THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA FEB 1 & 2005 = = = _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION FOR ELECTRICAL SERVICE BY DAKOTA TURKEY EL04-032 GROWERS, LLC TO HAVE DAKOTA ENERGY COOPERATIVE, INC. ASSIGNED AS ITS ELECTRIC PROVIDER IN THE SERVICE AREA OF NORTHWESTERN ENERGY _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ Transcript of Proceedings February 9, 2005 _ _ _ _ _ BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, GARY HANSON, CHAIRMAN BOB SAHR, VICE CHAIRMAN DUSTY JOHNSON, COMMISSIONER COMMISSION STAFF John Smith Rolayne Ailts Wiest Karen Cremer Greg Rislov Harlan Best Keith Senger Dave Jacobson Michele Farris Tina Douglas Heather Forney Pam Bonrud Steve Wegman Martin Bettmann APPEARANCES Alan Dietrich, NorthWestern Energy Darla Pollman Rogers, Riter, Rogers, Wattier & Brown Margo Northrup, Riter, Rogers, Wattier & Brown Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR, CRR

M

D

D

Case Compress

(

Ć

	Compress		
1	THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION		3
2	OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA	1	CHAIRMAN HANSON: This is Wednesday,
			•
3		2	February 9, 2005, and it is at or past 2:30 p.m.
4	IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION FOR	3	This is the State Capitol Building, Room 468,
5	ELECTRICAL SERVICE BY DAKOTA TURKEY GROWERS, LLC TO HAVE DAKOTA ENERGY EL04-032	4	Pierre, South Dakota. This is the South Dakota
	COOPERATIVE, INC. ASSIGNED AS ITS	1	
6	ELECTRIC PROVIDER IN THE SERVICE AREA OF NORTHWESTERN ENERGY	5	Public Utilities Commission hearing on EL04-032.
7		6	There is no one joining us by phone this afternoon
8	\$0E2227777222222277722222277	7	that we are aware of. I am Commissioner Gary
	Transcript of Proceedings		-
9	February 9, 2005	8	Hanson. I am joined by Commissioners Johnson and
10		9	Commissioner Sahr.
11	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,	10	The Commission granted an intervention to
	GARY HANSON, CHAIRMAN		
12	BOB SAHR, VICE CHAIRMAN DUSTY JOHNSON, COMMISSIONER	11	NorthWestern at its November 30, 2004 meeting.
13		12	NorthWestern filed a Motion for Summary Disposition
14	COMMISSION STAFF John Smith	13	of NorthWestern Corporation on January 1, 2005. A
	Rolayne Ailts Wiest		· · · ·
15	Karen Cremer Greg Rislov	14	Stipulation to Amend Petition was submitted by both
16	Harlan Best	15	parties on February 2, 2005. On February 3, 2005
17	Keith Senger Dave Jacobson	16	Dakota Turkey Growers filed a Memorandum of Law in
	Michele Farris	17	
18	Tina Douglas Heather Forney		Opposition of Motion for Summary Disposition.
19	Pam Bonrud	18	The question before the Commission today is
20	Steve Wegman Martin Bettmann	19	shall the Commission grant the Motion for Summary
		20	Disposition.
21	APPEARANCES		
22	Alan Dietrich, NorthWestern Energy	21	This is the time and place scheduled for the
23	Darla Pollman Rogers, Riter, Rogers, Wattier & Brown	22	argument in consideration of said Motion. And I
	Margo Northrup, Riter, Rogers, Wattier & Brown	23	believe everyone's represented by attorneys.
24	Reported By Cheri McComsey Wittler, RPR, CRR		
25		24	Are there any preliminary matters that we need
		25	to go over before we begin that either party wishes
·	2		
, , 1	ALSO PRESENT		4
	ALSO PRESENT	1	1.
1		1	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your
	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris	1 2	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern.
2	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker	1 2 3	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich.
2 3 4	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers		to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern.
2 3	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher		to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman
2 3 4	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers	3 4 5	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have
2 3 4 5	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher		to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that
2 3 ~4 5 6 7	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the	3 4 5	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have
2 3 4 5 6	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State	3 4 5 6 7	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our
2 3 ~4 5 6 7	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the	3 4 5 6 7 8	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of the statutes in question. And I'll refer to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of the statutes in question. And I'll refer to statutes 49-34A-56 and 49-34A-42 during our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of the statutes in question. And I'll refer to statutes 49-34A-56 and 49-34A-42 during our argument as Sections 42 and Section 56 just for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of the statutes in question. And I'll refer to statutes 49:34A:56 and 49:34A:42 during our argument as Sections 42 and Section 56 just for simplicity sake.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of the statutes in question. And I'll refer to statutes 49-34A-56 and 49-34A-42 during our argument as Sections 42 and Section 56 just for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of the statutes in question. And I'll refer to statutes 49-34A-56 and 49-34A-42 during our argument as Sections 42 and Section 56 just for simplicity sake. Section 56 is a special exception given to the
2 3 ~4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of the statutes in question. And I'll refer to statutes 49-34A-56 and 49-34A-42 during our argument as Sections 42 and Section 56 just for simplicity sake. Section 56 is a special exception given to the assigned service area of law that allows a new
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of the statutes in question. And I'll refer to statutes 49:34A-56 and 49:34A-42 during our argument as Sections 42 and Section 56 just for simplicity sake. Section 56 is a special exception given to the assigned service area of law that allows a new customer at a new location with a 2 megawatt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of the statutes in question. And I'll refer to statutes 49-34A-56 and 49-34A-42 during our argument as Sections 42 and Section 56 just for simplicity sake. Section 56 is a special exception given to the assigned service area of law that allows a new
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of the statutes in question. And I'll refer to statutes 49-34A-56 and 49-34A-42 during our argument as Sections 42 and Section 56 just for simplicity sake. Section 56 is a special exception given to the assigned service area of law that allows a new customer at a new location with a 2 megawatt connected demand to petition the Commission for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ALSO PRESENT Warren Lotensburg Jeff Decker Jay Morris Jeff Nelson Audrey Ricketts Nettie Meyers Robert D. Rademacher TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, held in the above-entitled matter, at the South Dakota State Capitol, Room 468, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota, on the 9th day of February 2005,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to bring up at this time? If not, seeing your inquisitive looks, we will begin with NorthWestern. Mr. Dietrich. MR. DIETRICH: Thank you, Chairman Hanson, Commissioners. The drawing that I have here is a somewhat larger view of the exhibit that we included with one of the affidavits in our Motion, and I can move it a little closer if it helps for illustrative purposes, but I believe in the documents you have that exhibit is included as well. As we look at the determination of our Motion and the facts that were laid out in the Affidavits and my Memorandum of Law, I think it's important that the Commission look at the precise language of the statutes in question. And I'll refer to statutes 49:34A-56 and 49:34A-42 during our argument as Sections 42 and Section 56 just for simplicity sake. Section 56 is a special exception given to the assigned service area of law that allows a new customer at a new location with a 2 megawatt

