

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA**

---

EL 19-003

IN THE MATTER OF THE  
APPLICATION BY CROWN  
RIDGE WIND, LLC FOR A  
PERMIT OF A WIND ENERGY  
FACILITY IN GRANT AND  
CODINGTON COUNTIES

INTERVENORS' NOTICE OF  
TRANSMITTAL

Please take notice that attached hereto are true and correct copies of correspondence related to a change in the Scheduling Order concerning witnesses in the above entitled proceedings.

Dated this 23 day of May, 2019

/s/ David L Ganje

Ganje Law Offices

17220 N Boswell Blvd Suite 130L, Sun City, AZ 85373

Web: [lexenergy.net](http://lexenergy.net)

Phone 605 385 0330

[davidganje@ganjelaw.com](mailto:davidganje@ganjelaw.com)

## David Ganje

---

**From:** Hanson, Mikal <Mikal.Hanson@state.sd.us>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 22, 2019 2:44 PM  
**To:** David Ganje; Edwards, Kristen; Van Gerpen, Patty; Thurber, Jon; Kearney, Darren; Paulson, Eric  
**Cc:** Amber Christenson  
**Subject:** RE: EL19-003

Thank you for yours and your client's cooperation on this matter.

---

**From:** David Ganje <davidganje@ganjelaw.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 22, 2019 3:11 PM  
**To:** Edwards, Kristen <Kristen.Edwards@state.sd.us>; Hanson, Mikal <Mikal.Hanson@state.sd.us>; Van Gerpen, Patty <Patty.VanGerpen@state.sd.us>; Thurber, Jon <Jon.Thurber@state.sd.us>; Kearney, Darren <Darren.Kearney@state.sd.us>; Paulson, Eric <Eric.Paulson@state.sd.us>  
**Cc:** Amber Christenson <coteaupreservation@gmail.com>  
**Subject:** RE: [EXT] EL19-003

Ms. Edwards

I have received your response today regarding the Hessler testimony. I am disappointed in the message. I have discussed with the clients in two conversation the position of the PUC regarding the Hessler testimony on June 6<sup>th</sup> rather than at the scheduled hearing on the Application. If the PUC is not able to otherwise devise a procedure that would address the issues I raised in my email to you of today, then my clients the Intervenors will accede to the request I received only yesterday that the PUC Staff call Mr. Hessler by telephone as a witness after the hearing on June 6<sup>th</sup> 2019 if the Motion to Deny and Dismiss should not be granted.

Thanks

David L Ganje  
Ganje Law Offices  
Web: [lexenergy.net](http://lexenergy.net)  
605 385 0330  
[davidganje@ganjelaw.com](mailto:davidganje@ganjelaw.com)

---

**From:** Edwards, Kristen [mailto:Kristen.Edwards@state.sd.us]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 22, 2019 11:28 AM

**To:** David Ganje <davidganje@ganjelaw.com>; Hanson, Mikal <Mikal.Hanson@state.sd.us>; Van Gerpen, Patty <Patty.VanGerpen@state.sd.us>; Thurber, Jon <Jon.Thurber@state.sd.us>; Kearney, Darren <Darren.Kearney@state.sd.us>; Paulson, Eric <Eric.Paulson@state.sd.us>

**Cc:** Amber Christenson <coteaupreservation@gmail.com>

**Subject:** RE: EL19-003

Understood. There is not another option for putting Mr. Hessler on the stand, so just be aware that given your objection it is unlikely that we will call him as a witness.

---

**From:** David Ganje <davidganje@ganjelaw.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 22, 2019 12:20 PM

**To:** Hanson, Mikal <Mikal.Hanson@state.sd.us>; Edwards, Kristen <Kristen.Edwards@state.sd.us>; Van Gerpen, Patty <Patty.VanGerpen@state.sd.us>

**Cc:** Miles Schumacher <MSchumacher@lynnjackson.com>; Brian.J.Murphy@nee.com; Amber Christenson <coteaupreservation@gmail.com>

**Subject:** [EXT] EL19-003

I was only advised of the possibility of Mr. Hessler appearing for testimony one week earlier than the scheduled hearings and not during the already scheduled hearings for the first time yesterday May 21<sup>st</sup> in an afternoon phone conversation with Staff attorney Mr. Hanson. Mt. Hanson stated that if the pending Motion to Deny and Dismiss was not granted that the PUC would prefer to have Mr. Hessler testify on that same date by telephone because he was going to be out of the country. This is a problem. I was not previously advised nor were my clients advise of any such possible 'scheduling conflict'?

