

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

<p>IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION FOR SWEETMAN CONST. CO. D/B/A KNIFE RIVER, TO HAVE XCEL ENERGY ASSIGNED AS ITS ELECTRIC PROVIDER IN THE SERVICE AREA OF SIOUX VALLEY ELECTRIC</p>	<p><b>EL-25-032</b></p> <p><b>PRE-FILED INTERVENOR TESTIMONY OF TED SMITH ON BEHALF OF SIOUX VALLEY-SOUTHWESTERN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.</b></p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS .....1

II. PURPOSE AND BASIS OF TESTIMONY .....1

III. SIOUX VALLEY ENERGY’S SERVICE TO KNIFE RIVER’S CURRENT OPERATIONS.....2

IV. SIOUX VALLEY ENERGY’S PROPOSAL TO KNIFE RIVER .....5

V. SDCL 49-34A-56 (Large Load Statute) .....9

**EXHIBITS**

- Exhibit\_TS-1: Resume
- Exhibit\_TS-2: Sioux Valley Energy Distribution Map
- Exhibit\_TS-3: Exhibits A and B of Clark Meyer’s Pre-Filed Testimony
- Exhibit\_TS-4: Conditional Use Application dated June 26, 2025 (Extract)
- Exhibit\_TS-5: Knife River CAD File Overlaid on Sioux Valley Energy Distribution Map

**I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS**

- 1
- 2 Q. **Please state your name.**
- 3 A. Ted Smith
- 4 Q. **State your employer and business address.**
- 5 A. Sioux Valley Energy, PO Box 216, Colman, SD 57017.
- 6 Q. **State your current position with Sioux Valley-Southwestern Electric Cooperative, Inc.**
- 7 A. Vice President of Engineering and Operations.
- 8 Q. **How long have you served in that capacity?**
- 9 A. 19 ½ years.
- 10 Q. **What is your educational background?**
- 11 A. I have a Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering from South Dakota State University,  
12 and an MBA from the University of Phoenix, along with a Professional Engineers (PE)  
13 License from the State of MN.
- 14 Q. **Please provide an overview of your professional work experience.**
- 15 A. 19 ½ years as the Vice President of Engineering and Operations at Sioux Valley Energy.  
16 Three years at Montana Dakota Utilities, initially as a System Engineer in Bismarck, ND, and  
17 then an Area Electric Supervisor in Williston, ND. Five years at Northwestern Energy,  
18 initially as a System Engineer in Huron, SD, and then an Area Manager in Aberdeen, SD. 4 ½  
19 years as an Electric Power Lineman in the United States Air Force at Beale Air Force Base in  
20 CA.  
21 My resume is provided as Exhibit\_TS-1.

**II. PURPOSE AND BASIS OF TESTIMONY**

- 23 Q. **On whose behalf was this testimony prepared?**
- 24 A. Sioux Valley-Southwestern Electric Cooperative, Inc., doing business as Sioux Valley Energy.



**PUBLIC DOCUMENT**  
**Confidential Data Has Been Excised**

49 A. The site that is currently owned by Knife River was initially energized on December 12, 2002,  
50 for Concrete Materials.

51 Q. **Provide a general overview of what the current electric service entails.**

52 A. There is a primary metering point that is located approximately 150 feet east of SD Hwy 11  
53 and 1,500 feet south of 259<sup>th</sup> Street. There is a total of approximately 12,500 feet of three  
54 phase 12 kV underground primary conductor and four separate 500 KVA transformers, two  
55 750 kVA transformers, and a 1,500 kVA transformer. See Exhibit\_TS-2 (Sioux Valley Energy  
56 Distribution Map).

57 Q. **Explain the difference between the distribution infrastructure Sioux Vally Energy would**  
58 **employ to provide electric service to a standard large power service requiring less than 2**  
59 **Megawatts of capacity compared to the on-site distribution infrastructure that a member**  
60 **such as Knife River may employ to receive such service at a larger operation.**

61 A. For a standard “large power” service (less than 2 MW) as defined in Sioux Valley Energy’s  
62 rates, Sioux Valley Energy would install all necessary 12 kV distribution line and install a  
63 service transformer to fit the members’ needs from the nearest distribution facilities with  
64 capacity. The members would be responsible for a contribution in aid to construction based on  
65 Sioux Valley Energy’s current line extension policy. This service would be supplied from the  
66 common distribution system where other Sioux Valley Energy members are also connected  
67 and using capacity. For a larger than 2 MW service such as Knife River, Sioux Valley Energy  
68 would evaluate the proposed load size and determine what dedicated facilities would be  
69 required to serve that load and provide the requested redundancy from the member.  
70 Specifically for this Knife River operation.