Case Cor	npress		
	5		7
1	NorthWestern is the assigned service provider	1	in other words, we've been serving this location
2	you can tell that from the pleadings in the case,	2	since the territorial law was enacted in 1975.
3	both the Petition and our Response and the	3	Now the drawing shows the areas in question
4	Dakota Turkey Growers is indeed a new customer and	4	here, and Dakota Turkey has raised the issue of
5	for the purposes of this Motion we are not	5	whether there's a genuine issue of fact in this
6	challenging the fact that they will have a	6	case, arguing that there's some question as to
7	2 megawatt load. What we are challenging is that	7	where the customer where the plant is going to
8	they are a new customer at a new location.	8	be located. For the purpose of our Motion,
9	The word "location" is used in two sections in	9	NorthWestern will admit that Mr. Decker's home
10	the electric territorial law provisions contained	10	occupied land in the northeast area of this tract
11	in Chapter 49-34A. Those two places are Section 42	11	of land and that the exact footprint of the plant
12	and Section 56. And it's NorthWestern's position	12	to be constructed is not in the same area where his
13	that this same definition should be used for that	13	house and other buildings were located or that the
14	word in the same chapter of the South Dakota Code.	14	footprint is going to be somewhere in the lower, as
15	And that definition means as announced by our	15	they said in their Affidavit, southeast portion of
16	-	16	they sale in their Andawit, southeast portion of this land.
1	South Dakota Supreme Court about a year ago the	17	
17	word "location" would mean the geographical area		So it isn't precisely the same piece of the
18	served by the electric utility. If the Legislature	18	farmland. However, this whole farmland area has
19	had intended for a different interpretation, all it	19	been owned by the same persons for 30 years by
20	would have needed to say was a customer a new	20	persons in the same exact ownership size and shape,
21	customer with a 2 megawatt load can petition for	21	the fact that it may have been replatted once or
22	service in the assigned service area of another.	22	replatted again, it was always owned together as
23	But it went beyond that and said a new customer at	23	one site, one farm site that was utilized by
24	a new location.	24	farmers. A farm does not just consist of the exact
25	Dakota Turkey's position is that it is a new	25	physical presence where the building is located. A
	6		8
1	customer, therefore, any location in which it	1	farm consists of the legal description or the farm
2	receives service is a new location for it. But it	2	acreage that that farmer holds. And Mr. Decker and
3	is our position that location must be used in the	3	his wife as well as their predecessors have owned
1	more general term consistent with the use of the	4	exactly the land that was transferred to
5	word in the statute.	5	Dakota Turkey and exactly that land upon which
6	And despite the objection that they raised, I	6	they're putting their plant and for which
	don't believe this renders Section 56 meaningless	7	Mr. Decker's house was removed and the electric
0	•	8	service to that would then not be served in the way
8	or without application. It just merely means that	9	that it was before.
9	a customer who is a new large customer who's	1	
10	seeking service must be seeking that in a place	10	The Black Hills case gives the Commission
11	where electric service has not been rendered. In	11	guidance to what location means under the
12	other words, a place where an existing utility has	12	territorial law. South Dakota Supreme Court in
13	not already made an investment to serve customers	13	this decision announced just a year ago January
14	at that location. And if it were, if it's anywhere	14	made it clear that location does not mean a level
15	else in the assigned service area where service has	15	of electric service but instead means a
16	not been provided, it would be appropriate,	16	geographical area. Therefore, even a much larger
17	provided the other qualifying measures are met.	17	use of electricity that may be present in the
18	The Commission should give the plain meaning	18	future does not change the right of an electric
19	to the words in the statute, and the words "new	19	service provider based on the past service to a
20	location" are a further qualifying phrase beyond	20	location. And the Supreme Court noted various
21	new customer. As evidenced in the Affidavits,	21	criteria to be used when assigning service areas;
22	Jeffrey Decker and his wife were receiving service	22	prevention of duplication of distribution lines and
23	from NorthWestern at the location and his	23	facilities, willingness and good faith intent of
23	predecessors entitled to the farmland that he owned	23	the electric utilities to provide accurate service,
24	were also receiving service from NorthWestern. So,	25	reasonable opportunity for future growth, and so
1 /7	were also receiving service from Northwestern. SO.	1 20	reasonable opportunity for future growth, and so

