## 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	Docket No. 21-BHCG-418-RTS
the Commission to Make Certain Changes	
in its Rates for Natural Gas Service.	

# DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS

## OF

# ROXIE MCCULLAR

## ON BEHALF OF

# KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION STAFF

September 10, 2021

# **Table of Contents**

I. 1	I. Introduction				
II.	Summary	2			
III.	Definition of Depreciation	4			
A.	Overview of Depreciation Expense Impact on Revenue Requirement	5			
В.	Calculation of Depreciation Rates	7			
IV.	Mass Property Estimated Future Net Salvage				
A.	Account 367, Transmission-Mains Future Net Salvage	15			
В.	Account 376, Distribution-Mains Estimated Future Net Salvage				
C.	Account 380, Services Estimated Future Net Salvage	17			
V.	Conclusion				

1		I. Introduction
2	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
3	A.	My name is Roxie McCullar. My business address is 8625 Farmington Cemetery
4		Road, Pleasant Plains, Illinois 62677.
5	Q.	What is your present occupation?
6	А.	Since 1997, I have been employed as a consultant with the firm of William Dunkel
7		and Associates and have regularly provided consulting services in regulatory
8		proceedings throughout the country.
9	Q.	Please describe your educational and professional background.
10	A.	I have over 20 years of experience consulting in regulatory rate cases and have
11		addressed depreciation rate issues in numerous jurisdictions nationwide. I am a
12		Certified Public Accountant licensed in the state of Illinois. I am a Certified
13		Depreciation Professional through the Society of Depreciation Professionals. I
14		received my Master of Arts degree in Accounting from the University of Illinois in
15		Springfield. I received my Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics from Illinois
16		State University in Normal.
17	Q.	Have you prepared an exhibit that describes your qualifications?
18	A.	Yes. My qualifications and previous experiences are shown on the attached Exhibit
19		RMM-1.
20	Q.	On whose behalf are you testifying?
21	A.	I am testifying on behalf of Staff of the Kansas Corporation Commission ("Staff").

1

1		<u>II. Summary</u>
2	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
3	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to address certain depreciation related issues
4		presented in Black Hills/Kansas Gas Utility Company, LLC d/b/a Black Hills Energy
5		("Black Hills" or "Company") testimony and filings in this proceeding.
6	Q.	Can you summarize your recommendations?
7	A.	My recommended changes to Black Hills proposed depreciation parameters are based
8		on my review of the Black Hills 2020 Depreciation Study filed as KSG Direct Exhibit
9		JJS-2 in this proceeding, my review of other Company witness testimonies regarding
10		depreciation related issues filed in this proceeding, my review of the supporting
11		information and workpapers provided in response to discovery, my review of recent
12		previous Commission orders addressing Black Hills depreciation rates in Kansas, and
13		my previous experience in depreciation rate studies.
14		As discussed, and supported in this testimony, reasonable adjustments to the
15		depreciation parameters proposed in Black Hills Energy 2020 Depreciation Study are
16		the use of a -5% estimated future net salvage percent for Account 367, Transmission-
17		Mains, a -5% estimated future net salvage percent for Account 376, Distribution-
18		Mains, and a -10% estimated future net salvage for Account 380, Services.

2

1	Q.	Did you participate in a field visit of Black Hills facilities in Kansas?
2	A.	Yes. On August 2, 2021, I participated in field visits of several different Black Hills
3		facilities or project locations. <sup>1</sup> At each location, Company personnel and/or outside
4		contractors discussed the facilities and ongoing projects with me.
5	Q.	Please compare the Staff's proposed depreciation rates with Black Hills
~		
6		proposed depreciation rates.
6 7	A.	proposed depreciation rates. The annualized accrual based on the Black Hills September 30, 2020 estimated
6 7 8	A.	proposed depreciation rates. The annualized accrual based on the Black Hills September 30, 2020 estimated investments using the Staff's proposed depreciation rates compared to Witness
6 7 8 9	A.	<ul> <li>proposed depreciation rates.</li> <li>The annualized accrual based on the Black Hills September 30, 2020 estimated</li> <li>investments using the Staff's proposed depreciation rates compared to Witness</li> <li>Spanos's proposed depreciation rates from the 2020 Depreciation Study, KSG Direct</li> </ul>

# Table 1: Comparison of Annual Depreciation Accrual Amount Using Projected September 30, 2020 Investments

			Black Hil	ls Proposed		Staff Propose	d
Function	9/30/20 Plant in Service	Current Approved Accrual Amount	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Difference from Company Proposed
Intangible Plant	3,140,828	71,638	112,367	40,729	112,367	40,729	0
Other Storage Plant	18,719	623	516	(107)	516	(107)	0
Transmission	44,058,801	573,592	706,192	132,600	673,162	99,570	(33,030)
Distribution	255,836,375	5,855,614	6,540,374	684,760	6,299,103	443,489	(241,271)
General	23,485,370	1,686,019	1,242,055	(443,964)	1,242,055	(443,964)	0
General Plant							
Amortization of Reserve	0	0	(5,105)	(5,105)	(5,105)	(5,105)	0
Total	326,540,093	8,187,486	8,596,399	408,913	8,322,098	134,612	(274,301)

13 The Staff proposed remaining life depreciation rates compared to Black Hill's

- 14 proposed depreciation rates from the 2020 Depreciation Study, KSG Direct Exhibit
- 15 JJS-2, are summarized in Table 2 below:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In Wichita I visited the Black Hills office, North Town Border Station, two District Regulator Stations, and two sites where active distribution main, service, and meter projects were underway.

1

			Black Hi	lls Proposed		Staff Propose	ed
Function	9/30/20 Plant in Service	Current Approved Accrual Amount	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Difference from Company Proposed
Intangible Plant	3,140,828	2.28%	3.58%	1.30%	3.58%	1.30%	0.00%
Other Storage Plant	18,719	3.33%	2.76%	-0.57%	2.76%	-0.57%	0.00%
Transmission	44,058,801	1.30%	1.60%	0.30%	1.53%	0.23%	-0.07%
Distribution	255,836,375	2.29%	2.56%	0.27%	2.46%	0.17%	-0.10%
General	23,485,370	7.18%	5.29%	-1.89%	5.29%	-1.89%	0.00%
General Plant	, ,						
Amortization of Reserve	0						
Total	326,540,093	2.51%	2.63%	0.13%	2.55%	0.04%	-0.08%

## Table 2: Comparison of Proposed Annual Depreciation Rate

Exhibit RMM-2 support Tables 1 and 2 above.

2

## 3 Q. Please describe your Exhibit RMM-2.

- 4 A. Exhibit RMM-2 contains the calculations of the Staff's remaining life proposed
- 5 depreciation rates for Black Hills Natural Gas Plant in Kansas.
- 6 III. Definition of Depreciation

## 7 Q. Could you please provide the definition of depreciation?

- 8 A. Yes. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") definitions contained in
- 9 the FERC Uniform System of Accounts (18 CFR 201 ("FERC USOA")) state:

10 12.B. Depreciation, as applied to depreciable gas plant, means the loss 11 in service value not restored by current maintenance, incurred in 12 connection with the consumption or prospective retirement of gas plant in the course of service from causes which are known to be in 13 14 current operation and against which the utility is not protected by 15 insurance. Among the causes to be given consideration are wear and tear, decay, action of the elements, inadequacy, obsolescence, changes 16 17 in the art, changes in demand and requirements of public authorities, 18 and, in the case of natural gas companies, the exhaustion of natural resources.<sup>2</sup> 19

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> FERC Uniform System of Accounts Prescribed for Natural Gas Companies Subject to the Provisions of the Natural Gas Act. (18 CFR 201).

1		The FERC USOA definition of "depreciation" specifically states depreciation is a
2		"loss in service value." FERC defines service value as "the difference between
3		original cost and net salvage value of gas plant." <sup>3</sup>
4		Since this is a utility regulation proceeding, I rely on the FERC USOA definition of
5		"depreciation" which focuses on the "loss of service value." Determining reasonable
6		depreciation rates is necessary for establishing the loss in service value of utility cost-
7		based plant-in-service and incorporating it into ratemaking revenue requirement to
8		allow for recovery of that cost.
9		A. Overview of Depreciation Expense Impact on Revenue Requirement
10	Q.	Please provide an overview of the impact of depreciation rates on the revenue
11		requirement.
12	A.	The depreciation rate that the Commission adopts for an account is multiplied by the
13		test year investment in that account to produce a calculated annual depreciation
14		expense for that account. The calculated depreciation expense for all accounts are
15		included in the revenue requirement that is to be recovered from the ratepayers.
16		As pointed out by the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners'
17		("NARUC") text Public Utility Depreciation Practices:
18 19 20 21 22		It is essential to remember that depreciation is intended only for the purpose of recording the periodic allocation of cost in a manner properly related to the useful life of the plant. It is not intended, for example, to achieve a desired financial objective or to fund modernization programs. <sup>4</sup>

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> FERC USOA (18 CFR 201) Definition 37.
 <sup>4</sup> Page 23, *Public Utility Depreciation Practices*, published by National Association of Regulatory Commissioners (NARUC), 1996.

