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CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: EL18-003, In the Matter of the Application of Dakota Range I, LLC and Dakota Range II, LLC for the Permit of a Wind Energy Facility in Grant County and Codington County in South Dakota for the Dakota Range Wind Project.

The question before the Commission is shall the Commission grant party status to those who have filed? And shall the Commission issue a procedural schedule?

We will go with -- let's see. There is one on the line with party status that has filed for party status. I think one of them has a conflict. So we will start with the party status applications first.

So I think we only have Teresa.
MS. KAAZ: I'm here.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Any comments on your application?

MS. KAAZ: No. I know they're trying to remove me from the party status, but $I$ am included in the description of their application so $I$ request that $I$ do not be dismissed and continue on.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you.
Are there other members that have applied for party status in the application that are online that $I$ haven't called?

Otherwise, we're going to go to staff, and then
we'll go to Dakota -- oops. We'll go to Dakota Range and then staff.

MS. SMITH: Madam Chair, this is Mollie Smith on behalf of Dakota Range.

So as we laid out in our brief, we had some opposition to some of the applications, and there are a few that we don't oppose.

To start with, those that we do not oppose, the applications of Diane Redlin, Daniel Seurer, and Christian Reimche -- if I'm saying those incorrectly. We did not oppose those. And then maybe breaking the other two down by category.

There were four of them that did not state any reason that they wanted to be an Intervenor. So they didn't complete the application. Teresa Kaaz, Kelly Owen, Kristi Mogen, and Wade Bauer, our request is that they be denied unless those people identified an interest that would warrant party status at our hearing today.

We do not oppose now Teresa Kaaz's petition given that her stated interest is that she is a project within the project footprint. But we do oppose the other three that did not provide any statement as to why they wanted to be a party to this docket.

Regarding the remaining applicants, there -- our concern is that they -- they, on the information that's
been provided to date, have not stated an adequate interest in the proceeding in part or that their interest -- there's a couple of them that their interest does not appear to be accurate. For instance, they say they're adjacent to the project, but they are miles away from the actual project footprint.

And so with the information provided we'd request that those petitions be denied or that additional information be provided to support their being parties to this action.

And on the part of -- I know that there's been a broad interpretation of who can be a party to the actions before the Commission, but under 49-41B-17 there's three categories. There's any person residing in the area. So like if Ms. Kaaz is in the area. So any person residing in the area where the facility is proposed to be sited. Any nonprofit organization that meets the requirements of the specified statute. There's certain purposes outlined. And then any interested person.

And so an interested person still has to have an interest in the proceeding. And if it was any person, there would be no point in having the other two categories in the statute. They could simply say anyone who wants to can come be a party to the action.

And so because these people are up to 25 miles
away and they're listing interests like concerned landowner, that does not provide a specific reason why they have an interest in this proceeding. And so those are the reasons that we are opposing those particular provisions. And we believe that there should be more required to at least show what their interest is.

Under the Commission's rules the requirements for an application to intervene are to show why you have an interest in the proceeding and your position, if it's known, regarding the application.

So we would ask that -- for additional
information to be required or that they be denied.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: We'll hold --
MS. KAAZ: If $I$ may speak for a moment, this is Teresa Kaaz.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Just wait one minute.
Ms. Smith, we're going to hold on the procedural schedule, and we will take that after party status.

MS. SMITH: That sounds good. Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Ms. Teresa.
MS. KAAZ: Yes. I was going to say many of the landowners who expressed an interest in this, they do have land adjacent such as land that they own in other places besides their addresses. So in that sense of them being dismissed, I think they should do more discovery
into where their lands are located before they are dismissed.

And some of them still -- even though they don't have time at this time today to be included in this procedure, I ask that they still do not be dismissed until they do other studies to see if they are impacted.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you. We're going to go to staff next.

MS. REISS: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is Amanda Reiss for staff.

Staff would support the intervention of all parties who have filed for party status. Historically the Commission has taken a very broad, expansive view of intervention, and staff would rely on that interpretation and support for these parties.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Questions of the Commission.
Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: For Ms. Smith, in your filing, subset number 2 , you very helpfully figured out where each of these folks resided and the distance from the nearest turbine.