71 Q. **Provide an overview of Sioux Valley Energy’s distribution infrastructure relative to**  
72 **Knife River’s current operations.**

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT**  
**Confidential Data Has Been Excised**

73 A. The current Knife River operations are fed from a distribution circuit out of the Corson  
74 substation similarly to what is proposed for the expansion as well. The difference is that the  
75 circuit feeding the current operations is not a dedicated circuit where other Sioux Valley  
76 Energy members are fed from that circuit before and after it reaches the Knife River property.  
77 The existing circuit is also smaller in size and has less overall capacity. The combination of the  
78 additional members, as well as the smaller cable capacity, limits the existing facilities serving  
79 the current operation from taking on substantial additional load. The added members on that  
80 line also add exposure to those facilities, adding some small reliability risks versus a dedicated  
81 feed.

82 **Q. What on-site distribution infrastructure does Knife River utilize for its current**  
83 **operations?**

84 A. The current operation at the Knife River plant is fed from approximately 12,500 feet of three  
85 phase 12 kV underground primary cable and seven distribution transformers ranging in size  
86 and output voltage. All of those facilities are maintained by Sioux Valley Energy, and Knife  
87 River is only responsible for all wires and connections beyond the secondary terminals of those  
88 seven service transformers.

89 **Q. Who is responsible for the construction, maintenance, and repair of Knife River's on-site**  
90 **distribution infrastructure?**

91 A. Sioux Valley Energy is responsible for all maintenance and repair of the existing distribution  
92 facilities described above. Sioux Valley Energy would also be responsible for construction of  
93 new 12 kV distribution facilities at the current operation and maintaining and repairing those  
94 facilities with Knife River only being responsible for contribution in aid to construction costs  
95 for those added facilities.

96 **Q. Provide a general overview of Sioux Valley Energy's line crew coverage and 24/7**

97 **dispatch capabilities relative to Knife River’s current operation.**

98 A. Sioux Valley Energy has 24/7 dispatch available in either the Colman dispatch center or fully  
99 redundant Brandon backup dispatch center. This includes SCADA control of the distribution  
100 substation. East River has a 24/7 dispatch center at their Madison location. Sioux Valley  
101 Energy has a total of nine electric linemen that are based in the Brandon service center. These  
102 individuals take their work trucks home at night and on weekends and reply directly from the  
103 home to any outages that may be reported to the dispatch center. Sioux Valley Energy has  
104 spare equipment, for all the equipment to be installed for Knife River, located at either the  
105 Brandon or Colman Service Centers. This will allow Sioux Valley Energy to minimize the  
106 amount of time for any outage that may happen due to an equipment failure.

107 **IV. SIoux VALLEY ENERGY’S PROPOSAL TO KNIFE RIVER**

108 Q. **Approximately when did Knife River contact Sioux Valley Energy regarding its newly**  
109 **anticipated load for the location at issue?**

110 A. Knife River initially made contact with Sioux Valley Energy around June 28, 2024, regarding  
111 the anticipated load.

112 Q. **What process did Sioux Valley Energy undertake to provide Knife River with a proposal**  
113 **for its newly anticipated load?**

114 A. Sioux Valley Energy’s staking department made contact with Knife River initially on July 1,  
115 2024, to inquire about load information anticipated. Sioux Valley Energy and Knife River had  
116 several email exchanges, phone calls, and an on-site meeting over the next several months, and  
117 after that, discussing details of the project to provide a proposal for service. Sioux Valley  
118 Energy also incorporated East River Electric into these discussions to evaluate transmission  
119 system and substation upgrades required to serve this anticipated load. A transmission system  
120 study was paid for by Knife River in December of 2024. On January 15, 2025, Knife River,

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT**  
**Confidential Data Has Been Excised**

121 Sioux Valley Energy, and East River Electric personnel had a web based meeting to review  
122 study results and discuss the potential improvements required to serve the load and meet the  
123 reliability needs of Knife River. This culminated with the presentation of an initial proposal to  
124 serve this load to Knife River on January 30, 2025.