1	Q.	What impact do the depreciation rates set in this proceeding have on future
2		proceedings?
3	A.	The depreciation rates, or any other adjustment to the accumulated depreciation
4		reserve, decided in this proceeding will impact the level of the accumulated
5		depreciation reserve in a future rate case.
6		The depreciation expense amounts, based on the approved depreciation rates, are
7		added to the accumulated depreciation reserve, while the accumulated depreciation
8		reserve is decreased at the time of a retirement for the book cost of the plant retired
9		and the cost of removal, less any salvage value. <sup>5</sup>
10		Adjustments to the accumulated depreciation reserve amount impact the allowed
11		return on net rate base in a future rate case.
12		In a rate case, the calculated net rate base is multiplied by a rate of return (ROR) to
13		calculate the shareholders' and other investors' "return on" their investment. The
14		calculation of the allowed return on rate based included in customer rates is expressed
15		in a simplified way here: <sup>6</sup>
		allowed return = (investment - reserve) * ROR
16		The accumulated depreciation reserve is the significant amount in the "reserve" part
17		of the formula shown above.

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> 18 CFR 201, Account 108.
 <sup>6</sup> Other items such as cash working capital, materials and supplies, deferred income taxes, regulatory liabilities, regulatory assets, etc. are included in the net rate base calculation.

1		<b>B.</b> Calculation of Depreciation Rates
2	Q.	Please provide a brief discussion about the remaining life techniques for
3		calculating depreciation rates.
4	A.	In the calculation of depreciation rates, the remaining life technique formula
5		is:
		Depreciation Rate = $\frac{(100\% - Book Reserve \% - Future Net Salvage \%)}{Average Remaining Life}$
6		In the formula above, the book reserve percent is the actual accumulated depreciation
7		reserve on the Company's books divided by the actual plant-in-service investment on
8		the Company's books at the time of the Depreciation Study.
9		The Depreciation Study estimates the projected average service life of the assets, the
10		retirement pattern of those assets, and the cost of removing or retiring those assets
11		less any expected salvage from the sale, scrap, insurance, reimbursements, etc. of
12		those assets. These estimates are referred to as depreciation parameters.
13		The projected average service life and retirement pattern (survivor curve) are the two
14		parameters from the Depreciation Study that calculate the average remaining life.
15		The estimated future net salvage percent parameter from the Depreciation Study
16		estimates the future cost of removing or retiring less any estimated future salvage
17		from the sale, scrap, insurance, reimbursements, etc.

7

1	Q.	What are some considerations used when estimating the depreciation
2		parameters used in the depreciation rate formula?
3	А.	When estimating a depreciation parameter for an account, an initial step is to analyze
4		that utility's actual historic life and net salvage experience data for that account. In
5		addition to considering the lives and net salvage indicated by the utility's experience
6		data, the expectations of the management, any changes to the current industry
7		practices, and informed judgement are part of the estimation process.
8		Informed judgement as explained in NARUC's Public Utility Depreciation Practices
9		states:
10 11 12 13 14		<i>Informed judgment</i> is a term used to define the subjective portion of the depreciation study process. It is based on a combination of general experience, knowledge of the properties and a physical inspection, information gathered throughout the industry, and other factors which assist the analyst in making a knowledgeable estimate.
15 16 17 18		The use of informed judgment can be a major factor in forecasting. A logical process of examining and prioritizing the usefulness of information must be employed, since there are many sources of data that must be considered and weighed by importance. <sup>7</sup>
19 20		IV Mass Property Estimated Enture Nat Salvaga
20	0	<u>IV. Mass Floperty Estimated Future Net Salvage</u>
21	Q.	Please explain what is meant by net salvage.
22	А.	NARUC's Public Utility Depreciation Practices defines net salvage as "the gross
23		salvage for the property retired less its cost of removal."8 Gross salvage is defined as
24		"the amount recorded for the property retired due to the sale, reimbursement, or reuse

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Page 128, *Public Utility Depreciation Practices* published by the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC), 1996. <sup>8</sup> Page 322, *Public Utility Depreciation Practices*, published by National Association of Regulatory

Commissioners (NARUC), 1996.

1		of the property."9 Cost of removal is defined as "the costs incurred in connection with
2		the retirement from service and the disposition of depreciable plant. Cost of removal
3		may be incurred for plant that is retired in place." <sup>10</sup>
4		NARUC also explains that careful consideration should be given to the net salvage
5		estimate stating:
6 7 8		Cost of retirement, however, must be given careful thought and attention, since for certain types of plant, it can be the most critical component of the depreciation rate. <sup>11</sup>
9		NARUC's Public Utility Depreciation Practices later points out that:
10 11 12 13		Determining a reasonably accurate estimate of the average or future net salvage is not an easy task; estimates can be the subject of considerable discussion and controversy between regulators and utility personnel. <sup>12</sup>
14	Q.	What impact does the estimated future net salvage percent have on depreciation
15		rates?
16	А.	Positive net salvage results in a lower depreciation rate, all other things being equal.
17		Negative net salvage results in a higher depreciation rate, all other things being equal.
18		As stated in NARUC's Public Utility Depreciation Practices:
19 20 21		Positive net salvage occurs when gross salvage exceeds cost of retirement, and negative net salvage occurs when cost of retirement exceeds gross salvage. <sup>13</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Page 320, *Public Utility Depreciation Practices*, published by National Association of Regulatory Commissioners (NARUC), 1996.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Page 317, *Public Utility Depreciation Practices*, published by National Association of Regulatory Commissioners (NARUC), 1996.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Page 19, *Public Utility Depreciation Practices*, published by National Association of Regulatory Commissioners (NARUC), 1996.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Page 157, *Public Utility Depreciation Practices* published by the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC), 1996.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Page 18, *Public Utility Depreciation Practices*, published by National Association of Regulatory Commissioners (NARUC), 1996.

1		The estimated future net salvage is part of the annual depreciation accrual, which is
2		credited to the depreciation reserve to cover the estimated future net salvage costs the
3		company may incur in the future associated with plant asset retirements.
4	Q.	Did Black Hills provide historical net salvage data in the depreciation study?
5	A.	Yes. The Black Hills depreciation study included the historic data of the actual
6		incurred and recorded net salvage and related retirements. Regarding historic net
7		salvage, Black Hills's depreciation study states:
8 9 10 11 12 13 14		The estimates of net salvage by account were based in part on historical data compiled for the years 2006 through 2020. Cost of removal and salvage were expressed as percents of the original cost of plant retired, both on annual and three-year moving average bases. The most recent five-year average also was calculated for consideration. The net salvage estimates by account are expressed as a percent of the original cost of plant retired. <sup>14</sup>
15	Q.	What is a concern regarding the historic net salvage ratios calculated in the
16		depreciation study?
16 17	A.	depreciation study? As pointed out in Wolf and Fitch's <i>Depreciation Systems</i> :
16 17 18	A.	depreciation study? As pointed out in Wolf and Fitch's <i>Depreciation Systems</i> : Salvage ratios are a function of inflation. <sup>15</sup>
16 17 18 19	A.	depreciation study? As pointed out in Wolf and Fitch's <i>Depreciation Systems</i> : Salvage ratios are a function of inflation. <sup>15</sup> Additionally, Wolf and Fitch's <i>Depreciation Systems</i> , points out that a historic net
16 17 18 19 20	A.	<pre>depreciation study? As pointed out in Wolf and Fitch's Depreciation Systems:     Salvage ratios are a function of inflation.<sup>15</sup> Additionally, Wolf and Fitch's Depreciation Systems, points out that a historic net salvage ratio that includes inflated dollars in the numerator and historic dollars in the</pre>
<ol> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> </ol>	A.	<pre>depreciation study? As pointed out in Wolf and Fitch's Depreciation Systems:     Salvage ratios are a function of inflation.<sup>15</sup> Additionally, Wolf and Fitch's Depreciation Systems, points out that a historic net salvage ratio that includes inflated dollars in the numerator and historic dollars in the denominator is a ratio using different units, stating:</pre>

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> KSG Direct Exhibit JJS-2 at 39.
 <sup>15</sup> Page 267, Wolf, Frank K. and W. Chester Fitch, *Depreciation Systems* Iowa State University Press, 1994.

1 2		measured in dollars, the timing of the cash flows reflects different price levels. <sup>16</sup>
3		The calculation of the historic net salvage ratio includes the impact of historic
4		inflation rates, since the net salvage amount in the numerator is in current dollars and
5		the cost of the plant (which may have been installed decades before) in the
6		denominator is in historic dollars. In other words, due to inflation the amounts in
7		numerator and denominator of the net salvage ratio are at different price levels.
8	Q.	Is the fact that historic inflation is included in the net salvage ratio recognized in
9		another authoritative depreciation text?
10	А.	Yes. NARUC's Public Utility Depreciation Practices, regarding inflation states:
11 12 13 14		The sensitivity of salvage and cost of retirement to the age of the property retired is also troublesome. Due to inflation and other factors, there is a tendency for costs of retirement, typically labor, to increase more rapidly than material prices. <sup>17</sup>
15	Q.	Why should inflation in the historic net salvage ratios be considered when
16		estimating the future net salvage amounts to be collected from today's
17		ratepayers?
18	A.	The estimated future net salvage accruals included in the revenue requirement in this
19		proceeding are to be collected from the ratepayers in today's more valuable current
20		dollars. Therefore, I not only reviewed the historic net salvage data as presented in the
21		depreciation study and the underlying data provided in response to discovery, I also

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Page 53, Wolf, Frank K. and W. Chester Fitch, *Depreciation Systems* Iowa State University Press, 1994.
 <sup>17</sup> Page 19, *Public Utility Depreciation Practices*, published by National Association of Regulatory

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Page 19, *Public Utility Depreciation Practices*, published by National Association of Regulatory Commissioners (NARUC), 1996.

- 1 evaluated the impact of collecting the more valuable current dollars from the
- 2 ratepayers to pay for estimated future costs.