Did you do that same calculation for the four individuals in Subsection 1 , how far their residence was from the nearest turbine?

MS. SMITH: I believe I looked at it, however -- you know, based on the address. But two things:

One, it is not our obligation to identify the interests of those that petition. It is their obligation to identify their own interests. And in the prior Crocker docket where there were petitions to intervene and they did not state an interest at all, those were denied. And so I believe they don't meet the requirements, and we shouldn't have to search to figure that out.

We did look at the ones where they did provide an interest, but we are trying to understand if their interest actually was legitimate or, you know, a true interest in the proceeding, given where they live.

All we had was their address. We mapped their address from their petition. We didn't do research because, again, don't feel that it's our obligation to identify their interests. Rather, it's their obligation to identify their interests.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: And so just so I am clear, you're telling me for Teresa Kaaz, Kelly Owen, Kristi Mogen, and Wade Bauer you did not calculate how far their distance is from the nearest proposed turbine; is that correct?

MS. SMITH: If we did have it on a map, I didn't -- that was not my concern. I don't believe that

Kelly Owen lives in the project area, but $I$ don't remember where the other ones -- the addresses are.

I do believe we mapped them. I do not believe that we identified -- I didn't focus on that in preparing the response because they didn't have any interests identified at all.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: If I might, Ms. -- Madam Chair, if I could ask Ms. Kaaz a question.

Ms. Kaaz, how far is your residence from the nearest proposed turbine?

MS. KAAZ: The nearest proposed turbine would completely surround my property. I have leaseholders on all four sides, and at this time $I$ know of at least three to four turbines that are going to be adjacent to my property within 1,500 feet from my residence.

And Kelly Owens does own land adjacent to the properties. She has a large amount of acres and is adjacent to those properties so she'll specify. For those that didn't put the reasons on there, I'm sure they didn't see that paragraph on that information because this is the first time they've been included in any type of PUC regulations and meetings. And I know that that was just an oversight on them. But we have many landowners who do have land adjacent to this project.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Ms. Kaaz, you know, we're going to be involved in this process through June or July of this year, and I'm just going to advise you that you're not in a position to represent the other Intervenors. And so you might want to be very careful in trying to represent them and answer questions for them.

And so I want to ask a question about your situation again. And so I'm understanding that you've told me that your residence is within 1,500 feet of at least one of the proposed turbine locations; is that correct?

MS. KAAZ: Well, it's -- it's very hard to understand the maps as they do change, but at this time I am going to have a minimum of three turbines surrounding my property. As to how far away they will be will be determined by the setbacks at our county level which have not been determined yet at this time.

But the two landowners that own land adjacent to my property -- one owns land on three sides of my property. The other owns land on one side. They are all leaseholders with the potential of turbines surrounding.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Right. I understand that. But as far as I'm aware, there's only been one map that's been filed with this that showed the proposed turbine locations.

So my question was not where the perimeter of
the project is but where the actual turbine locations were compared to your residence. And if you don't know that at this point, that's fine.

MS. KAAZ: Yeah. I'm not sure how many feet away because that's not been provided yet.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: I have no further questions.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you. Other questions of Commissioners?

Seeing none, is there a motion?
Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Madam Chair, in docket EL18-003 I move that the Commission grant party status to those who have filed.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you. And just to clarify, $I$ believe was it -- did we get the filing of Mark Kriesel, that he pulled out; correct?

Okay. Thank you.
Comments on your motion.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: I would just say that the Commission has always been -- I hate to use the word liberal in allowing those persons who have applied for party status. We haven't required that they show that they're next door. In many respects we've been overly liberal with it.

But certainly the precedence that's been set by this Commission would allow for every one of these folks to fall well within the categories that we have provided in the past. So I think that we -- it's incumbent upon us to continue with that policy.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Other comments on the motion.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: I would move to amend the motion by removing Kelly Owen, Kristi Mogen, and Wade Bauer from the motion.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Comments on your amendment.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: This is obviously a difficult decision. Primarily because I think the statute is not well worded as it relates to who is and is not allowed intervention.