Ĺ

Case	Compress
------	----------

(_____

	9	11
1 forth, and the very reasons that they rely upon for	1	connections within the other's assigned service
2 an initial assignment are the same reasons why	2	area. But if you look back to the Commission's
3 NorthWestern should continue to be able to service	3	initial decision, that would have provided that
4 it's assigned service area.	4	they would have been entitled to serve it.
5 We've been there for 30 years. The purpose of	5	And, in fact, the Supreme Court, even though
6 this law was to prevent duplication of lines and	6	it upheld the reversal of that decision, said that
7 facilities, and because of that we shouldn't have	7	the contract took away the right that the utility
8 to roll up our lines and go away so that they can	8	would have had to have continued to serve the
9 put a new service into an existing location. The	9	location had it not been for that contract. So, in
10 Supreme Court concluded that location denotes a	10	other words, the Supreme Court recognized that even
11 place where something is or could be located, that	11	a larger service that may have expanded into new
12 is a site.	12	plots of land would have provided the right for the
13 In that case Black Hills had been serving what	13	co-op to continue to serve this new load.
14 they call a frozen customer, a customer in another	14	The South Dakota case is cited by Dakota
15 utility service area that existed at the time the	15	Turkey in its opposition, has been discussed in our
16 territorial law went into effect and essentially	16	memorandum. They also cited a couple of
17 grandfathered that customer to be served in the	17	nonjurisdictional cases. In the City of La Grange
18 future. And, despite that, the court said that	18	case from Georgia a city was seeking to be allowed
•••	19	permanent service rights based upon temporary
	20	construction service to a site. That's not the
21 customer's usage of electricity expands and	21	issue that we have here. We're not talking about
22 requires additional service at new service points	22	the temporary rights to construction. We're asking
23 within that location, Black Hills should be allowed	23	that it is not it is based upon our permanent
24 to serve those new service points.	24	30 years of service upon the in that assigned
25 Our argument would be despite the fact that it	25	service area on that to this location.
1	0	12
1 may be located in a different place on this site,	1	And the Rural Electric Convenience Cooperative
2 it is still just a new service point within the	2	case from Illinois that was cited the Court entered
3 same tract of land upon which we have been	3	a finding directly contrary to the Black Hills
4 providing service. And in this case not only are	4	Decision by our South Dakota Supreme Court. In
5 we saying because we've been serving there but also	5	other words, they felt that a co-op the fact
6 because it is our assigned service area.	6	that a co op was serving a farm did not provide it
7 The Commission's decision in a Clay-Union	7	with the rights to serve a new customer. But
8 matter many years ago which was cited in our	8	that's entirely opposed by the Black Hills result.
9 memorandum provided service Clay-Union at the	9	So this Commission should come up with a different
10 time had provided service to a farmhouse which was	10	Decision contrary to what the finding was in
11 then going to be replaced with an aluminum	11	Illinois.
12 extruding factory that was not only going to buy	12	Dakota Turkey's argument is that it is a new
13 the tract of land upon which the farm had been	13	location because it's a new location for them.
14 based but a much larger portion of land as well	14	Essentially they're saying if you were to buy a
15 including additional tracts of land, and at the		
16 time this Commission said we think that this is	1 1 7	
17 service that the grandfathered service rights of	15	used car on a car lot because it's a new car to you
	16	that makes it a new car. It doesn't make it a new
	16 17	that makes it a new car. It doesn't make it a new car. It's still a used car. When the location is
18 Clay-Union should be upheld and they should get to	16 17 18	that makes it a new car. It doesn't make it a new car. It's still a used car. When the location is the location of service, not just the location for
18 Clay-Union should be upheld and they should get to19 serve the aluminum extruding factory.	16 17 18 19	that makes it a new car. It doesn't make it a new car. It's still a used car. When the location is the location of service, not just the location for the customer, any new customer could argue anywhere
 18 Clay-Union should be upheld and they should get to 19 serve the aluminum extruding factory. 20 This case was reversed on appeal to the 	16 17 18 19 20	that makes it a new car. It doesn't make it a new car. It's still a used car. When the location is the location of service, not just the location for the customer, any new customer could argue anywhere I go is a new location. In other words, their
 18 Clay-Union should be upheld and they should get to 19 serve the aluminum extruding factory. 20 This case was reversed on appeal to the 21 Circuit Court and then upheld by the Supreme Court 	16 17 18 19 20 21	that makes it a new car. It doesn't make it a new car. It's still a used car. When the location is the location of service, not just the location for the customer, any new customer could argue anywhere I go is a new location. In other words, their position would be anywhere in our assigned service
 Clay-Union should be upheld and they should get to serve the aluminum extruding factory. This case was reversed on appeal to the Circuit Court and then upheld by the Supreme Court but upon entirely different grounds and on the 	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that makes it a new car. It doesn't make it a new car. It's still a used car. When the location is the location of service, not just the location for the customer, any new customer could argue anywhere I go is a new location. In other words, their position would be anywhere in our assigned service territory they could come and put a new customer
 18 Clay-Union should be upheld and they should get to 19 serve the aluminum extruding factory. 20 This case was reversed on appeal to the 21 Circuit Court and then upheld by the Supreme Court 22 but upon entirely different grounds and on the 23 appeal the Court said you are further restricted by 	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that makes it a new car. It doesn't make it a new car. It's still a used car. When the location is the location of service, not just the location for the customer, any new customer could argue anywhere I go is a new location. In other words, their position would be anywhere in our assigned service territory they could come and put a new customer and petition and say this is a new customer, it is
 Clay-Union should be upheld and they should get to serve the aluminum extruding factory. This case was reversed on appeal to the Circuit Court and then upheld by the Supreme Court but upon entirely different grounds and on the 	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that makes it a new car. It doesn't make it a new car. It's still a used car. When the location is the location of service, not just the location for the customer, any new customer could argue anywhere I go is a new location. In other words, their position would be anywhere in our assigned service territory they could come and put a new customer

	Case Comp	ress			
		13		15	;]
	1	you have customers there or have had customers	1	any kind that have come to the Commission for a	
	2	there. We're entitled to petition under	2	determination and very few that have gone on appeal	
	3	Section 56.	3	to courts. And those cases have been boundary line	
· · ·	4	The Legislature could have written this to	4	disputes or, you know, other disputes with specific	
	5	have included language that would have made that	5	circumstances.	
	6	possible. They did not. They say it has to be a	6	The exception under Section 56 is still	
	7	new customer in a new location. To do otherwise	7	available, but in order to take advantage of it,	
	8	would be contrary to the purpose of the assigned	8	the customer should look to see is this a place	
	9	service territory laws and the integrity of our Act	9	where electric service is already being rendered by	
	10	and they Dakota Turkey could have acquired a	10	someone? If it is not a place where electric	
	11	site and been served by Dakota Turkey in either of	11	service is being rendered, then if I meet the other	
	12	two ways; located in their assigned service area,	12	qualifying things, I can apply or petition to be	
	13	or locating it in NorthWestern's assigned service	13	served by someone other than the service provider.	
	14	area where we aren't already serving the customer.	14	But generally to maintain that integrity and to	
	15	Neither of those things have happened, and	15	allow the first utilization of investments already	
	16	this situation does not qualify for Section 56	16	made by an electric utility, they should not be	
	17	Petition. We'd ask the Commission to grant our	17	allowed to come into a location and kick another	
	18	Motion to Dismiss this Petition.	18	provider out.	
	19	Any questions?	19	CHAIRMAN HANSON: But isn't all of	
	20	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you,	20	the land in South Dakota owned by someone?	
	21	Mr. Dietrich. I have a few, but I'll ask one and	20	MR. DIETRICH: It's certainly owned	
	22	then perhaps the other Commissioners have some.	22	by someone, but it may not have been served yet.	
	23	It seems as if you're saying that the load	23	If it was a real green field site, that is a site	
	24	then doesn't matter, that the exception for the	23	upon which electricity is not provided and there	
	25	2000 kilowatt shouldn't matter if there's a	25	are such sites in the vicinity of some of the	
	2.5		20		
	1.	14	_	16	3
	1	what's the purpose of having assigned territories?	1	communities. Most of the growth of these large	
	2	What's the purpose of having an exception to that,	2	customers is going to be either areas within an	
	3	if in fact you cannot have service to someone who	3	industrial park or just outside of a city or areas	
	4	has a higher load, if load doesn't matter?	4	that might be annexed into the city but aren't part	
	5	MR. DIETRICH: Load matters in a	5	of the city or on the outskirts of the cities are	
	6	couple of senses. First of all, in order to	6	where the larger customers are going to locate and	
	7	qualify at all under Section 56 a customer must be	7	in some of those areas there is no service.	
	8	large enough to qualify. It must be you know,	8	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Couldn't we carry	
	9	NorthWestern submits that it must meet three	9	your example here that you've given us someone	
	10	qualifying criteria. It must be a 2 megawatt	10	that has a 5,000 acre ranch, he or she has a farm	
	11	demand load. It must be a new customer. A	11	building and some wells, some spot, and a home. Is	
	12	customer couldn't just grow larger and say now that	12	that entire area then an existing location?	
	13	I've hit 2 megawatts decided want service from	13	MR. DIETRICH: Is the customer	
	14	someone else. And it must be at a new location.	14	planning to buy that entire site, or is he only	
	15	By saying new location that implies that it's not	15	going to buy a portion of it? Essentially here	
	16	only a new customer but is it a place where someone	16	Dakota Turkey has displaced this customer, has said	
	17	hasn't already been serving.	17	we're buying the entire site that you have had. I	
	18	Now I guess the first part of your question,	18	don't think they're going to buy 5,000 acres, but,	
	19	what was the purpose of the assigned service areas,	19	you know, here's a 100-acre site that's being	
	20	it was to prevent duplication of facilities,	20	acquired in its entirety for whatever purpose.	
	21	prevent the race to see who could get there first	21	If the building is only going in the southern	
	22	to have double transmission lines, double	22	portion, you know, they've still acquired the whole	
	23	distribution lines. And the assigned territorial	23	site, and they have essentially removed the	
	24	law has worked well. In 30 years since it was	24	existing customer and the existing service.	
	25	enacted we have had I'm sure less than 25 cases of	25	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.	