# 3 Q. Based on your review do you recommend a different estimate future net salvage

- 4 percent for any mass property accounts?
- 5 A. Yes. For Account 367, Transmission-Mains, Account 376, Distribution-Mains, and
- 6 Account 380, Services, I recommend estimated future net salvage ("FNS") percents
- 7 that differ from Witness Spanos's proposal as shown in Table 3 below:
  - Black Staff Hills Proposed Proposed<sup>18</sup> FNS%<sup>19</sup> Account -10% 367, Transmission-Mains -5% 376. Distribution-Mains -10% -5% 380, Services -15% -10%

# Table 3: Comparison of Distribution Plant Estimated Future Net Salvage ("FNS") Percent Proposals

## 10 Q. Why is the estimated future net salvage shown as a percent in the table above?

11 A. The depreciation rates are calculated in the depreciation study based on the estimated 12 per book amounts and experience as of September 30, 2020. The depreciation rates 13 resulting from the depreciation study are then applied to the investment amounts as of 14 the date of the test year in the rate proceeding. Since the depreciation study produces 15 a depreciation rate, the estimated future net salvage is included in the depreciation 16 rate formula as a percent of the estimated investment as of September 30, 2020.

8

9

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> KSG Direct Exhibit JJS-2 at 51.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Exhibit RMM-2.

1	Q.	Have you reviewed the recovery of estimated future net salvage costs included in
2		Black Hills' proposed depreciation accrual and the actual net salvage costs Black
3		Hills has incurred in today's dollars in the last few years?
4	A.	Yes. As a reasonableness check on the estimated future net salvage accrual amount to
5		be included in the revenue requirement, I have compared the estimated future net
6		salvage costs included in Black Hills' proposed depreciation accrual and the actual
7		net salvage costs incurred by Black Hills on average over the recent five-year period,
8		which is shown in Exhibit RMM-3.
9	Q.	Could the amount included for future net salvage in the annual depreciation
10		accrual shown in Exhibit RMM-3 change in the future?
11	A.	Yes. The annual amount for net salvage is calculated on the investment as of
12		September 30, 2020. In the future, as the plant-in-service investment in the account
13		increases, the amount for estimate future net salvage would increase in proportion to
14		the increase in investment.
15	Q.	Did you make any adjustments to the historic net salvage amounts shown in
16		Exhibit RMM-3?
17	A.	Yes. Black Hills 2020 Depreciation Study on page 40 when discussing Account 376,
18		Distribution-Mains and Account 380, Services states that "the majority of cost of

19 removal for the associated 2019 and 2020 retirements have not been recorded yet."<sup>20</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> KGS Direct Exhibit JJS-2 at 40.

1		In response to discovery Black Hills provided the cost of removal for the associated
2		2019 and 2020 retirements that had been recorded since September 30, 2020, I have
3		included those cost of removal amounts in the averages shown in Exhibit RMM-3. <sup>21</sup>
4	Q.	Are your proposed estimated future net salvage percents based only on the
5		comparison shown in Exhibit RMM-3?
6	A.	No. This is evidenced by the fact that my proposed estimated future net salvage
7		accrual amounts are not equal to the average annual historical amount as shown in
8		Exhibit RMM-3.
9		As discussed above estimating the depreciation parameters depreciation
10		recommendation includes informed judgement. My analysis included the review of
11		the historic net salvage data provided in the depreciation study and the relevant
12		information provided in response to discovery. My proposed estimated future net
13		salvage accrual amounts are in current dollars that consider Black Hills' historic
14		practices, the impact of inflation, and builds a reserve for reasonable estimated future
15		net removal costs associated with future retirements, based on the type of investments
16		in the account, and my previous experience.
17		Exhibit RMM-3 is a reasonableness check on the estimated future net salvage accrual
18		amount to be included in the revenue requirement.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Black Hills response to KCC-123, attached as Exhibit RMM-4.

1		A. Account 367, Transmission-Mains Future Net Salvage
2	Q.	Please discuss your proposed estimated future net salvage percent for Black
3		Hills Account 367, Transmission-Mains.
4	А.	It is reasonable to continue the use of the current approved -5% future net salvage
5		estimate Account 367, Transmission-Mains.
6	Q.	Does your proposal to keep the current approved -5% estimated future net
7		salvage percent result in an under-recovery of the estimated future costs?
8	A.	No. As shown in Exhibit RMM-3, for Account 367, Transmission-Mains, Black Hills
9		actually incurred \$4,371 on average per year. <sup>22</sup>
10		Witness Spanos proposes to collect \$52,951 which is 12.1 times the average annual
11		amount Black Hills has actually incurred for net salvage.
12		In my judgement, collecting annually from ratepayers for net salvage over 12 times as
13		much as the average annual cost incurred for net salvage is excessive and should be
14		adjusted.
15		My recommendation results in an annual accrual of \$26,080 which is 6.0 times the
16		average annual amount Black Hills has actually incurred for net salvage. <sup>23</sup> My
17		recommendation provides recovery of the expected cost of removal in the near future
18		and builds the reserve for future cost of removal associated with future retirements.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> KSG Direct Exhibit JJS-2 at 138.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> I am not recommending or implying a change from the "accrual" basis to the "cash" basis for the recovery of future net salvage costs. In other words, I am not recommending or implying that the depreciation accrual no longer be credited to the Accumulated Provision for Depreciation or that the net salvage costs be "expensed."

1		<b>B.</b> Account 376, Distribution-Mains Estimated Future Net Salvage
2	Q.	Please discuss your proposed estimated future net salvage percent for Black
3		Hills Account 376, Distribution-Mains.
4	A.	It is reasonable to use a -5% future net salvage estimate for Account 376,
5		Distribution-Mains. Witness Spanos proposes a -10% estimated future net salvage
6		percent.
7	Q.	During your review did you make any adjustments to the historic net salvage
8		amounts included in Black Hills 2020 Depreciation Study for Account 376,
9		Distribution-Mains?
10	А.	Yes. Black Hills 2020 Depreciation Study when discussing Account 376,
11		Distribution-Mains states that "the majority of cost of removal for the associated 2019
12		and 2020 retirements have not been recorded yet."24
13		The table below shows the adjustment to the 2019 and 2020 historic net salvage
14		amounts to include the cost of removal amounts that have been recorded since
15		September 30, 2020.

16	Table 4: Acco	unt 376, Distribution-N	<b>Iains Adjusted Historic</b>	Net Cost of Remova
		Net Cost of Removal	Additional Net Cost	Total Adjusted
		Amount KSG Direct	of Removal provided	Net Cost of
	Year	Exhibit JJS-2 p. 143	in KCC-123	Removal
	2016	\$5,443		\$5,443
	2017	\$14,916		\$14,916
	2018	\$4,664		\$4,664
	2019	\$9,099	\$1,818	\$10,917
	2020	\$5,180	\$50,390	\$55,570
	Total	\$39,302	\$55,208	\$91,510
	Average	\$7,860		\$18,302

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> KGS Direct Exhibit JJS-2 at 40.

1		
2	Q.	Does your proposal to use a -5% estimated future net salvage percent result in
3		an under-recovery of the estimated future costs?
4	A.	No. As shown in Exhibit RMM-3 and Table 4 above, for Account 376, Distribution-
5		Mains, Black Hills actually incurred \$18,302 on average per year. <sup>25</sup>
6		Witness Spanos proposes to collect \$178,765 which is 9.8 times the average annual
7		amount Black Hills has actually incurred for net salvage.
8		My recommendation results in an annual accrual of \$87,323 which is 4.8 times the
9		average annual amount Black Hills has actually incurred for net salvage. <sup>26</sup> My
10		recommendation provides recovery of the expected cost of removal in the near future
11		and builds the reserve for future cost of removal associated with future retirements.
12		C. Account 380, Services Estimated Future Net Salvage
13	Q.	Please discuss your proposed estimated future net salvage percent for Black
14		Hills Account 380, Services.
15	A.	It is reasonable to use a -10% future net salvage estimate for Account 380, Services.
16		Witness Spanos proposes a -15% estimated future net salvage percent.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> KGS Direct Exhibit JJS-2 at 143 and Black Hills response to KCC-123, attached as Exhibit RMM-4.
<sup>26</sup> I am not recommending or implying a change from the "accrual" basis to the "cash" basis for the recovery of future net salvage costs. In other words, I am not recommending or implying that the depreciation accrual no longer be credited to the Accumulated Provision for Depreciation or that the net salvage costs be "expensed."

1	Q.	During your review did you make any adjustments to the historic net salvage
2		amounts included in Black Hills 2020 Depreciation Study for Account 380,
3		Services?
4	A.	Yes. Black Hills 2020 Depreciation Study when discussing Account 380, Services
5		states that "the majority of cost of removal for the associated 2019 and 2020
6		retirements have not been recorded yet." <sup>27</sup>
7		The table below shows the adjustment to the 2019 and 2020 historic net salvage
8		amounts to include the cost of removal amounts that have been recorded since
9		September 30, 2020.

10	Table	e 5: Account 380, Services A	djusted Historic Net Cost o	f Removal
		Net Cost of Removal	Additional Net Cost of	Total Adjusted
		Amount KSG Direct	Removal provided in	Net Cost of
	Year	Exhibit JJS-2 p. 145	KCC-123	Removal
	2016	\$6,746		\$6,746
	2017	\$56,872		\$56,872
	2018	\$8,811		\$8,811
	2019	\$29,918	\$3,818	\$33,736
	2020	\$320	\$19,724	\$20,044
	Total	\$102,667	\$23,542	\$126,209
	Average	\$20,533		\$25,242

11

## 12 Q. Does your proposal to use a -10% estimated future net salvage percent result in

## 13 an under-recovery of the estimated future costs?

14 A. No. As shown in Exhibit RMM-3 and Table 5 above, for Account 380, Services,

15 Black Hills actually incurred \$133,144 on average per year.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> KGS Direct Exhibit JJS-2 at 40.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> KGS Direct Exhibit JJS-2 at 145 and Black Hills response to KCC-123, attached as Exhibit RMM-4.