But, as Ms. Smith pointed out, the statute does, in fact, use the word "interested," and that has to mean something. And in the case of the three that $I$
mentioned, they have not in any way indicated what their interest is in this process. Hence, my motion to amend.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Other comments on the motion.

Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: I very much appreciate my fellow Commissioner's motion to amend. The Commission
has struggled with this a number of times. We have examined whether or not and how to rephrase this -- the statute. We've worked on it with legislators even trying to figure out -- even in this past legislative session.

However, the law does state any interested person. And these are obviously persons, and they are obviously interested. The word "interested" can be defined for me as a person who's willing to go through the process of filling out the application and sending it in. They're obviously interested, or they wouldn't have gone through all of that process to put it together.

So while I -- while $I$ feel the pain of my fellow Commissioner, I have to -- I cannot support the motion to amend.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Other comments on the amendment?

All in favor of the amendment say aye; opposed, nay.

Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: No.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen votes
no. Amendment fails.
We're back to the main motion. Comments on the main motion.

Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: In regard to the individuals listed under Subsection 2 of the Applicant's filing, where individuals did, in fact, list an interest but in looking at where they actually reside, I'm having -- I struggle to figure out how they would, in fact, be impacted by this particular project.

And so because they did list an interest I think they do have a right to be involved, although I'm struggling to figure out exactly how they may be personally impacted by it. But at this point $I$ will certainly support Commissioner Hanson's motion.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Other comments on the motion.

All in favor say aye; opposed, nay.
Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen votes aye.

Motion carries.
That brings us -- no. We're doing procedural schedule. Got ahead of myself.

The procedural schedule is the next question before the Commission. Shall the Commission issue a procedural schedule? We're going to start with staff this time. Then we will go to Dakota Range and then Intervenors.

Public Utilities Commission staff, you're on.
MS. REISS: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is
Amanda Reiss for staff.
Staff filed a Motion for Adoption of Procedural Schedule on March 28. Staff is very aware that the procedural schedule we proposed is extremely time limited. We have a six-month deadine to process this application. And so staff proposed the most appropriate schedule we could find and discussed this with the Applicant, as well as sending the proposed schedule to the Intervenors to their e-mail addresses for input.

At this time staff would request the Commission adopt that procedural schedule.

As a side note, within discussions with the Applicant there was a question about one of their witnesses who has a potential conflict from June 13 through the $15 t h$, and within their response to the motion they requested that they allow that witness to testify on June 12. Staff has no objection to that and would support that request at this time.

As to the -- never mind. I'm sorry about that. CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Dakota Range.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Commissioner.
So yes. We agree and support the proposed schedule that has been laid out by staff and they took our input into consideration and we very much appreciate that.

And, yes, we do have one expert witness that we anticipate calling who is not available on the 13th through 15 th but could be in Pierre on the 12 th, and so we would ask that he be able to testify following the prehearing conference that day.

And then we also have some requests that -- some outline requirements that we would ask be included in the Commission's order accompanying the schedule, and those are outlined in our brief. And some of it comes from some of the items that we've discussed in other dockets regarding discovery and regarding conduct at the hearing and the requirements of filing prefiled testimony, cross-examination.

It's very important for all of the parties who are official parties to actually understand what the obligations and responsibilities are of being a party in the action, and particularly given that it appears that there are several unrepresented parties now to the
action, we think it's even more important that those requirements and obligations be outlined by the Commission in the order setting the schedule so that everybody is aware of them up front to avoid issues with compliance later on and also hopefully -- you know, also we anticipate there could be withdrawals if there is a lack of understanding of what is required up front.

So those are -- that's our request, and I'm happy to answer any questions about what we've outlined in our brief.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you.
We will go to anyone that has been granted party status that would like to comment on the procedural schedule.

Hearing none, questions of the Commission.
And I am going to ask staff -- sorry. Amanda Reiss, do you have another comment?

MS. REISS: Yes, Madam Chair. I apologize.
With the discussion between the Intervenors and the procedural schedule, I overlooked one item that staff wanted to comment on.

In the Applicant's response, the Applicant did request limiting the scope of discovery to a certain extent regarding using information provided only for this proceeding and that information not be posted publicly on
the Commission's docket and that materials be returned or destroyed.