(

Ć

(

4	17	4	19
	VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: Good afternoon,	1	this property and allowed the electric service to
2	Mr. Dietrich. Is it the Deckers? Is that who the	2	continue for the customer, I think that conclusion
3	property owners were?	3	may be easier to come to than the fact that they
4	MR. DIETRICH: The last farm owners	4	are essentially saying, Mr. Decker, you own all of
5	were the Deckers.	5	this land, we want it all. And what we were
6	VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: Could you point	6	serving, if there would have been any other uses of
7	again to where their house is it a house or	7	electricity on this site, they would be ours as the
8	I've driven by there.	8	assigned service provider. And the fact that they
9	MR. DIETRICH: It was. It's not	9	elected, first of all, to acquire a site where we
10	there any longer, but it was. It was located in	10	were already providing electricity and then to
11	this northeast quadrant (Indicating).	11	acquire the entire site as opposed to saying this
12	VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: Okay. Could	12	particular customer can remain, you know, the home
13	you point to where you believe the proposed site is	13	can remain, he's going to have to give up his
14	going to go?	14	farmland because we'll need that, but he can remain
15	MR. DIETRICH: According to the	15	and we will coexist, you know, I think that's a
16	Affidavit filed by Dakota Turkey, the footprint of	16	different situation than what we have here.
17	the plant building itself is going to be in the	17	What we have here is essentially,
18		18	5.
	southeastern portion of this property (Indicating).		NorthWestern, your customer goes away, roll up your
19	VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: The	19	lines, we're going to come in and serve now in your
20	Black Hills - West River case in my mind factually	20	service area.
21	is significantly different, and here's one of the	21	VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: Do you know
22	things that I would look at. If the Deckers would	22	historically did NorthWestern build for with
23	have been building an addition onto their house, l	23	future expansion in that particular area in mind?
24	would have said that looks a lot like what I felt	24	MR. DIETRICH: Well, we certainly
25	was going on at the Waste Water Treatment Center	25	built lines with the idea of serving
	18		20
1	out in the Rapid City area because it was taking	1	infrastructure to serve the entire service area,
2	place on that same site.	2	and, you know, this isn't on the record here but of
3	' I was concerned in that case, though, and I	3	course we had a packing plant on the east side of
4	have stated publicly concerns about expanding this	4	Huron that we served for many years that closed for
5	concept of location so wide, so large that you end	5	which we had constructed substations and other
1-	oonoope of lood of inter of an Be that Jea on a	-	
Ih	up. I think thwarting what the intention of this	16	
6	up, I think, thwarting what the intention of this law is _ And think in that case you were looking	6	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So
7	law is. And I think in that case you were looking	7	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a
7 8	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of	7 8	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long
7 8 9	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's	7 8 9	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the
7 8 9 10	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable.	7 8 9 10	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could
7 8 9 10 11	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your	7 8 9 10 11	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service.
7 8 9 10 11 12	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is	7 8 9 10 11 12	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River - Black Hills	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River - Black Hills case. And, for instance, I had mentioned that I	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case is that the lines were built clearly contemplating
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River - Black Hills case. And, for instance, I had mentioned that I thought in that case if they had, in fact, gone out	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case is that the lines were built clearly contemplating upgrades to that particular location, that
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River - Black Hills case. And, for instance, I had mentioned that I thought in that case if they had, in fact, gone out to a different part of that plot of land that was	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case is that the lines were built clearly contemplating upgrades to that particular location, that particular facility. And I'm just trying to get a
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River - Black Hills case. And, for instance, I had mentioned that I thought in that case if they had, in fact, gone out	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case is that the lines were built clearly contemplating upgrades to that particular location, that
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River - Black Hills case. And, for instance, I had mentioned that I thought in that case if they had, in fact, gone out to a different part of that plot of land that was	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case is that the lines were built clearly contemplating upgrades to that particular location, that particular facility. And I'm just trying to get a
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River - Black Hills case. And, for instance, I had mentioned that I thought in that case if they had, in fact, gone out to a different part of that plot of land that was owned by the City, that I would have thought I	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case is that the lines were built clearly contemplating upgrades to that particular location, that particular facility. And I'm just trying to get a feel for whether that sort of we should be
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River - Black Hills case. And, for instance, I had mentioned that I thought in that case if they had, in fact, gone out to a different part of that plot of land that was owned by the City, that I would have thought I probably would have leaned towards awarding it to West River under those circumstances. And that	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case is that the lines were built clearly contemplating upgrades to that particular location, that particular facility. And I'm just trying to get a feel for whether that sort of we should be concerned about waste and duplications, but it doesn't seem to rise to the same level as it did in
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River - Black Hills case. And, for instance, I had mentioned that I thought in that case if they had, in fact, gone out to a different part of that plot of land that was owned by the City, that I would have thought I probably would have leaned towards awarding it to West River under those circumstances. And that seems to be more along the lines of what is	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case is that the lines were built clearly contemplating upgrades to that particular location, that particular facility. And I'm just trying to get a feel for whether that sort of we should be concerned about waste and duplications, but it doesn't seem to rise to the same level as it did in that case, in my mind, if those sort of investments
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River - Black Hills case. And, for instance, I had mentioned that I thought in that case if they had, in fact, gone out to a different part of that plot of land that was owned by the City, that I would have thought I probably would have leaned towards awarding it to West River under those circumstances. And that seems to be more along the lines of what is happening here. It's not as if we are expanding or	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case is that the lines were built clearly contemplating upgrades to that particular location, that particular facility. And I'm just trying to get a feel for whether that sort of we should be concerned about waste and duplications, but it doesn't seem to rise to the same level as it did in that case, in my mind, if those sort of investments really weren't foreseeable other than maybe some
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River · Black Hills case. And, for instance, I had mentioned that I thought in that case if they had, in fact, gone out to a different part of that plot of land that was owned by the City, that I would have thought I probably would have leaned towards awarding it to West River under those circumstances. And that seems to be more along the lines of what is happening here. It's not as if we are expanding or adding on to that particular location. In my mind	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case is that the lines were built clearly contemplating upgrades to that particular location, that particular facility. And I'm just trying to get a feel for whether that sort of we should be concerned about waste and duplications, but it doesn't seem to rise to the same level as it did in that case, in my mind, if those sort of investments really weren't foreseeable other than maybe some day we'll expand it throughout the area.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River - Black Hills case. And, for instance, I had mentioned that I thought in that case if they had, in fact, gone out to a different part of that plot of land that was owned by the City, that I would have thought I probably would have leaned towards awarding it to West River under those circumstances. And that seems to be more along the lines of what is happening here. It's not as if we are expanding or adding on to that particular location. In my mind I think we're getting to another location here.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case is that the lines were built clearly contemplating upgrades to that particular location, that particular facility. And I'm just trying to get a feel for whether that sort of we should be concerned about waste and duplications, but it doesn't seem to rise to the same level as it did in that case, in my mind, if those sort of investments really weren't foreseeable other than maybe some day we'll expand it throughout the area. I mean, there clearly you have significant
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	law is. And I think in that case you were looking at expansion of an actual building or groups of buildings and facilities. To me here I think it's clearly distinguishable. I mean, you may have other merits within your arguments, but I think this particular instance is distinguishable from that West River · Black Hills case. And, for instance, I had mentioned that I thought in that case if they had, in fact, gone out to a different part of that plot of land that was owned by the City, that I would have thought I probably would have leaned towards awarding it to West River under those circumstances. And that seems to be more along the lines of what is happening here. It's not as if we are expanding or adding on to that particular location. In my mind	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	lines and transmission and distribution lines. So essentially there was another packing plant a little closer to the city that we served for a long time that closed a number of years ago and at the time our infrastructure was such that we could provide that service. VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: See, my recollection in the Black Hills - West River case is that the lines were built clearly contemplating upgrades to that particular location, that particular facility. And I'm just trying to get a feel for whether that sort of we should be concerned about waste and duplications, but it doesn't seem to rise to the same level as it did in that case, in my mind, if those sort of investments really weren't foreseeable other than maybe some day we'll expand it throughout the area.

