

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF DAKOTA RANGE I, LLC AND DAKOTA  
RANGE II, LLC FOR AN ENERGY FACILITY PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT  
A WIND ENERGY FACILITY

SD PUC DOCKET EL-18-003

PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF DANIEL PARDO  
ON BEHALF OF DAKOTA RANGE I, LLC AND DAKOTA RANGE II, LLC

May 21, 2018

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2

3 **Q. Please state your name, employer, and business address.**

4 A. My name is Daniel Pardo, and I work for DNV GL, with a business address of 333  
5 SW 5<sup>th</sup> Ave, Suite 400, Portland, Oregon 97204. I work at our office location with an  
6 address of 4100 rue Molson, suite 100, Montreal, H1Y 3N1, Canada.

7

8 **Q. Please describe your education and professional experience.**

9 A. I have a Master of Science in Wind Energy from Danmarks Tekniske Universitet and  
10 a Bachelors of Engineering in Mechanical Engineering from the Universidad de Los  
11 Andes. I have 13 years of practical experience in renewables. In my current  
12 position, I provide technical advice on renewable energy projects to developers in  
13 topics such as feasibility studies, technology selection, and decommissioning  
14 assessments. A copy of my statement of qualifications is attached as **Exhibit 1**.

15

16 **Q. Please describe your familiarity with the Dakota Range Wind Project**  
17 **(“Project”).**

18 A. DNV GL prepared the Decommissioning Cost Analysis provided as Appendix P to  
19 the Application.

20

21 **Q. Did you provide Direct Testimony in this Docket on January 24, 2018?**

22 A. No.

23

24 **Q. What is the purpose of your Rebuttal Testimony?**

25 A. The purpose of my Rebuttal Testimony is to respond to statements made in the  
26 Direct Testimony of Intervenor Kristi Mogen regarding decommissioning costs.

27

28 **Q. What exhibits are attached to your Rebuttal Testimony?**

29 A. The following exhibit is attached to my Rebuttal Testimony:

- 30
  - **Exhibit 1**: Statement of Qualifications

31

1 **II. RESPONSE TO TESTIMONY OF KRISTI MOGEN**

2  
3 **Q. Ms. Mogen indicates concerns regarding the per turbine decommissioning**  
4 **cost estimate for the Project. Could you provide DNV GL's per turbine**  
5 **decommissioning cost estimate identified in the Decommissioning Cost**  
6 **Analysis submitted as Appendix P to the Application, and explain the basis for**  
7 **that estimate?**

8 A. Yes. DNV GL's decommissioning cost analysis for the Project includes the  
9 disassembly, removal, and disposal of wind turbines and other associated project  
10 infrastructure. The results are presented for two scenarios: one where partial resale  
11 of turbine major components happens and another scenario where it does not. For  
12 the partial resale scenario, DNV GL estimates the Project can have a positive  
13 income of \$27,620 per turbine. For the scenario without partial resale, the  
14 decommissioning cost is estimated to be \$38,900 per turbine.

15  
16 **Q. Could you explain the role of partial resale and salvage value in your per**  
17 **turbine decommissioning cost estimate for the Project?**

18 A. Yes. The study assumes that some of the major components can be sold after they  
19 have been decommissioned. The resale value of these components constitutes  
20 potential income that would offset the costs of decommissioning. The study also  
21 assumes that some material can be sold as scrap and, thus, the salvage value  
22 would also offset a portion of the decommissioning costs.

23  
24 **Q. For what point in time is the cost estimate calculated? In other words, when is**  
25 **it assumed that the decommissioning costs for the Project would be incurred**  
26 **relative to when the Project becomes operational?**

27 For the analysis, decommissioning is anticipated to start soon after the end of the  
28 Project's operating life (assumed to be 30 years for purposes of this study).  
29 However, the costs are calculated in 2017 dollars.

1 **Q. In her testimony, Ms. Mogen references decommissioning costs of \$200,000**  
2 **per turbine, and asserts that DNV GL's decommissioning cost analysis**  
3 **conducted for the Project underestimates the Project's anticipated per turbine**  
4 **decommissioning costs. Do you agree?**

5 A. No. It is unclear what methodology Ms. Mogen used to come to her conclusion that  
6 decommissioning costs will be \$200,000 per turbine. The DNV GL decommissioning  
7 cost analysis thoroughly explains the methodology for its decommissioning cost  
8 conclusions. Additionally, the results presented in DNV GL's cost analysis study  
9 use conservative assumptions. Some of these assumptions are: all access roads  
10 will be decommissioned, use of a conservative distance from the Project to  
11 recycling/salvage facilities, and a width of 16 feet for all access roads. For the  
12 partial resale scenario, conservative assumptions have also been made. These  
13 assumptions include: only major components that are five years or younger can be  
14 sold, and medium-grade materials, such as small motors and medium-gauge  
15 cabling, would not be resold. Thus, DNV GL's analysis provides a conservative  
16 decommissioning cost estimate based on a specified and appropriate methodology.

17

18 **III. CONCLUSION**

19

20 **Q. Does this conclude your Rebuttal Testimony?**

21 A. Yes.

22

1 Dated this 21st day of May, 2018.

2

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Daniel Pardo', is written over a horizontal line.

3

4

---

5 Daniel Pardo

6