

Docket Number: EL17-023
Subject Matter: First Data Request
Request to: Dakota Energy Cooperative, Inc.(Dakota) and Northern Electric Cooperative, Inc. (NEC)
Request from: South Dakota Public Utilities Commission Staff (Staff)
Date of Request: May 18, 2017
Responses Due: June 1, 2017

1-1. Why is NEC serving the customer before this agreement was submitted to the Commission and before being approved by the Commission?

RESPONSE: The statement in the petition that NEC is currently serving the customer was erroneous. NEC is not currently serving the customer. Because a subcontractor was available at the opportune time and was in the area to install the facilities, the contractor was directed to begin construction of the necessary facilities as time and his location permitted. Service has not and will not be provided to the customer until approved by the PUC.

1-2. When did the companies and the customer agree to have NEC serve the customer instead of Dakota?

RESPONSE: The two electric cooperatives agreed to request a service rights exception before the PUC for this location on approximately December 5th, 2016. Again service to the customer is not being provided at this time by either cooperative.

1-3. When did NEC begin constructing facilities to this facility and begin serving the customer?

RESPONSE: A subcontractor first did some work constructing facilities for this location on approximately December 12, 2016. Construction is/has been intermittent. Construction is still not completed. Again as noted above neither cooperative at this time is providing service to the member. Facilities have not been completed and we are still awaiting PUC approval.

1-4. Explain how the agreement between Dakota and NEC is in the public interest.

RESPONSE: The public benefit is the elimination of unnecessary expense and the consumer in this case avoids paying approximately \$12,000 in aid to construction. The purpose of the Territorial Assignment Act was to avoid unnecessary costs through the elimination of duplication of facilities. By allowing the utility in closer proximity to the proposed service location that already has facilities in place to provide electrical service, , we fulfill this core purpose by avoiding duplication of facilities and the elimination of unnecessary costs.

1-5. How much would the line extension have been in total and for the customer if Dakota had served the fueling station?

RESPONSE: Total cost \$25,000.00. Member/consumer would have been required to pay 100% of this expense.

1-6. How much was the line extension in total and for the customer with the NEC extension?

RESPONSE: Total cost of the construction is expected to be \$17,520. Of this amount the member Mr. Koester would be responsible for \$13,074.