Staff obviously would like to point to the Commission's discussion on the last docket. At this time staff wants to be clear that the Commission's aware of this and that staff does not support any limitation regarding how the materials are used in this docket.

Staff would defer to the Commission on any limitation that would be appropriate beyond that.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Thank you. A question for the staff.

The final prehearing conference, normally that's not in a formal procedural schedule. And, you know, the staff and the parties actually deal with that. Could we pull that off the formal procedural schedule?

MS. REISS: Madam Chair, that was a request of the Applicants, and she graciously agreed to discuss that if there was a question regarding that. So I would defer to the Applicant.

MS. SMITH: Certainly. This is Mollie Smith again. I can address that.

I think what we were hoping is that if there were any last-minute issues regarding, you know, the witness list, witnesses that have come in or pending
motions that still had not been decided, that those would be decided at the time of that prehearing conference. And so for that it is -- if those decisions would be made by the Commissioners, we would ask that then the Commissioners would be present.

If those decisions are to be made by someone identified by the Commission such as the Commission's counsel acting in sort of an administrative judicial role, then we'd ask that that person be present.

So it depends on who's making the ultimate decisions on the motions in the procedure. But that's why we wanted to keep the prehearing schedule on the formal schedule for the docket.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Okay. I have another question of staff then.

It appears that the evidentiary hearing will be changed to June 12. That's what you guys are asking for. If that's voted on today, I don't know. But it would be June 12 through the 15 th because of the person that wants to testify on the 12 th.

So then we could possibly delete the prehearing conference and be heard on the 12 th if there's any issues that need to come in front of the Commission. Would that be proper?

MS. REISS: Yes. Madam Chair, staff would be
comfortable with that. And $I$ believe there is a Commission meeting that morning as well so we can include any items on the agenda if required.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Right. So we could get rid of that in the procedural schedule and still take care of business.

Okay. Questions of the Commission.
Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: I guess a question for staff. In the Applicant's response for the procedural schedule on the top of page 5 dealing with prefiled testimony -- and they've made a request that prefiled testimony be a prerequisite to giving live testimony at the hearing, and we've done that in the past -- does staff support that?

MS. REISS: Staff does support that. As you mentioned, the Commission has ordered that in the past and has taken that stance.

If there is an issue with prefiled testimony, staff is confident that the parties can file a written request, and we can address that issue if it comes up.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. And then my follow-up question would be for Ms. Smith. The very next sentence in that same paragraph. Talking about, however, each party may have the right to have witnesses available
that have not filed prefiled testimony to address things that may be raised by the Commission.

That just seems pretty broad to me. Give me some comfort into what you're really asking there.

MS. SMITH: Certainly. So and we're sort of learning as we go through these proceedings, but what we found is applicants filing their testimony primarily up front in the docket and addressing in rebuttal comments made by the parties to the action. But sometimes it appears that the Commissioners themselves, that you may have questions that are outside of what's been covered in rebuttal.

So we're not asking that the person be -- you know, get up there and testify unless the Commissioners themselves raise a question. So if you, Commissioner Nelson, were to raise a question that hadn't been addressed in rebuttal but you wanted to have the information in order to make your decision, we would want to be able to have that witness present and call them to address your question.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you. I appreciate that, and that certainly works for me.

Now, Madam Chair, if $I$ might, on the procedural schedule itself I'm going to be very transparent. I've got on June 15 a conflict. It's not 100 percent set in
concrete conflict, but $I$ would really much prefer not to be here on the 15th. And so I'm wondering if we could begin the hearing at 1 o'clock on the 12 th with the intention of trying to push pretty hard and wrap up by the 14 th. And if we're not wrapped up by the 14 th, we will continue on to the 15 th, and I'll be here.

Does anybody have objection to that?
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: And I think we actually talked about starting the 12 th now. So 1 o'clock, I mean, or whatever is fine.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Ms. Smith, does that work with you?

MS. SMITH: Yes. That's fine with us.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: And we're seeing a lot of heads shaking yes on this side. So and again if we don't get done by the $14 t h$, we absolutely want to give everybody the opportunity that they need to be heard and so we'll be here on the 15 th and I'll be here on the 15th.