1		Witness Spanos proposes to collect \$204,512 which is 8.1 times the average annual
2		amount Black Hills has actually incurred for net salvage.
3		My recommendation results in an annual accrual of \$133,144 which is 5.3 times the
4		average annual amount Black Hills has actually incurred for net salvage. <sup>29</sup> My
5		recommendation provides recovery of the expected cost of removal in the near future
6		and builds the reserve for future cost of removal associated with future retirements.
7		V. Conclusion
8	Q.	Please summarize your recommendations.
9	A.	For the reasons stated above, I recommend that the Staff's proposed remaining life
10		depreciation rates shown on Exhibit RMM-2 be approved for Black Hills in Kansas.
11	0	Does this conclude your direct testimony?
11	v	Does this conclude your un eet testimony.
12	A.	Yes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> I am not recommending or implying a change from the "accrual" basis to the "cash" basis for the recovery of future net salvage costs. In other words, I am not recommending or implying that the depreciation accrual no longer be credited to the Accumulated Provision for Depreciation or that the net salvage costs be "expensed."

Roxie McCullar, CPA, CDP 8625 Farmington Cemetery Road Pleasant Plains, IL

Roxie McCullar is a regulatory consultant, licensed Certified Public Accountant in the state of Illinois, and a Certified Depreciation Professional through the Society of Depreciation Professionals. She is a member of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, the Illinois CPA Society, and the Society of Depreciation Professionals. Ms. McCullar has received her Master of Arts degree in Accounting from the University of Illinois-Springfield as well as her Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics from Illinois State University. Ms. McCullar has 20 years of experience as a regulatory consultant for William Dunkel and Associates. In that time, she has filed testimony in over 50 state regulatory proceedings on depreciation issues and cost allocation for universal service and has assisted Mr. Dunkel in numerous other proceedings.

## Current Position: Consultant at William Dunkel and Associates

Participation in the proceedings below included some or all of the following:

Developing analyses, preparing data requests, analyzing issues, writing draft testimony, preparing data responses, preparing draft questions for cross examination, drafting briefs, and developing various quantitative models.

## Education

Master of Arts in Accounting from the University of Illinois-Springfield, Springfield, Illinois

12 hours of Business and Management classes at Benedictine University-Springfield College in Illinois, Springfield, Illinois

27 hours of Graduate Studies in Mathematics at Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois

Completed Depreciation Fundamentals training course offered by the Society of Depreciation Professionals

Relevant Coursework:

- Calculus	- Discrete Mathematics
- Number Theory	- Mathematical Statistics
- Linear Programming	- Differential Equations
- Finite Sampling	- Statistics for Business and Economics
- Introduction to Micro Economics	- Introduction to Macro Economics
- Principles of MIS	- Introduction to Financial Accounting
- Introduction to Managerial Accounting	- Intermediate Managerial Accounting
- Intermediate Financial Accounting I	- Intermediate Financial Accounting II
- Advanced Financial Accounting	- Auditing Concepts/Responsibilities
- Accounting Information Systems	- Federal Income Tax
- Fraud Forensic Accounting	- Accounting for Government & Non-Profit
- Commercial Law	- Advanced Utilities Regulation
- Advanced Auditing	- Advanced Corp & Partnership Taxation

	Previous Experience of Roxie McCullar									
Year	State	Commission	Docket	Company	Description	On Behalf of				
2021	Florida	Florida Public Service Commission	20210015-EI	Florida Power & Light Company	Electric Depreciation Issues	Office of Public Counsel				
2020	DC	District of Columbia Public Service Commission	FC1137	Washington Gas & Light	Natural Gas Depreciation Issues	District of Columbia Public Service Commission				
2020	DC	District of Columbia Public Service Commission	FC1156	Potomac Electric Power Company	Electric Depreciation Issues	District of Columbia Public Service Commission				
2020	North Carolina	North Carolina Utilities Commission	E-2, SUB 1219	Duke Energy Progress, LLC	Electric Depreciation Issues	Public Staff - North Carolina Utilities Commission				
2020	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	20-BLVT-218-KSF	Blue Valley Tele- Communications, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2020	Utah	Public Service Commission of Utah	18-035-36	Rocket Mountain Power	Electric Depreciation Issues	Division of Public Utilities				
2020	North Carolina	North Carolina Utilities Commission	E-7, SUB 1214	Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC	Electric Depreciation Issues	Public Staff - North Carolina Utilities Commission				
2019	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	20-UTAT-032-KSF	United Telephone Association	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2019	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	19-ATMG-525-RTS	Amos Energy	Natural Gas Depreciation Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2019	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	19-GNBT-505-KSF	Golden Belt Telephone Association	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2019	Arizona	Arizona Corporation Commission	E-01933A-19-0028	Tucson Electric Power Company	Electric Depreciation Issues	The Utilities Division Staff Arizona Corporation Commission				
2019	North Carolina	North Carolina Utilities Commission	E-22, SUB 562	Dominion Energy North Carolina	Electric Depreciation Issues	Public Staff - North Carolina Utilities Commission				
2019	Utah	Public Service Commission of Utah	19-057-03	Dominion Energy Utah	Natural Gas Depreciation Issues	Division of Public Utilities				

	Previous Experience of Roxie McCullar									
Year	State	Commission	Docket	Company	Description	On Behalf of				
2019	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	19-EPDE-223-RTS	Empire District Electric Company	Electric Depreciation Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2019	Arizona	Arizona Corporation Commission	T-03214A-17-0305	Citizens Telecommunications Company	Arizona Universal Service Fund	The Utilities Division Staff Arizona Corporation Commission				
2018	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	18-KGSG-560-RTS	Kansas Gas Service	Natural Gas Depreciation Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2018	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	18-KCPE-480-RTS	Kansas City Power & Light Company	Electric Depreciation Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2018	Rhode Island	Rhode Island and Providence Plantations Public Utilities Commission	4800	SUEZ Water	Water Depreciation Issues	Division of Public Utilities and Carriers				
2018	Rhode Island	Rhode Island and Providence Plantations Public Utilities Commission	4770	Narragansett Electric Company	Electric & Natural Gas Depreciation Issues	Division of Public Utilities and Carriers				
2018	North Carolina	North Carolina Utilities Commission	E-7, SUB 1146	Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC	Electric Depreciation Issues	Public Staff - North Carolina Utilities Commission				
2017	DC	District of Columbia Public Service Commission	FC1150	Potomac Electric Power Company	Electric Depreciation Issues	District of Columbia Public Service Commission				
2017	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	17-RNBT-555-KSF	Rainbow Telecommunications Association, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2017	North Carolina	North Carolina Utilities Commission	E-2, SUB 1142	Duke Energy Progress, LLC	Electric Depreciation Issues	Public Staff - North Carolina Utilities Commission				
2017	Washington	Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission	UE-170033 & UG-170034	Puget Sound Energy	Electric & Natural Gas Depreciation Issues	Washington State Office of the Attorney General, Public Council Unit				
2017	Florida	Florida Public Service Commission	160186-EI & 160170-EI	Gulf Power Company	Electric Depreciation Issues	The Citizens of the State of Florida				

	Previous Experience of Roxie McCullar									
Year	State	Commission	Docket	Company	Description	On Behalf of				
2016	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	16-KGSG-491-RTS	Kansas Gas Service	Natural Gas Depreciation Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2016	DC	District of Columbia Public Service Commission	FC1139	Potomac Electric Power Company	Depreciation Issues	District of Columbia Public Service Commission				
2016	Arizona	Arizona Corporation Commission	E-01933A-15-0239 & E- 01933A-15-0322	Tucson Electric Power Company	Electric Depreciation Issues	The Utilities Division Staff Arizona Corporation Commission				
2016	Georgia	Georgia Public Service Commission	40161	Georgia Power Company	Addressed Depreciation Issues	Georgia Public Service Commission Public Interest Advocacy Staff				
2016	DC	District of Columbia Public Service Commission	FC1137	Washington Gas & Light	Depreciation Issues	District of Columbia Public Service Commission				
2015	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	16-ATMG-079-RTS	Amos Energy	Natural Gas Depreciation Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2015	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	15-TWVT-213-AUD	Twin Valley Telephone, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Allocation of FTTH Equipment, & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2015	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	15-KCPE-116-RTS	Kansas City Power & Light Company	Electric Depreciation Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2015	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	15-MRGT-097-AUD	Moundridge Telephone Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2014	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	14-S&TT-525-KSF	S&T Telephone Cooperative Association, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2014	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	14-WTCT-142-KSF	Wamego Telecommunications Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2013	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	13-PLTT-678-KSF	Peoples Telecommunications, LLC	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				

Year	State	Commission	Docket	Company	Description	On Behalf of
2013	New Jersey	State of New Jersey Board of Public Utilities	BPU ER12121071	Atlantic City Electric Company	Electric Depreciation Issues	New Jersey Rate Counsel
2013	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	13-JBNT-437-KSF	J.B.N. Telephone Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2013	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	13-ZENT-065-AUD	Zenda Telephone Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2013	DC	District of Columbia Public Service Commission	FC1103	Potomac Electric Power Company	Depreciation Issues	District of Columbia Public Service Commission
2012	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	12-LHPT-875-AUD	LaHarpe Telephone Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2012	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	12-GRHT-633-KSF	Gorham Telephone Company	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2012	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	12-S&TT-234-KSF	S&T Telephone Cooperative Association, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2011	DC	District of Columbia Public Service Commission	FC1093	Washington Gas & Light	Depreciation Issues	District of Columbia Public Service Commission
2011	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	11-CNHT-659-KSF	Cunningham Telephone Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2011	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	11-PNRT-315-KSF	Pioneer Telephone Association	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2010	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	10-HVDT-288-KSF	Haviland Telephone Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2009	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	09-BLVT-913-KSF	Blue Valley Tele- Communications, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff

Year	State	Commission	Docket	Company	Description	On Behalf of
2009	DC	District of Columbia Public Service Commission	FC1076	Potomac Electric Power Company	Depreciation Issues	District of Columbia Public Service Commission
2008	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	09-MTLT-091-KSF	Mutual Telephone Company	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2007	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	08-MRGT-221-KSF	Moundridge Telephone Company	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2007	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	07-PLTT-1289-AUD	Peoples Telecommunications, LLC	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2007	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	07-MDTT-195-AUD	Madison Telephone, LLC	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2007	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	06-RNBT-1322-AUD	Rainbow Telecommunications Assn., Inc.	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2006	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	06-WCTC-1020-AUD	Wamego Telecommunications Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2006	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	06-H&BT-1007-AUD	H&B Communications, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2006	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	06-ELKT-365-AUD	Elkhart Telephone Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2005	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	05-SCNT-1048-AUD	South Central Telephone Association, Inc.	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2005	Utah	Public Service Commission of Utah	05-2302-01	Carbon/Emery Telecom, Inc.	Cost Study Issues & Depreciation Issues	Utah Committee of Consumer Services
2005	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	05-TTHT-895-AUD	Totah Communications, Inc.	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff

Voor	State	Commission	Docket	Company	Description	On Behalf of
2005	Maine	Public Utilities Commission of the State of Maine	2005-155	Verizon	Depreciation Issues	Office of Public Advocate
2005	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	05-TRCT-607-KSF	Tri-County Telephone Association	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2005	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	05-CNHT-020-AUD	Cunningham Telephone Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2005	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	05-KOKT-060-AUD	KanOkla Telephone Association, Inc.	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2004	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	04-UTAT-690-AUD	United Telephone Association, Inc.	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2004	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	04-CGTT-679-RTS	Council Grove Telephone Company	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2004	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	04-GNBT-130-AUD	Golden Belt Telephone Association	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2004	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	03-TWVT-1031-AUD	Twin Valley Telephone, Inc.	Cost Study Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2003	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	03-HVDT-664-RTS	Haviland Telephone Company	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2003	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	03-WHST-503-AUD	Wheat State Telephone Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues & Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2003	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	03-S&AT-160-AUD	S&A Telephone Company	Cost Study Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff
2002	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	02-JBNT-846-AUD	JBN Telephone Company	Cost Study Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff

	Previous Experience of Roxie McCullar									
Year	State	Commission	Docket	Company	Description	On Behalf of				
2002	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	02-S&TT-390-AUD	S&T Telephone Cooperative Association, Inc.	Cost Study Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2002	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	02-BLVT-377-AUD	Blue Valley Telephone Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2001	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	01-PNRT-929-AUD	Pioneer Telephone Association, Inc.	Cost Study Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2001	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	01-BSST-878-AUD	Bluestem Telephone Company	Cost Study Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2001	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	01-SFLT-879-AUD	Sunflower Telephone Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2001	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	01-CRKT-713-AUD	Craw-Kan Telephone Cooperative, Inc.	Cost Study Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2001	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	01-RNBT-608-KSF	Rainbow Telecommunications Association	Cost Study Issues, Support Fund Adjustments	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2001	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	01-SNKT-544-AUD	Southern Kansas Telephone Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2001	Kansas	Kansas Corporation Commission	01-RRLT-518-KSF	Rural Telephone Service Company, Inc.	Cost Study Issues	Kansas Corporation Commission Staff				
2000	Illinois	Illinois Commerce Commission	98-0252	Ameritech	Cost Study Issues	Government and Consumer Intervenors				

#### Black Hills Energy Comparison of Proposals Using Plant Balances as of September 30, 2020

		Curre	nt Approved		Black Hills Prop	osed		Stat	f Proposal		
Function	9/30/20 Plant in Service	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Difference from Company Proposed	
Intangible Plant	3,140,828	2.28%	71,638	3.58%	112,367	40,729	3.58%	112,367	40,729	0	
Other Storage Plant	18,719	3.33%	623	2.76%	516	(107)	2.76%	516	(107)	0	
Transmission	44,058,801	1.30%	573,592	1.60%	706,192	132,600	1.53%	673,162	99,570	(33,030)	
Distribution	255,836,375	2.29%	5,855,614	2.56%	6,540,374	684,760	2.46%	6,299,103	443,489	(241,271)	
General	23,485,370	7.18%	1,686,019	5.29%	1,242,055	(443,964)	5.29%	1,242,055	(443,964)	0	
General Plant Amortiz	0		0		(5,105)	(5,105)		(5,105)	(5,105)	0	
Total	326,540,093	2.51%	8,187,486	2.63%	8,596,399	408,913	2.55%	8,322,098	134,612	(274,301)	

			Current	Approved	В	lack Hills Pr	oposed		Sta	ff Proposal	
Account	Description	9/30/20 Plant in Service	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Difference from Company Proposed
Intangible P	lant										
302.00	Franchises and Consents	74.990	0.81%	607	0.48%	358	(249)	0.48%	358	(249)	0
303.00	Miscellaneous Intangible Plant	1.335.506	0.46%	6.143	1.83%	24,424	18.281	1.83%	24.424	18.281	0
303.01	Miscellaneous Intangible Plant - Easemer	1,730,332	3.75%	64,887	5.06%	, 87,585	22,698	5.06%	, 87,585	22,698	0
Total Intang	ible Plant	3,140,828	2.28%	71,638	3.58%	112,367	40,729	3.58%	112,367	40,729	0
Production	Plant										
336.01	Purification Equipment	18,719	3.33%	623	2.76%	516	(107)	2.76%	516	(107)	0
Total Produ	ction Plant	18,719	3.33%	623	2.76%	516	(107)	2.76%	516	(107)	0
<u>Transmissio</u>	n Plant										
366.01	Structures and Improvements	131,402	1.97%	2,589	0.98%	1,282	(1,307)	0.98%	1,282	(1,307)	0
367.00	Mains	39,814,131	1.11%	441,937	1.46%	582,465	140,528	1.38%	549,435	107,498	(33 <i>,</i> 030)
368.04	Compressor Station Equipment	2,475	5.31%	131	7.27%	180	49	7.27%	180	49	0
369.03	Measuring and Regulating Station Equipn	4,002,449	3.02%	120,874	2.81%	112,621	(8,253)	2.81%	112,621	(8,253)	0
371.01	Other Equipment	108,344	7.44%	8,061	8.90%	9,644	1,583	8.90%	9,644	1,583	0
Total Transr	nission Plant	44,058,801	1.30%	573,592	1.60%	706,192	132,600	1.53%	673,162	99,570	(33,030)
<b>Distribution</b>	Plant										
375.01	Structures and Improvements	937,596	6.62%	62,069	2.45%	23,005	(39,064)	2.45%	23,005	(39,064)	0
376.00	Mains	118,761,515	1.74%	2,066,450	1.66%	1,966,410	(100,040)	1.54%	1,828,927	(237,523)	(137,483)
377.00	Compressor Equipment	175,304	3.00%	5,259	4.86%	8,515	3,256	4.86%	8,515	3,256	0
378.00	Measuring and Regulating Station Equipn	5,724,719	2.53%	144,835	2.33%	133,188	(11,647)	2.33%	133,188	(11,647)	0
379.00	Measuring and Regulating Station Equipn	61,111	3.51%	2,145	4.74%	2,897	752	4.74%	2,897	752	0
380.00	Services	70,054,268	2.34%	1,639,270	2.24%	1,567,922	(71,348)	2.09%	1,464,134	(175,136)	(103,788)
381.00	Meters	10,897,456	3.05%	332,372	9.23%	1,005,857	673,485	9.23%	1,005,857	673,485	0
381.01	Meters - ERT and AMI	9,756,739	6.69%	652,726	7.10%	692,952	40,226	7.10%	692,952	40,226	0
382.01	Meter Installations	1,665,776	0.72%	11,994	0.90%	14,918	2,924	0.90%	14,918	2,924	0
383.01	House Regulators	31,459,092	2.69%	846,250	3.08%	968,534	122,284	3.08%	968,534	122,284	0
385.01	Industrial Measuring and Regulating Stati	6,233,437	1.45%	90,385	2.45%	152,986	62,601	2.45%	152,986	62,601	0
387.00	Other Equipment	109,363	1.70%	1,859	2.92%	3,190	1,331	2.92%	3,190	1,331	0
Total Distrib	oution Plant	255,836,375	2.29%	5,855,614	2.56%	6,540,374	684,760	2.46%	6,299,103	443,489	(241,271)