Cas	e Compress		
	21		23
1	could say at that particular location. I'm not	1	was and I sat through that hearing and all of the
2	so sure you could say the same thing here. I	2	appeals and the second time it came back to the
3	certainly if you have thoughts otherwise, I	3	Commission and a Section 56 application and this
4	would appreciate those.	4	Commission said in the first instance this the
5	MR. DIETRICH: Well, certainly, our	5	service to that farmhouse is service grandfather
6	service area around the communities we serve is	6	service to a location.
7	limited because after you go a few miles outside	7	And the Supreme Court said that the only thing
8	the city limits we run into rural electric service	8	that took that away was the fact that this contract
9	areas, primarily areas that weren't served. But we	9	was more restrictive.
10	built a transmission or a line along the	10	VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: Thank you.
11	highway. This is Highway 14 east of Huron, and the	11	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman
12	co op service area is on the north side of the	12	
13	highway. Ours is on the south side. And, you	12	Mr. Dietrich, I'm trying to get my mind around a
14			little bit more of your legal argument of what
	know, we have built lines to serve the customers	14	constitutes location. Getting back to Chairman
15	that we have.	15 16	Hanson's hypothetical about the large ranch, is it
16	We have a 60 megawatt generating station	16	your contention that purchasing 99 acres of the
17	within a quarter of a mile of this particular	17	ranch would allow for somebody to have this
18	location.	18	selection but to purchase 100 acres if that
19	VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: But you didn't	19	additional marginal 1 acre had a well on it, that
20	build that 60 megawatt generator just to serve this	20	would remove somebody's option of choosing a
21	guy's farmhouse and that particular piece of land,	21	different provider?
22	and I think to a large extent that line	22	MR. DIETRICH: Well, I think each
23	Black Hills had was going out to serve that	23	case needs to be looked at individually, but in
24	particular customer in that particular location \cdots	24	this case I think it clearly is a farm property
25	I don't want to say exclusively because I certainly	25	that has been entirely purchased by the new
ļ	22		24
11	could be proven wrong on that, but I do think if	1	provider, new proposed plan. As I said, if they
2	we're going to consider the issues of waste and	2	had purchased the western half and we can make
3	duplication, I think while I'm not minimizing some	3	all kinds of arguments as to, you know, what
4	of your arguments, I do think it's clearly	4	portion of that, but certainly NorthWestern would
5	distinguishable on the facts the differences	5	have continued to have been able to utilize a
6	between the West River - Black Hills case and the	6	portion of its investment if they had carved out
7		7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	ones we're presented here today.	0	even that northeast quadrant that was replatted to
8	MR. DIETRICH: While those facts may	8	be just part of the general description.
9	be different, that neither Dakota Energy or	9	You know, it was initially platted as
10	NorthWestern Energy contemplated a turkey	10	Decker Outlot 1, even though he also purchased the
11	processing plant in precisely this location or	11	other properties, but whereas here they're buying
12	precisely you know, or animal slaughter	12	the whole thing, you know, I think it it's tough
13	operations were going to return to the Huron area,	13	for me to deal in hypotheticals as to exactly what
14	in fact, they were considering other sites besides	14	size no longer is a single location, but whereas
15	Huron in recent months as they were planning this	15	here this farmland has been owned by one farmer or
16	plan.	16	another in its entirety for the entire duration of
17	But I think we need to go back to look at	17	the electric territorial law and served by
18	really what the law what the court said in the	18	NorthWestern, it seems we have a location.
19	Black Hills case, and that was location has a	19	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Yeah. I
20	meaning and our position is the same meaning should	20	understand your reticence to want to talk about
21	apply whether it was an investment to serve a	21	hypotheticals. You know, I certainly share I
22	farmhouse or an investment to serve a factory and	22	mean, in this situation, I mean, is it your
23	that the investment just as in the Clay Union case	23	contention if they executed a sale of everything
24	this Commission said and I recognize none of the	24	except the homestead area on day 1 and on day 2
25	current Commissioners were here at that time, but I	25	executed the sale of the homestead area and still
L		L	