I think that's all the questions I've got.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Perfect.
And I believe the deadine for prehearing motions is fine for the 11 th with all parties. If not, because we're moving it up to the 12th, the evidentiary hearing, say now or forever hold your peace.

And the only other comment $I$ have is, you know, thank you for Dakota Range for suggesting some ideas for the Commission. As you know, the Commission makes decisions on many of these things throughout the hearing, but I appreciate your suggestions. But a lot of those decisions will be made throughout the hearing.

Other comments on the motion? -- I mean, not on the motion. Any other questions?

Is there a motion?
COMMISSIONER NELSON: I will move in EL18-003 that we establish the procedural schedule as provided by staff with the exception that the final prehearing conference would be removed from the schedule, that that would be handled by the parties off line.

However, if there are any last minute issues that need to be resolved, that we could put them on the agenda for the meeting the morning of the 12 th, that we begin the evidentiary hearing at 1 o'clock on the 12th, and we'll schedule it to run through the 15th. I think that's only fair.

The other parameter, and I'm going to the -- the applicants made a number of different requests. I think the only one that $I$ would include in my motion is the one that we talked about that each party may submit prefiled testimony on behalf of the party's witnesses.

The submission of prefiled testimony is a prerequisite to giving live testimony at the hearing. However, each party may have persons who have not submitted prefiled testimony available to testify at the hearing in the event issues not addressed in prefiled testimony are raised by the Commission.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Other comments -- comments on the motion.

COMMISSIONER HANSON: Just a clarification. Were you excluding that information, or were you including?

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Which information?
COMMISSIONER HANSON: That you just read.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: No. That, I am including. That is the only part of what the Applicant asked for that I'm specifically including.

And, if I might, I think the rest of it will kind of take care of itself. And if there needs to be something specific addressed to the rest of it, we can do that as things proceed.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Comments on the motion. And then I'm going to ask staff a question about your motion. COMMISSIONER NELSON: I'm going to ask staff a question also.

Regarding my motion, the requirement for
prefiled testimony, do we have a mechanism for adequately communicating that to the lay Intervenors so that they clearly understand that requirement?

MS. REISS: Thank you for the question, Commissioner. Staff will be sure to send a copy of the Commission's order through mail to each Intervenor and through e-mail and we'll attempt to explain this requirement and we'll accept any questions the Intervenors have regarding this requirement.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: Thank you.
Yeah. I think an explanation that a layperson could understand accompanying that would be great. But understand $I$ do not expect you to prepare their testimony or handhold them through the preparation of that. That is their responsibility.

MS. REISS: I appreciate that. Thank you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER NELSON: You're welcome.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: You might have answered this so I'm sorry. I wasn't listening.

So what happens if staff or someone asks a question of Dakota Range or Dakota Range asks a question of staff that's not in their prefiled testimony and they need to get an expert to check the facts or whatever? They can't do that anymore? Or how can we make sure
that --
Like right now it's Commissioners. They can rebut Commissioners' questions, but they can't --

MS. REISS: Can you rephrase that question a little bit, Commissioner?

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: I'm going to go try to find the -- let's see. So however each party may have a person who may not have submitted prefiled testimony, but the only time that that person can come up is if the question is asked by the Commission.

What if it's asked of you? The staff? Or what if it's asked as the Intervenor? Or what if it's asked -- I'm trying to figure out have we ever let somebody come in and testify or check a fact that hasn't filed prefiled testimony?

MS. EDWARDS: I do believe we had testimony in one docket on a Wall Lake issue. That person had filed prefiled testimony, but that was outside of the scope of the prefiled testimony. And as a general practice it has been our position that the -- any party would have a due process right to rebut new information that came up.

So to the best of their abilities, include your case in prefiled. If new information comes up, it's our position, $I$ believe, that you have a due process right to address that.

CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Great. Thank you. I just
wanted to be sure that everybody had that. So perfect. And I think we'll have that.

Other comments, questions on the motion?
All in favor say aye; opposed, nay.
Commissioner Nelson.
COMMISSIONER NELSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Hanson.
COMMISSIONER HANSON: Aye.
CHAIRWOMAN FIEGEN: Commissioner Fiegen votes
aye.
Motion carries.
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