125 **Q. In developing this initial proposal, what considerations came into play?**

126 A. Sioux Valley Energy had discussions with Knife River during the planning process to  
127 determine anticipated load levels, load ramp up schedule, redundancy/contingency  
128 requirements of Knife River, as well as reliability discussions with proposed facility options.  
129 Ultimately Sioux Valley Energy and East River took into consideration initial overall cost to  
130 serve the load, reliability concerns, and risks to both the distribution system and the  
131 transmission system to meet Knife River expectations of service, as well as the overall long  
132 term plans for the facility.

133 **Q. What did that initial proposal entail?**

134 A. The initial proposal provided to Knife River included a 1.25 mile 115 kV transmission line  
135 extension to a new distribution substation with a 10 MVA base capacity on the site of the  
136 Knife River facility. Out of this substation, the proposal included 12 kV underground  
137 distribution facilities to run to different service locations identified by Knife River. At those  
138 locations, the distribution service transformers would also be installed by Sioux Valley Energy,  
139 where Knife River would only be responsible for all secondary service wires and connections  
140 at the requested secondary service voltages.

141 **Q. Did Sioux Valley Energy provide Knife River with a proposal for electric service to the**  
142 **location at issue?**

143 A. Yes, we provided a proposal for service as identified above.

144 **Q. After receiving Sioux Valley Energy's initial proposal, did Knife River engage in further**

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT**  
**Confidential Data Has Been Excised**

145 **discussions with Sioux Valley Energy before filing its Petition for Electric Service?**

146 A. After the initial service proposal was provided to Knife River on January 30, 2025, Knife  
147 River followed up with a request for a monthly bill estimate to determine ongoing power costs.  
148 Knife River provided estimated usage rates and load information to Sioux Valley Energy on  
149 March 6, 2025. Sioux Valley Energy provided a proposed monthly power cost estimate for  
150 Knife River on March 18, 2025, based on some assumptions of initial contribution in aid costs  
151 for the facilities proposed as well as usage assumptions based on data from Knife River and  
152 estimated rate data at the current time. Following this, Sioux Valley Energy requested a status  
153 update from Knife River, of which Knife River had some clarification requests on the billing  
154 estimate that were clarified by Sioux Valley Energy on May 30, 2025. No other discussions  
155 regarding the proposal for service or the billing estimate were initiated with Sioux Valley  
156 Energy before filing the Petition for Electric Service.

157 Q. **Were other options potentially available to serve Knife River's anticipated load?**

158 A. Yes, the initial proposal presented was based on discussion with Knife River and what Sioux  
159 Valley Energy and East River felt were going to provide the service expectations requested by  
160 Knife River at the time, but other options were certainly available and could have been  
161 discussed with Knife River to determine the pros and cons of each option to meet its needs for  
162 service and initial costs expectations.

163 Q. **What would that alternative entail?**

164 A. The alternative proposal would have involved serving the anticipated load from the existing  
165 Corson substation. New 12 kV distribution facilities would be extended from the Corson  
166 substation located approximately 4,000 feet west of the southwest corner of the Knife River  
167 property identified in this filing. The distribution facilities would have been routed to different  
168 areas of the plant in need of service, and distribution service transformers would be placed on

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT**  
**Confidential Data Has Been Excised**

169 site similar to the initial proposal that would still provide service to the point where Knife  
170 River would take control at the secondary service points on the distribution transformers.

171 **Q. Are there any drawbacks to implementing this alternative relative to Knife River?**

172 A. This alternative would increase the amount of underground distribution facilities required to  
173 serve this load that would be located off of the Knife River property. In general, underground  
174 distribution facilities are at a higher risk for damage from public activities than overhead  
175 transmission facilities, so one drawback would be the added risk of fault situations. Generally,  
176 underground facility damage also takes longer to repair potentially increasing outage times at  
177 the facility. The long distance of lower voltage facilities also increase voltage drop and system  
178 losses, which would be an additional drawback to the system.