(

{

Case Com	Dress		
	25		2
1	allowed it to have NorthWestern lines, that the	1	we have to read the word "new location" in terms of
2	remaining the initial sales area would be able	2	the service territorial law, not just the
3	to make an election of service provider?	3	subjective determination of that customer that this
4	MR. DIETRICH: They would have	4	is a new car to me even though it's a 1998 Taurus.
5	purchased the other part?	5	It's a new car to me. It's not a new car.
6	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Uh-huh. In	6	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. Thank you.
7	two separate transactions.	7	John.
8	MR. DIETRICH: I think we could	8	MR. SMITH: Alan, in terms of the
9	still make the argument that our investment that we	9	diagram up there and the chart and the Affidavit,
10	made to serve that customer and the lines that we	10	is that line around the edge, which my eyes are so
11	had there were intended to provide service, you	11	bad I can barely see it, but is that the
12	know, to the whole assigned service area that we	12	description that's in the Amended Complaint?
13	had. But I think our argument would be weaker if	13	MR. DIETRICH: This, yes. This is
14	they had not displaced the homeowner. I think we	14	now Dakota Turkey Growers Outlots 1, which is all
15	may still be able to make the argument, but I think	15	of the land here except and then Dakota Turkey
16	it would be a tougher sell.	16	Growers Outlot 2 is this little square here and
17	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Thank you.	17	then this part where the dotted line was previously
18	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Just one little	18	deeded away so it is not part of this outlot.
19	clarification. When you gave the three criteria,	19	MR. SMITH: Okay.
20	the two megawatts, the new customer, the new	20	MR. DIETRICH: But the property that
20	location, could that also be read as two criteria,	21	is described in the NorthWestern Motion is in
22		22	the Affidavit in NorthWestern's Motion, the
22	2 megawatts, the second one being a new customer at a new location?	22	•
23		23	Affidavit of Jay Morris is Dakota Turkey Outlots 1 and 2 and, you know ··
25	MR. DIETRICH: Well, certainly, you	24 25	MR. SMITH: That's what that is.
20	know, you have to meet all of these elements to do	20	
I ·	26		2
1	it. I'm not certain what tying them together	1	MR. DIETRICH: That includes what
2	means.	2	was Decker Outlot 1. There's also some other
3	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Well, it would	3	vacated outlots, small vacated outlots here that
4	mean that ··	4	were all rolled into Dakota Turkey Growers
5	MR. DIETRICH: If it's an existing	5	Outlot 1. So essentially everything north of the
6	customer but he's looking for service to a new	6	railroad tracks south of the highway between this
7	location ··	7	quarter section line and 403 Avenue with this
8	CHAIRMAN HANSON: It would be the	8	little carve out is what is the subject matter of
9	example that we have the present situation where	9	this proceeding and which was the property that has
10	you do have a new customer that is locating to a	10	been acquired by Dakota Turkey Growers.
11	new location for them and that is opposed to the	11	MR. SMITH: That's the description
12	new location of someone adding on, the example that	12	that's now in the Amended Complaint. Is that the
13	if they were here presently and they were using	13	same thing? There was an amendment, right? There
14	1 megawatt and or increasing to 4 or something	14	was a typo?
15	of that nature.	15	MR. DIETRICH: The amendment was
16	MR. DIETRICH: They would not be a	16	just to correct a typographical error in the legal
17	new customer then.	17	description of the range, I believe. Because it
18	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Correct.	18	had been previously explained the Petition
19	MR. DIETRICH: If we accept	19	itself refers to the land in a general nature as
20	Dakota Turkey's argument that a new customer it	20	land in the northeast quarter of Section 4. But
21	is determined whether it's a new customer's new	21	the only change has been the description of the
22	location anywhere, the fact that it's a new	22	only correction was just a typographical correction
23	customer means, you know, it's a customer that	23	which counsel had asked if we were okay correcting
24	hasn't existed and anywhere they go is going to be	24	that because it obviously was not range 6, and 1
1 844 1			
25	a new location to them. But it's not a I think	25	indicated that that was acceptable to NorthWestern.