The request to allow one witness to testify a week before each of the other witnesses is not reasonable or fair to my clients. My clients have due process rights and, thus, a right to a fair hearing of the evidence. Mr. Hessler should appear by phone or other means from where he might be located on the dates of the scheduled hearing. This should be taken into consideration by the Commission for purposes of the hearing, and the Commission could reschedule the hearing on the merits of the Application for later dates as there is enough time remaining on the subject Application deadline requirements of the law.

It is unreasonable to allow the examination of a witness one week before the evidentiary hearing, when the common mode of course is for all parties to gather together and have the hearing. Allowing one witness to testify and without the benefit of hearing other witness testimony is prejudicial to my clients. Applicant's witness on subjects relevant to Mr. Hessler's testimony in the normal course of proceedings would come before Mr. Hessler's testimony. This allows the Intervenors to understand the Applicant's relevant testimony, and then hear Mr. Hessler's relevant testimony after the Applicant's particular discussion of issues to be discussed by Mr. Hessler. To argue that - well it is all already testimony on paper as these parties have filed written testimony - is an inadequate justification for the prejudice this



would present. The live testimony of witnesses is the very purpose of the scheduled hearings. That live testimony may buttress, further explain, contradict or change points from any witnesses pre filed written testimony. Having Mr. Hessler testify a week before the hearing will deprive my clients of the opportunity to hear from Mr. Hessler's live testimony after the Applicant's first relevant witness[s]' testimony. The suggested early-testifying procedure will deprive Mr. Hessler of providing testimony discussing concerns or criticism of Applicant's witness's live testimony. This will deprive my clients of the right to examine Mr. Hessler about his testimony concerning Applicant's first witness's comments. It is not fair, and thus violates due process at the risk of losing Mr. Hessler's analysis of Applicant's first witness's live testimony, and deprives Intervenors of asking Hessler questions based upon Applicant's presentation which will come first in the normal order of a hearing.

Not only would my clients be prejudiced by losing the chance to hear from Mr. Hessler regarding his consideration of Applicant's live testimony which is provided first in the normal order of hearings, but Applicant would receive an unfair advantage by the opportunity to hear from a potentially critical witness, and my examination of Mr. Hessler, then during the course of several long days before the actual hearing, prepare responses and rebuttals and prepare its experts and other witnesses. Intervenors will have that opportunity. Once again, that is not fair process, and is in violation of due process of the law. U. S. Const. amend XIV; S.D. Const. Art. VI, §2. "(D)ue process is flexible, and calls for such procedural protections as the particular situation demands." *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471.

Why can Mr. Hessler not appear and attend by phone or Skype? I understand that he may be in Europe at the time of the hearing, though it is not clear when you first learned about that problem. I have had the privilege on several occasions of teaching in Europe while at the same time practicing law in the United States. On those occasions I was able work abroad yet still communicate with my U.S clients and business—by phone, Skype and by computer, etc. There may be a minor inconvenience because of the time difference, but regarding important matters, I was always able to get things done. And for sure this case EL19-003 is an important matter. Arrangements could be made for Mr. Hessler to attend by phone and or appear by Skype during the existing scheduled hearing dates.

My clients requested a later date for the hearing when it was initially scheduled, but the request was denied. The PUC indicated previously that consistency among permit hearings is important and that last minute changes are frowned upon in light of due process concerns. It should be noted that, in this matter, my clients are at a disadvantage they are not a big corporation with lots of good lawyers working on the matter.

David L Ganje  
Ganje Law Offices  
Web: [lexenergy.net](http://lexenergy.net)  
605 385 0330  
[davidganje@ganjelaw.com](mailto:davidganje@ganjelaw.com)

To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this document (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

This email is being sent from a law firm and may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please advise the sender immediately by reply e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments without retaining a copy.