179 **Q. Are there any drawbacks to implementing this alternative relative to Sioux Valley**  
180 **Energy's distribution system?**

181 A. The facilities identified in the initial proposal as well as what is identified as the alternative for  
182 serving from the Corson substation would both be dedicated facilities to Knife River, so affects  
183 to the overall Sioux Valley Energy distribution system are minimal. This would add load to a  
184 substation facility that also serves additional Sioux Valley Energy members, but we do not feel  
185 this would propose a substantial additional risk that would be a drawback for the Sioux Valley  
186 Energy distribution system.

187 **Q. In terms of cost/benefit/risk to Knife River, how would you compare Sioux Valley**  
188 **Energy's initial proposal to an alternative proposal?**

189 A. The initial proposal identified would be at a higher initial cost than the alternative proposal but  
190 would provide some additional benefit and lower risk. The added benefit would be limiting  
191 underground distribution facility lengths, which would improve voltage drop on the system as  
192 well as provide lower distribution system losses, given that both options would be metered at

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT**  
**Confidential Data Has Been Excised**

193 the substation sites. The decrease in underground distribution facilities also lowers the risk of  
194 potential damage to those facilities, which would cause longer system outages. The alternative  
195 proposal is a substantially lower initial cost but increases losses and voltage drop, as well as  
196 exposes the Knife River facility to additional risk of damage on underground facilities, which  
197 would cause prolonged outage situations.

198 **V. SDCL 49-34A-56 (Large Load Statute)**

199 **Q. Working in your current capacity with Sioux Valley Energy, have you become familiar**  
200 **with the language of SDCL 49-34A-56?**

201 **A. Yes.**

202 **A. Current Customer**

203 **Q. What is the average load currently provided to Knife River's Concrete Sand facilities?**

204 **A. Over the last 24 months, the current Knife River facility averages 870 kW of peak load and**  
205 **consumes 125,700 kWh monthly.**

206 **Q. Does that load currently provide electric service to Knife River's Concrete Sand Washing**  
207 **Plant and its Concrete Sand Deposit?**

208 **A. Yes.**

209 **Q. Based upon your review of Knife River's responses to data requests, as well as the pre-**  
210 **filed testimony of Clark Meyer, is it your understanding that the proposed facilities will**  
211 **be owned and operated by the same entity that is currently a customer of Sioux Valley**  
212 **Energy?**

213 **A. Yes.**

214 **Q. Does Sioux Valley Energy consider Sweetman Const. Co., doing business as Knife River,**  
215 **to be a new customer?**

216 **A. No.**

217

**B. Same Location**

218 Q. **Provide an overview of Sioux Valley Energy’s distribution infrastructure that currently**  
219 **serves Knife River’s Concrete Sand facilities.**

220 A. Please see attached Exhibit\_TS-2 (Sioux Valley Energy Distribution Map). There is a primary  
221 metering point that is located approximately 150 feet east of SD Hwy 11 and 1,500 feet south  
222 of 259<sup>th</sup> Street. There is a total of approximately 12,500 feet of three phase 12 kV  
223 underground primary conductor and four separate 500 KVA transformers, two 750 kVA  
224 transformers, and a 1,500 kVA transformer.

225 Q. **Based upon your review of Exhibit\_TS-3 (Exhibits A and B of Clark Meyer’s pre-filed**  
226 **testimony), where is the existing Sand Washing Plant located as compared to the**  
227 **proposed Quartzite Processing/Crushing Plant?**

228 A. The sand washing plant is located between the two portions of Knife River’s proposed  
229 Quartzite plant.

230 Q. **Based upon your review of Exhibit\_TS-3 (Exhibits A and B of Clark Meyer’s pre-filed**  
231 **testimony), where is the existing Concrete Sand Deposit located as compared to the**  
232 **proposed Quartzite Rock Deposit?**

233 A. The quartzite rock deposit is located adjacent to southeast of the existing concrete sand  
234 deposit.

235 Q. **Based upon your review of Exhibit\_TS-4 (an extract of Knife River’s Conditional Use**  
236 **Application dated June 26, 2025, to Minnehaha County), how would you characterize the**  
237 **proposed Quartzite facility as compared to Knife River’s current operations?**