			Current Approved		В	lack Hills Pr	oposed	Staff Proposal			
Account	Description	9/30/20 Plant in Service	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Difference from Company Proposed
General Pla	nt										
390.00	Structures and Improvements										
390.01	Owned	9.083.466	2.51%	227.995	2.71%	246.529	18.534	2.71%	246.529	18.534	0
390.51	Leased	26.483	3.41%	903	0.00%	0	(903)	0.00%	0	(903)	0
	Total Structures and Improvements	9,109,949	2.51%	228,898	2.71%	246,529	17,631	2.71%	246,529	17,631	0
	Office Furniture and Equipment										
391.01	Furniture and Equipment										
	Fully Accrued	1,407	11.70%	165	0.00%	0	(165)	0.00%	0	(165)	0
	Amortized	355,266	11.70%	41,566	5.00%	17,758	(23 <i>,</i> 808)	5.00%	17,758	(23,808)	0
	Total Furniture and Equipment	356,672	11.70%	41,731	4.98%	17,758	(23,973)	4.98%	17,758	(23,973)	0
391.03	Computer Hardware										
	Fully Accrued	93,868	19.22%	18,042	0.00%	0	(18,042)	0.00%	0	(18,042)	0
	Amortized	701,898	19.22%	134,905	20.00%	140,390	5,485	20.00%	140,390	5,485	0
	Total Computer Hardware	795,767	19.22%	152,946	17.64%	140,390	(12,556)	17.64%	140,390	(12,556)	0
391.07	iPad Hardware	222,824	25.00%	55,706	20.00%	44,566	(11,140)	20.00%	44,566	(11,140)	0
	Total Office Furniture and Equipment	1,375,263	18.21%	250,383	14.74%	202,714	(47,669)	14.74%	202,714	(47,669)	0
	Transportation Equipment										
392.01	Subunit	50,025	11.52%	5,763	8.53%	4,269	(1,494)	8.53%	4,269	(1,494)	0
392.03	Light Trucks	7,276,262	13.23%	962,649	7.13%	519,111	(443,538)	7.13%	519,111	(443,538)	0
392.04	Medium Trucks	62,551	12.40%	7,756	11.60%	7,257	(499)	11.60%	7,257	(499)	0
392.05	Heavy Trucks	427,251	8.63%	36,872	1.12%	4,796	(32,076)	1.12%	4,796	(32,076)	0
392.06	Trailers	167,615	5.81%	9,738	1.46%	2,455	(7,283)	1.46%	2,455	(7,283)	0
	Total Transportation Equipment	7,983,704	12.81%	1,022,779	6.74%	537,888	(484,891)	6.74%	537,888	(484,891)	0
393.00	Stores Equipment	29,525	2.65%	782	4.00%	1,182	400	4.00%	1,182	400	0

394.00 Tools, Shop, and Garage Equipment

			Current	Approved	В	lack Hills Pr	oposed		Sta	ff Proposal	
Account	Description	9/30/20 Plant in Service	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Difference from Company Proposed
	Fully Accrued	64.302	2.03%	1.305	0.00%	0	(1.305)	0.00%	0	(1.305)	0
	Amortized	2.304.765	2.03%	46.787	4.00%	92.278	45.491	4.00%	92.278	45.491	0
	Total Tools, Shop, and Garage Equipment	2,369,067	2.03%	48,092	3.90%	92,278	44,186	3.90%	92,278	44,186	0
395.00	Laboratory Equipment										
	Fully Accrued	1,564	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0
	Amortized	11,714	1.55%	182	5.00%	586	404	5.00%	586	404	0
	Total Laboratory Equipment	13,278	1.37%	182	4.41%	586	404	4.41%	586	404	0
396.00	Power Operated Equipment	1,060,470	2.66%	28,208	5.57%	59,095	30,887	5.57%	59 <i>,</i> 095	30,887	0
397.00	Communication Equipment										
	Fully Accrued	17,111	6.85%	1,172	0.00%	0	(1,172)	0.00%	0	(1,172)	0
	Amortized	1,509,786	6.85%	103,420	6.67%	100,635	(2,785)	6.67%	100,635	(2,785)	0
	Total Communication Equipment	1,526,897	6.85%	104,592	6.59%	100,635	(3,957)	6.59%	100,635	(3,957)	0
398.00	Miscellaneous Equipment	17,218	12.21%	2,102	6.67%	1,148	(954)	6.67%	1,148	(954)	0
Total Gener	al Plant	23,485,370	7.18%	1,686,019	5.29%	1,242,055	(443,964)	5.29%	1,242,055	(443,964)	0
TOTAL DEPR	RECIABLE PLANT	326,540,093	2.51%	8,187,486	2.63%	8,601,504	414,018	2.55%	8,327,203	139,717	(274,301)
201 01	G Reserve for Amortization			0		(10 617)	(40 647)		(10 6 17)	(40 647)	0
201 02	Computer Hardware			0		(40,047) E 140	(40,047)		(40,047) E 140	(40,047)	0
201.05	iPad Hardware			0		1 100	1 100		1 100	1 100	0
303 00	Stores Equipment			0		(365)	(365)		(365)	(365)	0
393.00	Tools Shon and Garage Equipment			0		(17 7//)	(303)		(17 7//)	(303)	0
395.00	Laboratory Equipment			0		(2 202)	(17,744)		(2 202)	(17,744)	0
397.00	Communication Equipment			0		48 309	(2,392)		(2,392) 48 300	(2,392) 48 309	0
398.00	Miscellaneous Equipment			0		1 395	1 395		1 395	1 395	n n
Total Unrec	overed Reserve for Amortization	0	-	0	-	(5,105)	(5,105)	-	(5,105)	(5,105)	0

			Current Approved		Black Hills Proposed			Staff Proposal			
Account	Description	9/30/20 Plant in Service	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Accrual Rate	Accrual Amount	Difference from Current	Difference from Company Proposed
Nondeprecia	able and Accounts Not Studied										
301.00	Organization	186,932		0		0	0			0	0
303.02	Miscellaneous Intangible Plant - Tradema	181,000		0		0	0			0	0
365.01	Land	9,431		0		0	0			0	0
365.02	Land Rights	594,368		0		0	0			0	0
365.71	Land - Farm Tap	644		0		0	0			0	0
365.72	Land Rights - Farm Tap	2,100		0		0	0			0	0
374.01	Land	187,066		0		0	0			0	0
374.02	Land Rights	183,574		0		0	0			0	0
389.01	Land	905,127		0		0	0			0	0
Total Nondepreciable		2,250,242	-	0	-	0	0		0	0	0
TOTAL GAS	PLANT	328,790,335	-	8,187,486	-	8,596,399	408,913		8,322,098	134,612	(274,301)

#### Black Hills Energy Table 2: Calculation of Remaining Life Annual Accrual Rate Using Plant Balances as of September 30, 2020

							Total An	inual
					Future			
			9/30/20 Book	Book	Net			
		9/30/20 Plant in	Reserve	Reserve	Salvage	Remaining	Calculated	Accrual
Account	Description	Service	Amount	Percent	Percent	Life	Accrual Rate	Amount
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	H)=(1-(E)-(F))/(C	(I)=(C)*(H)
Intangible P	lant							
302.00	Franchises and Consents	74,990	72,676	96.91%	0%	6.5	0.47%	356
303.00	Miscellaneous Intangible Plant	1.335.506	1.061.138	79.46%	0%	11.2	1.83%	24,497
303.01	Miscellaneous Intangible Plant - Fasemer	1,730,332	1.051.552	60.77%	0%	7.7	5.09%	88,153
Total Intang	vible Plant	3.140.828	2.185.366	69.58%	070	7.7	3.60%	113.006
Production	Plant	10 710	12 (10	C7 410/	00/	11.0	2 70%	F 1 7
336.01	Purification Equipment	18,719	12,618	67.41%	0%	11.8	2.76%	517
Total Produ	ction Plant	18,719	12,618	67.41%			2.76%	517
Transmissio	n Plant							
366.01	Structures and Improvements	131,402	101,999	77.62%	-5%	28.1	0.97%	1,280
367.00	Mains	39,814,131	10,258,430	25.77%	-5%	57.6	1.38%	547,681
368.04	Compressor Station Equipment	2,475	1,678	67.80%	-5%	5.1	7.29%	181
369.03	Measuring and Regulating Station Equipn	4,002,449	1,596,331	39.88%	-10%	24.9	2.82%	112,705
371.01	Other Equipment	108,344	38,354	35.40%	0%	7.3	8.85%	9,588
Total Trans	mission Plant	44,058,801	11,996,792	27.23%			1.52%	671,434
Distribution	Plant							
275 01	Structures and Improvements	027 506	202 191	22 2/0/	5%	20.6	2 15%	22 017
375.01	Maine	957,590 110 761 F1F	505,161	32.34%	-3%	29.0	2.43%	25,017
376.00		118,761,515	41,628,843	35.05%	-5%	45.3	1.54%	1,833,791
377.00	Compressor Equipment	175,304	56,068	31.98%	-5%	15.0	4.87%	8,533
378.00	Measuring and Regulating Station Equiph	5,724,719	1,/6/,//5	30.88%	-10%	34.0	2.33%	133,218
379.00	Measuring and Regulating Station Equiph	61,111	30,663	50.18%	-10%	12.6	4.75%	2,901
380.00	Services	70,054,268	27,703,262	39.55%	-10%	33.7	2.09%	1,464,583
381.00	Meters	10,897,456	952,787	8.74%	0%	9.9	9.22%	1,004,512
381.01	Meters - ERT and AMI	9,756,739	4,279,910	43.87%	0%	7.9	7.11%	693,269
382.01	Meter Installations	1,665,776	1,218,422	73.14%	0%	30.0	0.90%	14,912
383.01	House Regulators	31,459,092	3,204,944	10.19%	-5%	30.8	3.08%	968,412
385.01	Industrial Measuring and Regulating Stati	6,233,437	1,842,868	29.56%	-5%	30.7	2.46%	153,167
387.00	Other Equipment	109,363	23,558	21.54%	0%	26.9	2.92%	3,190
Total Distrik	oution Plant	255,836,375	83,012,281	32.45%			2.46%	6,303,507
General Pla	nt							
390.00	Structures and Improvements							
390.01	Owned	9,083,466	1,345,360	14.81%	-5%	33.2	2.72%	246,755
390.51	Leased	26,483	26,483	100.00%	0%	0.0	0.00%	0
	Total Structures and Improvements	9,109,949	1,371,843	15.06%	-5%	33.2	2.71%	246,755
	Office Furniture and Fauinment							
391 01	Furniture and Equipment							
331.01	Fully Accrued	1 /07	1 407	100 00%	0%	0.0	0.00%	0
	Amortized	255 266	120 200	26.68%	0%	12.7	4 00%	17 714
	Amontized Total Euroiture and Equipment	255,200	121 707	26.02%	0%	12.7	4.99%	17,714
	Total Furniture and Equipment	550,072	131,707	50.95%	0%	12.7	4.97%	17,714
391.03	Computer Hardware							
	Fully Accrued	93,868	93,868	100.00%	0%	0.0	0.00%	0
	Amortized	701,898	160,600	22.88%	0%	3.9	19.77%	138,794
	Total Computer Hardware	795,767	254,468	31.98%	0%	3.9	17.44%	138,794
391.07	iPad Hardware	222,824	55,700	25.00%	0%	3.8	19.74%	43,980
	Total Office Furniture and Equipment	1,375,263	441,875	32.13%	0%	4.7	14.58%	200,488