(

(

{

Case Compress

	29			31
1	MR. SMITH: And that legal	1	of law. In this case I do not believe that	
2	description describes what we're looking at there.	2	NorthWestern has met that burden and, in fact, if	
3	MR. DIETRICH: In the Petition?	3	there's going to be an entitlement to judgment on	
4	MR. SMITH: In the Amended Petition.	4	the merits as a matter of law, it would weigh on	
5	All that did was correct a turn 6 into a 61,	5	the side of Dakota Turkey, DTG.	
6	right, in the range?	6	Let's look, first of all, at the factual	
7	MR. DIETRICH: Right. It's a more	7	distinction if we could. In this case the facts as	
	÷	8		
8	general nature description in the petition. It		to a new customer appear not to be in dispute. In	
9	does not contain the specificity of the exact legal	9	fact, NorthWestern admitted that. The facts as a	
10	description of the site. But I guess you'd have to	10	large load also do not appear to be in dispute at	
11	ask counsel about the Petition.	11	least at this juncture.	
12	MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.	12	The facts as to a new location or the	
13	MR. DIETRICH: Anything further?	13	interpretation of the facts to arrive at the	
14	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Any questions? If	14	conclusion of what constitutes a new location are	
15	not, thank you.	15	disputed. And if you look at the Affidavits that	
16	MR. DIETRICH: Thank you very much.	16	have been filed, you have to look at exactly what	
17	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Dakota Turkey	17	facts are in dispute.	
18	Growers.	18	The Affidavit of Jay Morris states that	
19	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: Good afternoon,	19	NorthWestern Public Service has served this	
20	members of the Commission. The thought occurred to	20	location, and then he refers to the entire location	
21	me as I was coming up here no matter how many times	21	on the map. In the Affidavit of Jeffrey Decker he	
22	one takes this position, whether it's in the	22	states that the entire location was occupied by	
23	Legislature or in front of the body like yourself,	23	their family since 1997. Now there's approximately	
24	you still sort of feel like you're in a hot spot.	24	122 acres in that location.	
25	I apologize for being late getting here.	25	The Affidavit of Ken Rutledge says the	
20	Tapologize for being face getting here. T	20	The Annualit of Neh Nutieuge says the	
		1		
	30			32
1		1	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres.	32
1 2	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they	1 2	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres.	32
1 2 3	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws	1 2 3	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site	32
3	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them.	3	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture	32
3	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today.	3 4	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to	32
3 4 5	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the	3 4 5	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner.	32
3 4 5 6	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey	3 4	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are	32
3 4 5 6 7	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them	3 4 5 6 7	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes	32
3 4 5 6 7 8	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to	3 4 5 6 7 8	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy	32
3 4 5 6 7 8	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition. DTG	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is going to occupy the entire 122 acres. So those	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition. DTG would urge the Commission to deny that Motion and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is going to occupy the entire 122 acres. So those factual differences are important in your	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition. DTG would urge the Commission to deny that Motion and essentially for two reasons. The first reason is	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is going to occupy the entire 122 acres. So those factual differences are important in your consideration.	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition. DTG would urge the Commission to deny that Motion and essentially for two reasons. The first reason is that the issue of new location, which is raised in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is going to occupy the entire 122 acres. So those factual differences are important in your consideration. And I believe because you do need to consider	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition. DTG would urge the Commission to deny that Motion and essentially for two reasons. The first reason is that the issue of new location, which is raised in NorthWestern's Petition, is based on an analysis	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is going to occupy the entire 122 acres. So those factual differences are important in your consideration. And I believe because you do need to consider all of the facts that have been submitted to date,	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition. DTG would urge the Commission to deny that Motion and essentially for two reasons. The first reason is that the issue of new location, which is raised in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is going to occupy the entire 122 acres. So those factual differences are important in your consideration. And I believe because you do need to consider	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition. DTG would urge the Commission to deny that Motion and essentially for two reasons. The first reason is that the issue of new location, which is raised in NorthWestern's Petition, is based on an analysis	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is going to occupy the entire 122 acres. So those factual differences are important in your consideration. And I believe because you do need to consider all of the facts that have been submitted to date,	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition. DTG would urge the Commission to deny that Motion and essentially for two reasons. The first reason is that the issue of new location, which is raised in NorthWestern's Petition, is based on an analysis and determination of facts. And since that is the case we do not believe under the rules of the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is going to occupy the entire 122 acres. So those factual differences are important in your consideration. And I believe because you do need to consider all of the facts that have been submitted to date, and as further facts come in in this case I do not believe a Summary of Disposition Motion is	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition. DTG would urge the Commission to deny that Motion and essentially for two reasons. The first reason is that the issue of new location, which is raised in NorthWestern's Petition, is based on an analysis and determination of facts. And since that is the case we do not believe under the rules of the Commission and also under the rules of South Dakota	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is going to occupy the entire 122 acres. So those factual differences are important in your consideration. And I believe because you do need to consider all of the facts that have been submitted to date, and as further facts come in in this case I do not believe a Summary of Disposition Motion is appropriate.	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition. DTG would urge the Commission to deny that Motion and essentially for two reasons. The first reason is that the issue of new location, which is raised in NorthWestern's Petition, is based on an analysis and determination of facts. And since that is the case we do not believe under the rules of the Commission and also under the rules of South Dakota Law that it is appropriate for summary disposition.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is going to occupy the entire 122 acres. So those factual differences are important in your consideration. And I believe because you do need to consider all of the facts that have been submitted to date, and as further facts come in in this case I do not believe a Summary of Disposition Motion is appropriate. In fact, NorthWestern would not, I don't	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition. DTG would urge the Commission to deny that Motion and essentially for two reasons. The first reason is that the issue of new location, which is raised in NorthWestern's Petition, is based on an analysis and determination of facts. And since that is the case we do not believe under the rules of the Commission and also under the rules of South Dakota Law that it is appropriate for summary disposition. We further believe that if there is going to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is going to occupy the entire 122 acres. So those factual differences are important in your consideration. And I believe because you do need to consider all of the facts that have been submitted to date, and as further facts come in in this case I do not believe a Summary of Disposition Motion is appropriate. In fact, NorthWestern would not, I don't think, dispute that because in NorthWestern's	32
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	got tied up in a meeting, and as I was leaving they had some questions about interpretation of bylaws which I had to stop and clarify for them. I appreciate your indulgence in waiting for me today. My name is Darla Pollman Rogers, for the record. I am the attorney for Dakota Turkey Growers, and I will probably refer to them affectionately as DTG. That's how we refer to them. And I have also filed a Notice of Appearance for Dakota Energy in this case. They joined in the initial Petition with an Affidavit of Joinder and their interests are similar in the case. The issue before the Commission today is NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition. DTG would urge the Commission to deny that Motion and essentially for two reasons. The first reason is that the issue of new location, which is raised in NorthWestern's Petition, is based on an analysis and determination of facts. And since that is the case we do not believe under the rules of the Commission and also under the rules of South Dakota Law that it is appropriate for summary disposition.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	facility is located on a portion of the 122 acres. And, in fact, according to his Affidavit the site where the facility is being located is bare pasture land. It's on the southeast corner as opposed to the farm site was on the northeast corner. So those are factual disputes, and they are important in your consideration of what constitutes a new location because it's I mean, I'm having a hard time understanding how a family could occupy an entire 122 acres. I don't believe that's possible. And I don't think that that's what the facts have established. And I also don't believe that the facility that DTG is going to construct is going to occupy the entire 122 acres. So those factual differences are important in your consideration. And I believe because you do need to consider all of the facts that have been submitted to date, and as further facts come in in this case I do not believe a Summary of Disposition Motion is appropriate. In fact, NorthWestern would not, I don't	32

Case Co	ompress		
	33		35
1	NorthWestern Public Service or in the alternative	1	There's another distinction here, and that is
2	if the facts filed herewith are contested by DTG,	2	DTG did not displace the current customer. And I
3	the Commission should schedule an evidentiary	3	think that was implied in the other argument. The
4	hearing.	4	Deckers sold the land to the City. The City then
5	The facts as submitted by NorthWestern are	5	sold it to the development corporation, and that's
6	disputed by DTG in the Affidavit in everything that	6	who DTG acquired the land from. So it's not a
7	has been filed to date, and, therefore, we don't	7	situation where DTG as a new customer comes in and
8	believe that a Summary Disposition here is	8	displaces the current occupant. That's not what
9	appropriate for that reason.	9	happened here. It went through several changes of
10	But the second reason to deny a Motion for	10	hands. So when actually DTG acquired it Deckers
11	Summary Judgment is that has the moving party shown	11	didn't own that land anymore. They had already
12	that it is entitled to judgment on the merits as a	12	conveyed it to someone else, and I'm sure they did
13	matter of law? And we would submit that, no, DTG	13	so because it was very financially advantageous for
14	has not done that.	14	them to do so.
15	NorthWestern is asking you to interpret new	15	The only way I believe to interpret new
16	location in a very unique manner, in my opinion,	16	location under Section 56 in a manner that makes
17	and I think that it is contrary to the basic words	17	sense and that supports the true purpose of the
18	of the statute. Like Mr. Dietrich, I will be	18	large load exception is to define location from the
19	referring to the statutory code sections as	19	perspective of the new customer because that's what
20	Section 56 and Section 42 for ease of reference.	20	the statute says. It doesn't say new customers at
21	But, in essence, I think it comes down to this:	21	a new location. It says new customers at new
22	You have a plat of land, whether it's this plat or	22	locations which develop after March 21, 1975. Then
23	the 99 versus 100 acres, whatever it is. You have	23	it goes on to say with a large load.
24	a piece of land. And you have it's in someone's	24	That's exactly what we have here with Dakota
25	assigned service area because all the land is.	25	Turkey. DTG is a new customer. They have not
. [34		36
1 1	Now the question becomes if the current	1	previously been served by NorthWestern. To my
2	provider is providing service to one piece of that	2	knowledge they haven't been served by Dakota Energy
3	entire location to one point then there could never	3	or anyone else. They are building a new site from
4	be a new location on that piece of land under	4	the ground up at a new location. This site, which
-	Section 56. I do not believe that that is the	l _	they have acquired and which is now a brand new
5	intent of that law. If it doesn't make the statute	5 6	place and they're building it on bare ground from
7	meaningless, it certainly limits it to a point that		the ground up, that's exactly what's contemplated
8	it is really hard to interpret, and it makes it a	8	here at new locations which develop after
9	not very reasonable application.	9	March 21, 1975. They're developing a new location.
10	We could all sit here and speculate how we	10	The load they exceed the load requirement, the
11	could have crafted this statute to be a little bit	11	2000 kilowatt requirement in this statute.
1		12	•
12	clearer. The statute does not state, for example,	12	All of those factors are met by DTG. DTG was not located at this site prior to starting the
13	that new customers at new locations never served by		1 3
14	the current utility. It doesn't say that. Or new	14 15	property. It acquired this property for the
15	customers at a new location that is bare ground,		purposes of constructing a plant at this new
16	although even if it said that, Dakota Turkey would	16 17	facility. DTG followed all of the steps of a
17	fit into that category.		person or entity that is moving to a new location.
18	But that is what NorthWestern is arguing here.	18	They acquired title from the current owner, which
19	So if, for example, DTG had caused this property to	19	happened to be the City and then the development
20	be replatted in such a way that the Decker farm	20	corporation. They caused it to be replatted. They
21	site, the old Decker farm site was excluded, would	21	started the construction process. Those are all