**BEFORE THE SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION  
BY CROWNED RIDGE WIND, LLC FOR A  
PERMIT OF A WIND ENERGY FACILITY  
IN GRANT AND CODINGTON COUNTIES

EL19-003

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Ms. Patricia Van Gerpen  
Executive Director  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
500 E. Capitol Ave.  
Pierre, SD 57501  
patty.vangerpen@state.sd.us  
(605) 773-3201 - voice

Ms. Kristen Edwards  
Staff Attorney  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
500 E. Capitol Ave.  
Pierre, SD 57501  
Kristen.edwards@state.sd.us  
(605) 773-3201 - voice

Ms. Amanda Reiss  
Staff Attorney  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
500 E. Capitol Ave.  
Pierre, SD 57501  
amanda.reiss@state.sd.us  
(605) 773-3201 - voice

Mr. Darren Kearney  
Staff Analyst  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
500 E. Capitol Ave.  
Pierre, SD 57501  
darren.kearney@state.sd.us  
(605) 773-3201 - voice

Mr. Jon Thurber  
Staff Analyst  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
500 E. Capitol Ave.  
Pierre, SD 57501  
jon.thurber@state.sd.us  
(605) 773-3201 - voice

Mr. Eric Paulson  
Staff Analyst  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
500 E. Capitol Ave.  
Pierre, SD 57501  
eric.paulson@state.sd.us  
(605) 773-3201- voice



Mr. Miles Schumacher – representing Crowned Ridge Wind, LLC  
Lynn, Jackson, Shultz and Lebrun, PC  
101 N. Minnesota Ave., Ste. 400  
Sioux Falls, SD 57104  
mschumacher@lynnjackson.com  
(605) 332-5999 – voice  
(605) 332-4249 – fax

Mr. Tyler Wilhelm  
Associate Project Manager  
Crowned Ridge Wind, LLC  
700 Universe Blvd.  
Juno Beach, FL 33408  
Tyler.Wilhelm@nexteraenergy.com  
(561) 694-3193 – voice

Mr. Brian J. Murphy  
Senior Attorney  
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC  
700 Universe Blvd.  
Juno Beach, FL 33408  
Brian.J.Murphy@nee.com  
(561) 694-3814 – voice

Ms. Cindy Brugman  
Auditor  
Codington County  
14 First Ave. SE  
Watertown, SD 57201  
cbrugman@codington.org  
(605) 882-6297 – voice

Ms. Karen Layher  
Auditor  
Grant County  
210 E. Fifth Ave.  
Milbank, SD 57252  
Karen.Layher@state.sd.us  
(605) 432-6711 – voice

Mr. Allen Robish  
47278 161st St.  
Strandburg, SD 57265  
allen.robish@gmail.com  
(605) 949-2648 - voice

Ms. Amber Christenson  
16217 466th Ave.  
Strandburg, SD 57265  
amber@uniformoutlet.net  
(605) 756-4119 - voice

Ms. Kristi Mogen  
15160 471st Ave.  
Twin Brook, SD 57269  
silversagehomestead@gmail.com  
(307) 359-2928 - voice

Ms. Melissa Lynch  
45971 162nd St.  
Watertown, SD 57201  
melissamarie1010@yahoo.com  
(605) 520-2450 - voice

Mr. Patrick Lynch  
45971 162nd St.  
Watertown, SD 57201  
Patrick.Lynch\_m@hotmail.com  
(605)265-0326 – voice

Mr. Mikal Hanson  
Staff Attorney  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
500 E. Capitol Ave.  
Pierre, SD 57501  
mikal.hanson@state.sd.us  
(605) 773-3201 - voice

I hereby certify that true and correct copies of the Notice of Transmittal with  
attached correspondence was served electronically to the above named parties on  
the 23 day of May, 2019.

  
/s/ David L. Ganje

Ganje Law Offices

17220 N Boswell Blvd Suite 130L, Sun City, AZ 85373

Web: [lexenergy.net](http://lexenergy.net)

Phone 605 385 0330

[davidganje@ganjelaw.com](mailto:davidganje@ganjelaw.com)