#### Black Hills Energy Table 2: Calculation of Remaining Life Annual Accrual Rate Using Plant Balances as of September 30, 2020

							Total Ar	nnual
					Future			
			9/30/20 Book	Book	Net			
		9/30/20 Plant in	Reserve	Reserve	Salvage	Remaining	Calculated	Accrual
Account	Description	Service	Amount	Percent	Percent	Life	Accrual Rate	Amount
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)	H)=(1-(E)-(F))/(C	(I)=(C)*(H)
	Transportation Equipment							
392.01	Subunit	50,025	27,141	54.25%	25%	2.4	8.64%	4,324
392.03	Light Trucks	7,276,262	2,510,327	34.50%	25%	5.7	7.11%	516,995
392.04	Medium Trucks	62,551	33,707	53.89%	25%	1.8	11.73%	7,337
392.05	Heavy Trucks	427,251	263,749	61.73%	25%	11.8	1.12%	4,804
392.06	Trailers	167,615	89,584	53.45%	25%	14.7	1.47%	2,458
	Total Transportation Equipment	7,983,704	2,924,506	36.63%	2%	9.1	6.71%	535,918
393.00	Stores Equipment	29,525	20,780	70.38%	0%	7.4	4.00%	1,182
394.00	Tools, Shop, and Garage Equipment							
	Fully Accrued	64,302	64,302	100.00%	0%	0.0	0.00%	0
	Amortized	2,304,765	708,500	30.74%	0%	17.3	4.00%	92,270
	Total Tools, Shop, and Garage Equipment	2,369,067	772,802	32.62%	0%	17.3	3.89%	92,270
395.00	Laboratory Equipment							
	Fully Accrued	1,564	1,564	100.00%	0%	0.0	0.00%	0
	Amortized	11,714	5,600	47.81%	0%	10.4	5.02%	588
	Total Laboratory Equipment	13,278	7,164	53.95%	0%	10.4	4.43%	588
396.00	Power Operated Equipment	1,060,470	286,151	26.98%	15%	10.4	5.58%	59,159
397.00	Communication Equipment							
	Fully Accrued	17,111	17,111	100.00%	0%	0.0	0.00%	0
	Amortized	1,509,786	765,000	50.67%	0%	7.4	6.67%	100,647
	Total Communication Equipment	1,526,897	782,111	51.22%	0%	7.4	6.59%	100,647
398.00	Miscellaneous Equipment	17,218	2,420	14.06%	0%	12.9	6.66%	1,147
Total Gener	al Plant	23,485,370	6,609,652	28.14%			5.27%	1,238,153
TOTAL DEPR	RECIABLE PLANT	326,540,093	103,816,710	31.79%			2.55%	8,326,617
Unrecovere	d Reserve for Amortization							
391.01	Furniture and Equipment		203,233			5.0		(40,647)
391.03	Computer Hardware		(25,744)			5.0		5,149
391.07	iPad Hardware		(5,952)			5.0		1,190
393.00	Stores Equipment		1,827			5.0		(365)
394.00	Tools, Shop, and Garage Equipment		88,720			5.0		(17,744)
395.00	Laboratory Equipment		11,961			5.0		(2,392)
397.00	Communication Equipment		(241,544)			5.0		48,309
398.00	Miscellaneous Equipment		(6,976)			5.0		1,395
Total Unrec	overed Reserve for Amortization	0	25,526	-			-	(5,105)
TOTAL GAS	PLANT	326,540,093	103,842,235	31.80%				8,321,512
	=							

#### Black Hills Energy Table 3: Current and Proposed Parameters Using Plant Balances as of September 30, 2020

			Current Ap	proved	Black Hills Proposed			Staff Proposal				
								Future				Future
							Average	Net			Average	Net
		Projection	Survivor	Future Net	Projection	Survivor	Remaining	Salvage	Projection	Survivor	Remaining	Salvage
Account	Description	Life Years	Curve	Salvage Percent	Life Years	Curve	Life Years	Percent	Life Years	Curve	Life Years	Percent
	· · ·											
Intangible P	Plant											
302.00	Franchises and Consents	0	0	0%	30	SQ	6.5	0%	30	SQ	6.5	0%
303.00	Miscellaneous Intangible Plant	0	0	0%	30	SQ	11.2	0%	30	SQ	11.2	0%
303.01	Miscellaneous Intangible Plant - Easemer	0	0	0%	20	SQ	7.7	0%	20	SQ	7.7	0%
Production	Plant											
336.01	Purification Equipment	30	S2	0%	30	S2	11.8	0%	30	S2	11.8	0%
Transmissio	on Plant											
366.01	Structures and Improvements	40	R2.5	-5%	50	R2	28.1	-5%	50	R2	28.1	-5%
367.00	Mains	VARI	DUS	-5%	70	R1	57.6	-10%	70	R1	57.6	-5%
368.04	Compressor Station Equipment	35	S1.5	-5%	25	S2.5	5.1	-5%	25	S2.5	5.1	-5%
369.03	Measuring and Regulating Station Equipr	37	S0.5	-5%	40	R2	24.9	-10%	40	R2	24.9	-10%
371.01	Other Equipment	23	L3	-1%	25	\$1.5	7.3	0%	25	S1.5	7.3	0%
Distribution	n Plant											
375.01	Structures and Improvements	35	R2.5	-5%	35	SO	29.6	-5%	35	S0	29.6	-5%
376.00	Mains	VARI	DUS	0%,-10%,-25%	57	R3	45.3	-10%	57	R3	45.3	-5%
377.00	Compressor Equipment	35	S1.5	-5%	25	S2.5	15.0	-5%	25	S2.5	15.0	-5%
378.00	Measuring and Regulating Station Equipr	40	R2.5	-10%	45	R2.5	34.0	-10%	45	R2.5	34.0	-10%
379.00	Measuring and Regulating Station Equipr	40	L2.5	-10%	35	S1.5	12.6	-10%	35	S1.5	12.6	-10%
380.00	Services	VARI	OUS	-40%,-20%	48	R4	33.7	-15%	48	R4	33.7	-10%
381.00	Meters	33	R2	0%	22	S0	9.9	0%	22	S0	9.9	0%
381.01	Meters - ERT and AMI	VARI	DUS	0%	15	R3	7.9	0%	15	R3	7.9	0%
382.01	Meter Installations	55	S2.5	-5%	50	R1.5	30.0	0%	50	R1.5	30.0	0%
383.01	House Regulators	45	R2.5	-15%	37	S0.5	30.8	-5%	37	S0.5	30.8	-5%
385.01	Industrial Measuring and Regulating Stat	VARI	DUS	-10%,-5%	42	R0.5	30.7	-5%	42	R0.5	30.7	-5%
387.00	Other Equipment	28	L3	0%	32	S2	26.9	0%	32	S2	26.9	0%
General Pla	nt											
390.00	Structures and Improvements											
390.01	Owned	40	R3	0%	40	R2.5	33.2	-5%	40	R2.5	33.2	-5%
390.51	Leased	20	S3	0%	20	S3	0.0	0%	20	S3	0.0	0%
	Office Furniture and Equipment											
391.01	Furniture and Equipment											
	Fully Accrued	FULLY AC	CRUED	0%	FULLY AC	CRUED	0.0	0%				
	Amortized	18	SQ	0%	20	SQ	12.7	0%	20	SQ	12.7	0%
391.03	Computer Hardware											
	Fully Accrued	FULLY AC	CRUED	0%	FULLY AC	CRUED	0.0	0%				
	Amortized	6	SQ	0%	5	SQ	3.9	0%	5	SQ	3.9	0%
391.07	iPad Hardware	0	0	0%	5	SQ	3.8	0%	5	SQ	3.8	0%