238 A. I feel that this is, in Knife River’s words on the cover page, clearly an expansion of the existing  
239 operation. The map, captioned “Corson Quarry/Existing Conditions (August 2024),” clearly  
240 labels the areas both north and south of the existing quarry permit area as a South Quarry

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT**  
**Confidential Data Has Been Excised**

241 Permit Expansion and a North Quarry Permit Expansion. I do not understand how this could  
242 be characterized as an expansion when applying for the conditional use permit and yet it is  
243 Knife River’s wish to classify this as a new customer at a new location to meet the criteria of  
244 SDCL 49-34A-56. Knife River is not a new customer, and this is not a new location, as Sioux  
245 Valley Energy has had a service to this site for over 20 years (since 2002).

246 Q. **Does Sioux Valley Energy consider the Knife River’s proposed Quartzite facilities to be**  
247 **operated at a new location?**

248 A. No.

249 C. **SDCL 49-34A-56(1): “The electric service requirements of the load to be served;”**

250 Q. **Based on the discussions that Sioux Valley has had with Knife River, what do you**  
251 **ascertain as to the requirements of the expansion project?**

252 A. It is our understanding that there will be approximately 11.9 MW of load added to the existing  
253 load at the existing Knife River plant site.

254 D. **SDCL 49-34A56(2) – “The availability of adequate power supply;”**

255 Q. **In your current capacity with Sioux Valley Energy, and based upon Sioux Valley**  
256 **Energy’s all requirements contract with East River Electric Power Cooperative, Inc., do**  
257 **you have an opinion as to whether there is an adequate power supply available for Sioux**  
258 **Valley Energy to serve Knife River’s anticipated 11MW load?**

259 A. There is adequate power supply available to serve this anticipated load expansion.

260 E. **SDCL 49-34A-56(3): “The development or improvement of the electric system of the**  
261 **utility seeking to provide the electric service, including the economic factors relating**  
262 **thereto;”**

263 Q. **How would the initial proposal to Knife River develop or improve Sioux Valley Energy’s**  
264 **distribution system?**

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT**  
**Confidential Data Has Been Excised**

265 A. The facilities identified in the initial proposal to Knife River would be dedicated facilities to  
266 serve the Knife River operation and would not provide any improvement to the overall Sioux  
267 Valley Energy distribution system.

268 Q. **In terms of economic factors, how are the costs for providing and servicing such an**  
269 **anticipated large load addressed across Sioux Valley Energy's cooperative membership?**

270 A. Sioux Valley Energy has always strived to avoid cross subsidization in its membership  
271 whenever possible, and specifically for these larger loads. We believe that costs should be  
272 allocated to the areas responsible for causing those costs and also the rates should be set to  
273 recover those costs as much as possible so that cross-subsidization is avoided throughout the  
274 membership as much as possible.

275 Q. **If Sioux Valley Energy were to serve Knife River's proposed Quartzite operations, can**  
276 **you explain how the costs for construction, maintenance, and repair are allocated in**  
277 **terms of distribution and on-site distribution?**

278 A. Since the facilities required to serve the Quartzite operations are dedicated facilities, the  
279 construction costs for those facilities are allocated directly to Knife River in the form of a  
280 contribution in aid to construction requirement. The initial proposal identified those costs, and  
281 the bill estimate provided to Knife River assumed 100% contribution up front for those costs,  
282 but Sioux Valley has always been open to discussion on the terms of payment for those costs  
283 either up front or over time. As far as maintenance and repair, there is an ongoing monthly  
284 service charge that is structured to provide revenue to cover ongoing maintenance and repair  
285 costs over the life of those facilities identified in the proposal.

286 Q. **Based upon your review of Knife River's and Xcel Energy's responses to your data**  
287 **requests, what is your understanding of how costs for construction, maintenance and**  
288 **repair are allocated in terms of distribution and on-site distribution?**

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT**  
**Confidential Data Has Been Excised**

289 A. I understand that Xcel does not require a CIAC for the 10 miles of 34.5 kV distribution line  
290 that it is building to the plant expansion. Xcel will install a primary (34.5 kV) metering point  
291 somewhere either on or close to the Knife River property. I can only assume that the rate that  
292 will be charged to Knife River will provide for the cost of this 10 mile line extension, or  
293 alternatively, other Xcel customers are subsidizing this line extension.

