00	\$355.00	\$45.00	\$45.00	Current Tariff
7	GSRS - \$/month	\$2.27	\$3.70	\$3.70	\$16.11	\$16.11	\$163.72	\$163.72	\$163.72	\$11.04	\$11.04	Current Tariff
8	Delivery Charge - \$/therm	\$0.20251	\$0.20251	\$0.20251	\$0.15606	\$0.15606	\$0.07937	\$0.07937	\$0.07937	\$0.05378	\$0.05378	Current Tariff
9	PGA - \$/therm	\$0.64694	\$0.64694		\$0.64694		\$0.64694	\$0.37099		\$0.38660		
10	3 Average Monthly Bill (Current Pa	ites)										
11	<u>S. Average Monthly Bin (Current Ra</u>	\$20.77	\$31.70	\$31.70	\$86.11	\$86.11	\$518.72	\$518.72	\$518.72	\$56.04	\$56.04	
12	Volumetric	\$42.09	\$90.79	\$49.90	\$677.28	\$186.92	\$5 646 83	\$5 996 91	\$3 520 40	\$779.44	\$36.04 \$86.04	
13	Total Average Bill	\$62.86	\$122.49	\$81.60	\$763.39	\$273.03	\$6,165.55	\$6.515.63	\$4.039.12	\$835.48	\$142.08	
	g		+		4,0000			40,0000	* .,			
14	4. Proposed Rates											
15	Customer Charge - \$/month	\$31.50	\$49.50	\$49.50	\$148.00	\$148.00	\$358.00	\$358.00	\$358.00	\$49.50	\$49.50	
16	GSRS - \$/month	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
17	Delivery Charge - \$/therm	\$0.20947	\$0.20947	\$0.20947	\$0.11264	\$0.11264	\$0.08445	\$0.08445	\$0.08445	\$0.07487	\$0.07487	
18	PGA - \$/therm	\$0.64694	\$0.64694		\$0.64694		\$0.64694	\$0.37099		\$0.38660		
19	5 Average Monthly Bill (Proposed F	(ates)										
20	Monthly	\$31.50	\$49.50	\$49.50	\$148.00	\$148.00	\$358.00	\$358.00	\$358.00	\$49.50	\$49.50	
21	Volumetric	\$42.43	\$91.50	\$51.61	\$640.65	\$134.91	\$5 686 34	\$6,064,57	\$3 745 77	\$816.77	\$119.78	
22	Total Average Bill	\$73.93	\$141.04	\$101.11	\$788.65	\$282.91	\$6,044.34	\$6,422.57	\$4,103.77	\$866.27	\$169.28	
	8											
23	6. Average Customer Bill Impact											
24	Change in Ave Monthly Bill - \$	\$11.07	\$18.55	\$19.51	\$25.26	\$9.88	(\$121.21)	(\$93.06)	\$64.65	\$30.79	\$27.20	
25	Change in Ave Monthly Bill - %	17.6%	15.1%	23.9%	3.3%	3.6%	-2.0%	-1.4%	1.6%	3.7%	19.1%	