#### Black Hills Energy Table 3: Current and Proposed Parameters Using Plant Balances as of September 30, 2020

			Current Ap	proved	Black Hills Proposed		Staff Proposal					
							Average	Future Net			Average	Future Net
Account	Description	Projection Life Years	Survivor Curve	Future Net Salvage Percent	Projection Life Years	Survivor Curve	Remaining Life Years	Salvage Percent	Projection Life Years	Survivor Curve	Remaining Life Years	Salvage Percent
1	Transportation Equipment											
392.01 9	Subunit	7	L4	25%	7	L3	2.4	25%	7	L3	2.4	25%
392.03 L	Light Trucks	6	L2	30%	8	L2.5	5.7	25%	8	L2.5	5.7	25%
392.04 N	Medium Trucks	7	L2	30%	6	R2.5	1.8	25%	6	R2.5	1.8	25%
392.05 H	Heavy Trucks	10	L3	30%	15	L2.5	11.8	25%	15	L2.5	11.8	25%
392.06 1	Trailers	19	R2	20%	20	\$1.5	14.7	25%	20	\$1.5	14.7	25%
393.00	Stores Equipment	25	SQ	0%	25	SQ	7.4	0%	25	SQ	7.4	0%
394.00 1	Tools, Shop, and Garage Equipment											
	Fully Accrued	FULLY AC	CRUED	0%	FULLY AG	CRUED	0.0	0%				
	Amortized	27	SQ	0%	25	SQ	17.3	0%	25	SQ	17.3	0%
395.00 L	Laboratory Equipment											
	Fully Accrued	FULLY AC	CRUED	0%	FULLY AG	CRUED	0.0	0%				
	Amortized	20	SQ	0%	20	SQ	10.4	0%	20	SQ	10.4	0%
396.00 F	Power Operated Equipment	VARI	DUS	-25%	17	S1	10.4	15%	17	S1	10.4	15%
397.00 (	Communication Equipment											
	Fully Accrued	FULLY AC	CRUED	0%	FULLY AG	CRUED	0.0	0%				
	Amortized	18	SQ	0%	15	SQ	7.4	0%	15	SQ	7.4	0%
398.00 M	Miscellaneous Equipment	18	SQ	0%	15	SQ	12.9	0%	15	SQ	12.9	0%
nrecovered I	Reserve for Amortization											
391.01 F	Furniture and Equipment						5.0				5.0	
391.03 0	Computer Hardware						5.0				5.0	
391.07 i	Pad Hardware						5.0				5.0	
393.00	Stores Equipment						5.0				5.0	
394.00 1	Tools, Shop, and Garage Equipment						5.0				5.0	
395.00 L	Laboratory Equipment						5.0				5.0	
397.00 0	Communication Equipment						5.0				5.0	
398.00 M	Miscellaneous Equipment						5.0				5.0	

			Net Salvage		Net Salvage	
			Recovery		Recovery	
		Five Year Net	included in	Black Hills'	included in	Staff
		Salvage	Balck Hills'	Proposed /	Staff's	Proposed /
		Actually	Proposed	Actually	Proposed	Actually
Account	Description	Incurred	Depr Rates	Incurred	Depr Rates	Incurred
		А	В	C=B/A	D	E=D/A
Transmissior	n Plant					
366.01	Structures and Improvements	162	61	0.4	61	0.4
367.00	Mains	4,371	52,844	12.1	26,164	6.0
368.04	Compressor Station Equipment	0	9		9	
369.03	Measuring and Regulating Station Equipment	1,595	10,224	6.4	10,224	6.4
371.01	Other Equipment	0	0		0	
Total Transm	nission Plant	6,128	63,139	10.3	36,458	5.9
Distribution	Plant	<i>i</i>				
375.01	Structures and Improvements	(500)	1,094	-2.2	1,094	-2.2
376.00	Mains	18,302	179,222	9.8	87,092	4.8
377.00	Compressor Equipment	0	406		406	
378.79	Measuring and Regulating Station Equipment	4,530	12,389	2.7	12,389	2.7
380.00	Services	25,242	204,680	8.1	133,103	5.3
381.00	Meters	0	0		0	
381.01	Meters - ERT and AMI	0	0		0	
382.01	Meter Installations	(4)	0	0.0	0	0.0
383.01	House Regulators	10,475	46,140	4.4	46,140	4.4
385.01	Industrial Measuring and Regulating Station Equipmen	3,502	7,272	2.1	7,272	2.1
387.00	Other Equipment	0	0		0	
Total Distrib	ution Plant	61,546	451,203	7.3	287,496	4.7

## Comparison of Actually Incurred Net Salvage and Net Salvage in Proposed Depreciation Rates

Source:

KGS Direct Exhibit JJS-2 pages 136-155

Response to KCC-123 provided additional cost of removal for the years 2019 and 2020 for Accounts 376 and 380.

## BLACK HILLS / KANSAS GAS UTILITY COMPANY, LLC d/b/a BLACK HILLS ENERGY DOCKET NO. 21-BHCG-418-RTS KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION DATA REQUEST NO. KCC-123

DATE OF REQUEST:	06/03/2021
DATE RESPONSE DUE:	06/14/2021
REQUESTOR:	Kansas Corporation Commission
AUDITOR:	Roxie McCullar
ANSWERED BY:	John Spanos
DATE RESPONDED:	06/14/2021
SUBJECT:	Depreciation
REFERENCE:	

## REQUEST:

Page 40 of KGS Direct Exhibit JJS-2 when discussing Accounts 376.00 and 380.00 states that "the majority of cost of removal for the associated 2019 and 2020 retirements have not been recorded yet." Please provide the cost of removal and gross salvage amounts related to the 2019 and 2020 retirements separately for each account when they are available.

## RESPONSE:

Since September 30, 2020 cost of removal in account 376.00 has been posted of \$1,818 for 2019 and \$50,390 for 2020 work orders. The cost of removal for account 380.00 has been posted in the amount of \$3,818 for 2019 and \$19,724 for 2020 work orders. Nothing has been posted towards gross salvage for 2019 and 2020 work orders.

ATTACHMENTS: None.

## Verification of Response

I have read the foregoing information request and answer(s) thereto and find the answer(s) to be true, accurate, full and complete and contain no material misrepresentations or omissions to the best of my knowledge and belief; and I will disclose to the Commission Staff any matter subsequently discovered which affects the accuracy or completeness of the answer(s) to this information request.

## Signed: /s/ Tom Stevens

Date: June 14, 2021

## VERIFICATION

STATE OF ILLINOIS	)
COUNTY OF Sangamen	) ss. )

Roxie McCullar of William Dunkel & Associates, being duly sworn upon her oath deposes and states that she is a Consultant for the Kansas Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas; that she has read and is familiar with the foregoing *Direct Testimony*, and that the statements contained therein are true and correct to the best of her knowledge, information and belief.

MCL

Roxie McCullar Consultant for Staff Kansas Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this  $\underline{\$}^{\texttt{H}}$  day of September, 2021. otary Public My Appointment Expires: 76/y 39,2023 PRINYA MEKDARA Official Seal Notary Public - State of Illinois My Commission Expires Jul 30, 2023

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

#### 21-BHCG-418-RTS

I, the undersigned, certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing testimony was sent by electronic mail this 10th day of September, 2021, to the following:

JAMES G. FLAHERTY, ATTORNEY ANDERSON & BYRD, L.L.P. 216 S HICKORY PO BOX 17 OTTAWA, KS 66067 jflaherty@andersonbyrd.com

ROB DANIEL, MANAGER REGULATORY & FINANCE BLACK HILLS/KANSAS GAS UTILITY COMPANY, LLC D/B/A BLACK HILLS ENERGY 655 EAST MILLSAP DRIVE FAYETTEVILLE, AR 72703 rob.daniel@blackhillscorp.com

TOM STEVENS, DIRECTOR REGULATORY & FINANCE BLACK HILLS/KANSAS GAS UTILITY COMPANY, LLC D/B/A BLACK HILLS ENERGY 655 EAST MILLSAP DRIVE FAYETTEVILLE, AR 72703 tom.stevens@blackhillscorp.com

\* TODD E. LOVE, ATTORNEY CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 t.love@curb.kansas.gov

\* SHONDA RABB CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 s.rabb@curb.kansas.gov ANN STICHLER, SNR. ANALYST-REG. & FINANCE BLACK HILLS/KANSAS GAS UTILITY COMPANY LLC D/B/A Black Hills Energy 2287 College Road Council Bluffs, IA 51503 ann.stichler@blackhillscorp.com

DOUGLAS LAW, ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL BLACK HILLS/KANSAS GAS UTILITY COMPANY, LLC D/B/A BLACK HILLS ENERGY 1731 Windhoek Drive Lincoln, NE 68512 douglas.law@blackhillscorp.com

\* JOSEPH R. ASTRAB, ATTORNEY CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 j.astrab@curb.kansas.gov

DAVID W. NICKEL, CONSUMER COUNSEL CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 d.nickel@curb.kansas.gov

\* DELLA SMITH CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 d.smith@curb.kansas.gov

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

21-BHCG-418-RTS

\* MONTGOMERY ESCUE, CONSULTANT FREEDOM PIPELINE, LLC PO BOX 622377 OVIEDO, FL 63762 montgomery@escue.com \* KIRK HEGER FREEDOM PIPELINE, LLC 1901 UNIVERSITY DRIVE LAWRENCE, KS 66044 kirkheger@gmail.com

\* COLE BAILEY, LITIGATION COUNSEL KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 c.bailey@kcc.ks.gov DAVID COHEN, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 d.cohen@kcc.ks.gov

\* CARLY MASENTHIN, LITIGATION COUNSEL KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 c.masenthin@kcc.ks.gov

\* RICHARD L. HANSON RICHARD L. HANSON 16171 ROAD I LIBERAL, KS 67901 rlhanson@wbsnet.org \* GLENDA CAFER, ATTORNEY MORRIS LAING EVANS BROCK & KENNEDY 800 SW JACKSON SUITE 1310 TOPEKA, KS 66612-1216 gcafer@morrislaing.com

Abigail mery Abigail Emery, CRP

Abigail Émery, CRP Paralegal

\* Denotes those receiving the Confidential version