294 Q. **In terms of development or improvement of Sioux Valley Energy's distribution system,**  
295 **and in light of any relevant economic factors, how would you compare and contrast the**  
296 **initial proposal to Knife River with the alternative to which you have testified**  
297 **previously?**

298 A. In terms of development or improvement of Sioux Valley Energy's distribution system, both  
299 the initial proposal and the alternative proposal provide dedicated facilities to Knife River, and  
300 neither option provides improvement to the overall Sioux Valley distribution system. Both the  
301 initial proposal and the alternative have different advantages and disadvantages from a cost,  
302 benefit, and risk standpoint, but do not provide improvement to the overall distribution system  
303 of Sioux Valley Energy.

304 Q. **Based upon your review of Exhibit\_TS-5 (Knife River CAD File Overlaid on Sioux**  
305 **Valley Energy Distribution Map), what impact do you foresee on the respective**  
306 **distribution systems of Sioux Valley Energy and Xcel Energy should Knife River's**  
307 **Petition be granted?**

308 A. I do not see any way that this system can be built without crossing and intermingling with the  
309 existing Sioux Valley Energy facilities. There is significant danger to anyone working on  
310 either of these systems, as the intermingling of two separate electric distribution systems at  
311 different voltages will be a complicated, convoluted system that is unlike anything that Sioux  
312 Valley Energy has ever dealt with. I feel this would create a significant safety issue. This is

313 unique enough of a situation that Sioux Valley Energy line workers would be challenged to  
314 keep everything clear. I do not believe Xcel Energy will work on the system beyond their  
315 primary metering point. This concerns me greatly, as now you have electricians that may not  
316 be as qualified as a line crew, that work with high voltage daily, having to perform work on the  
317 Knife River distribution system. I am extremely concerned with safety at this site.

318 **F. SDCL 49-34A-56(3): “The proximity of adequate facilities from which electric service**  
319 **of the type required may be delivered;”**

320 Q. **What distribution infrastructure would Sioux Valley Energy have to build in order to**  
321 **serve Knife River’s anticipated load of 11 MW at its proposed Quartzite facilities?**

322 A. The alternative proposal currently being presented by Sioux Valley Energy would require  
323 substation upgrades at the Corson substation by East River to provide the required capacity.  
324 From the distribution side, Sioux Valley Energy would need to install a minimum of two  
325 dedicated 12kV underground distribution circuits over to the plant. On site at the plant, Sioux  
326 Valley Energy would also have to install several pieces of switchgear to properly sectionalize  
327 the feeds, as well as install distribution transformers at identified locations. From these  
328 transformers, Knife River would take service at the secondary terminals of the transformer.  
329 These two circuits would provide nearly zero redundancy to Knife River when the plant is  
330 running at full capacity and it would be recommended to install a third distribution feeder to  
331 the plant site if Knife River was wanting redundancy incorporated into that service.

332 Q. **Based upon your review of Xcel Energy’s responses to your data requests, what is your**  
333 **understanding of the necessary distribution infrastructure that would have to be built?**

334 A. My understanding is that Knife River will be responsible for all onsite distribution from the  
335 above primary metering point to include any and all primary voltage switchgear, system  
336 protection and all conductor up to and including the distribution transformers. We have

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT**  
**Confidential Data Has Been Excised**

337 estimated that it will require approximately **[PROTECTED DATA BEGINS]**  
338 **[PROTECTED DATA ENDS]** to provide all associated switchgear, conductor and multiple  
339 distribution transformers to supply energy in the locations and at the voltages needed for the  
340 plant expansion. This estimate was created using costs for 12.47 kV equipment, as that is the  
341 voltage we are familiar with. I assume the costs will be higher for a 34.5 kV on-site  
342 distribution system.

343

344 Dated this 17th day of February, 2026.

345

346 \s\ Ted Smith

347

348 Ted Smith, Vice President of Engineering and Operations, Sioux Valley Energy