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

## IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF CROWNED RIDGE WIND II, LLC FOR A FACILITIES PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A 300.6 MEGAWATT WIND FACILITY

Docket No. EL19-027

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF TYLER WILHELM

January 8, 2019

I		INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS
2	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAMES AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
3	A.	Tyler Wilhelm. My business address is 700 Universe Blvd., Juno Beach, Florida, 33408.
4		
5	Q.	BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
6	A.	I am employed by NextEra Energy Resources, LLC ("NEER") as a Senior Project Manager
7		of Business Development at NEER. I am responsible for the development, permitting,
8		community outreach, regulatory compliance, and meeting the commercial operations date
9		("COD") for the 300.6 megawatt ("MW") Crowned Ridge Wind II, LLC ("CRW II") wind
10		generation project ("Project").
11		
12	Q.	ARE YOU THE SAME TYLER WILHELM WHO SUBMITTED DIRECT
13		TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING ON JULY 9, 2019 AND SUPPLEMENTAL
14		TESTIMONY ON SEPTEMBER 20, 2019?
15	A.	Yes.
16	Q.	HAS THIS REBUTTAL TESTIMONY BEEN PREPARED BY YOU OR UNDER
17		YOUR DIRECT SUPERVISION?
18	A.	Yes.
19	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY.
20 21	A.	The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to address the direct testimony of Staff witnesses
22		David Hessler, Darren Kearney, Hilary Meyer, and Paige Olson and Intervener witness
23		Garry Ehlebracht.

1	Q.	STAFF WITNESS HESSLER (PAGE 5, LINES 7-11) CLAIMS THAT CRW II MAY	
2		BE ABLE TO FURTHER OPTIMIZE SOUND THROUGH THE USE OF 6	
3		ALTERNATIVE TURBINE LOCATIONS (94, 97, 103, 113, 134, AND ALT6). DO	
4		YOU AGREE?	
5	A.	Based on the review of these alternative turbine locations as set forth in the testimonies of	
6		CRW II witnesses Thompson and Sappington, CRW II agrees to make the following	
7		turbine locations 94, 97, 134, and ALT6 primary, and agrees to relegate turbine locations	
8		13, 72, 77, and ATL5 to alternative status. The reduction in sound and shadow flicker	
9		from these changes is set forth in the rebuttal testimony of CRW II witness Haley, which	
10		shows the sound reduction associated with the use of turbine locations 94, 97, 134, and	
11		ALT6.	
12			
13	Q.	STAFF WITNESS KEARNEY (PAGE 14, LINES 23-32) TESTIFIES HE WAS	
14		UNABLE TO DETERMINE IF TURBINE LOCATION CRII-64 IS CLOSER THAN	
15		1 MILE TO THE CITY LIMITS OF KRANZBURG, BECAUSE OF A LACK OF A	
16		DESCRIPTION OF THE MUNICIPAL BOUNDARY. PLEASE ADDRESS THIS	
17		CONCERN.	
18	A.	To determine if turbine location CRII-64 is closer than 1 mile to the city limits of	
19		Kranzburg, CRW II searched for the annexation document to determine when the original,	
20		unincorporated lands were included within the municipal boundary of Kranzburg. CRW	
21		II visited and met with officials at the offices of the Register of Deeds, Director of	
22		Equalization, Treasurer, and Auditor in Codington County and was unable to find any	
23		annexation documentation. CRW II also met with officials at the city offices, including	

the Chairman of the village board, Dale Plunkett, and it was concluded that no records of the annexation exist since the annexation took place between 1900 and 1975, when lands were annexed to accommodate the placement of drill wells to support the city water system. In addition, CRW II reviewed the breakdown of tax bills to understand which properties paid taxes to the city of Kranzburg to help determine the municipal boundary of Kranzburg. The Northwest quarter of Section 1 indicates that taxes are paid to the City of Kranzburg but not to any local Townships, which shows the inclusion of this parcel within the Kranzburg municipal boundary. The opposite is the case for the Northeast quarter of Section 1, which does not pay taxes to the City of Kranzburg, as it only pays taxes to the local Township. Based on this tax information, CRW II concluded that the Northwest Ouarter of Section 1 marks the northernmost boundary of Section 1, which is the location utilized to confirm the distance of turbine CRII-64 from the city limit of Kranzburg. CRW II believes the available tax bill breakdown information is the best information in determining the described municipal boundary in place of annexation documents that do not exist at either the county or city offices.

16

17

18

19

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Q. STAFF WITNESS KEARNEY (PAGES 21-22) PROPOSES A
DECOMMISSIONING FINANCIAL ASSURANCE CONDITION BASED ON THE
UNDERSTANDING THAT NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY (NSP)
WILL PURCHASE CRW II. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE CONDITION?

21 A. Yes, it is consistent with the conditions used on other Commission dockets where NSP was
22 the purchaser of the wind facility.

Q.	STAFF WITNESS MEYER (PAGE 21) RECOMMENDS THAT CRW II
	COORDINATE WITH SOUTH DAKOTA GAME, FISH, AND PARKS 60 DAYS
	PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION TO COORDINATE PUBLIC
	ACCESS TO WALK-IN AREAS THAT MAY BE TEMPORARILY IMPACTED
	DUE TO CONSTRUCTION. DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS
	RECOMMENDATION?
A.	Yes, we will coordinate if there is a possibility that the Project will make impact to a walk
	in area. At this time, there is no anticipated impact on such areas.
Q.	STAFF WITNESS OLSON (PAGES 6-8) RECOMMENDS FOUR CONDITIONS
_	RELATED TO CULTURAL RESOURCES. DO YOU AGREE WITH THESE
	CONDITIONS?
A	Yes, these four conditions are the same conditions agreed to in Docket No. EL19-003
11.	(Crowned Ridge Wind I).
	(erowned reage while ty)
Q.	INTERVENER WITNESS EHLEBRACHT (PAGE 3, LINES 28-31) TESTIFIED
	THAT DURING A TELEPHONE CONVERSATION WITH A LAND AGENT
	ASSOCIATED WITH CRW II, THE LAND AGENT LAUGHED AT HIS
	REQUEST THAT THE WIND TURBINES SHOULD BE MOVED FURTHER
	AWAY FROM HIS HOME? HAVE YOU DISCUSSED THIS CONCERN WITH
	YOUR LAND AGENTS?
	A. <b>Q.</b>

1	A.	Yes, I have discussed this matter with the land agent. The land agent's laugh was
2		inadvertent in the context of hoping to lighten what he perceived was becoming a heated
3		conversation. After the conversation, the land agent was instructed to not engage further
4		with Mr. Ehlebracht.

5

## 6 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

7 A. Yes, it does.

1

STATE OF FLORIDA	)
	) ss
COUNTY OF PALM BEACH	)

I, Tyler Wilhelm, being duly sworn on oath, depose and state that I am the witness identified in the foregoing prepared testimony and I am familiar with its contents, and that the facts set forth are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Tyler Wilhelm

Subscribed and sworn to before me this day of January 2020.

**SEAL** 

Notary Public

My Commission Expires \_\_\_\_\_

SHARON R ROMERO
MY COMMISSION # FF955972
EXPIRES January 31, 2020
HondeNotaryService com

2