what is meant by new location under Section 56. What the statute provides is in those circumstances then the new customer is not

the indices of a new location. That is exactly

the statute.

we be here today on this Motion? If they go out

now and sell off that piece of property, would we

be here? I don't think that that's the intent of

22

23

24

25

22

23

24

25

36

Case	Compress

1

	ompress		
	37		39
1	obligated to take service from the utility having	1	I think that actually Black Hills tried to get the
2	the assigned service area. And, again, that's	2	Supreme Court to go farther in its ruling and, in
3	talking about the assigned service area. I think	3	fact, to go all the way to the point of saying any
4	you need to read the whole statute and what is	4	customer in that area would not be Black Hills
5	accorded a new large load customer in this section.	5	would be entitled to serve that customer. But
6	Furthermore, even if you accept NorthWestern's	6	remember the Court specifically declined to find
	· · ·	7	that holding. They did not make that ruling. They
	strained interpretation under Section 56, you need		
8	to look at the specific facts in the case, and in	8	did not go so far under an interpretation of
9	this case they negate the argument because the site	9	Section 42 to make that finding.
10	is not the same site as the farm. And I believe	10	This is an interpretation of Section 56, and
11	also in a case law sited by NorthWestern the	11	for sure there is not that \cdots they did not go that
12	replatting issue is significant.	12	far to make a finding in this case, which is,
13	I do not believe that case law in South Dakota	13	again, a different factual and statutory
14	supports NorthWestern's argument either. One of	14	interpretation.
15	the cases cited in my brief was what I call the Hub	15	believe that the other cases that we cited
16	City case. It was in the matter of NorthWestern.	16	in our brief, even though they are from another
17	And I think that case really supports DTG's	17	jurisdiction, provide much more guidance because
18	interpretation of the statute. You have to recall	18	they are dealing with the same issues that we have
		19	here. You have a farm site. That farm site is no
19	that in the original Petition filed with this		
20	Commission, not specifically this Commission but	20	longer there. You have a new customer coming onto
21	with the Commission at the time, and Northwest	21	that location. That is a new customer at a new
22	intervened and they had a full hearing on it, that	22	location, regardless of the prior owner.
23	Petition was granted. There was a new customer.	23	So we believe that the Commission in this
24	It was a division at a new location that was	24	case and we would urge you to deny the Motion,
25	actually an add on to a manufacturing plant there	25	first of all, because of the factual disputes
	38		40
1	38 with a large load. It was a foundry. And this	1	40 between the parties and second of all because DTG
1	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this	1	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG
1	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new	1 2 2	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new
3	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose	3	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under
3 4	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider.	3 4	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law.
3 4 5	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was	3 4 5	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the
3 4 5 6	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the	3 4	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case.
3 4 5	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was	3 4 5	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the
3 4 5 6	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the	3 4 5	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case.
3 4 5 6 7	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you	3 4 5 6 7	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant	3 4 5 6 7 8	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important legal and factual distinctions between that case	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place. Didn't NorthWestern continue to provide
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important legal and factual distinctions between that case and this case. Probably the most significant is	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place. Didn't NorthWestern continue to provide electricity, including a three-phase service for
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important legal and factual distinctions between that case and this case. Probably the most significant is the issue presented to the Court.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place. Didn't NorthWestern continue to provide electricity, including a three-phase service for the construction of the facility? So haven't they
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important legal and factual distinctions between that case and this case. Probably the most significant is the issue presented to the Court. That case did not at all involve Section 56.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place. Didn't NorthWestern continue to provide electricity, including a three-phase service for the construction of the facility? So haven't they in essence regardless of the changing of hands,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important legal and factual distinctions between that case and this case. Probably the most significant is the issue presented to the Court. That case did not at all involve Section 56. It was not an interpretation of 56. They were	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place. Didn't NorthWestern continue to provide electricity, including a three-phase service for the construction of the facility? So haven't they in essence regardless of the changing of hands, haven't they continued to provide electricity
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important legal and factual distinctions between that case and this case. Probably the most significant is the issue presented to the Court. That case did not at all involve Section 56. It was not an interpretation of 56. They were talking about the same customer, the same location.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place. Didn't NorthWestern continue to provide electricity, including a three-phase service for the construction of the facility? So haven't they in essence regardless of the changing of hands, haven't they continued to provide electricity throughout the entire period of time?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important legal and factual distinctions between that case and this case. Probably the most significant is the issue presented to the Court. That case did not at all involve Section 56. It was not an interpretation of 56. They were	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place. Didn't NorthWestern continue to provide electricity, including a three-phase service for the construction of the facility? So haven't they in essence regardless of the changing of hands, haven't they continued to provide electricity
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important legal and factual distinctions between that case and this case. Probably the most significant is the issue presented to the Court. That case did not at all involve Section 56. It was not an interpretation of 56. They were talking about the same customer, the same location.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place. Didn't NorthWestern continue to provide electricity, including a three-phase service for the construction of the facility? So haven't they in essence regardless of the changing of hands, haven't they continued to provide electricity throughout the entire period of time? MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: To my knowledge they are providing electricity to the construction
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important legal and factual distinctions between that case and this case. Probably the most significant is the issue presented to the Court. That case did not at all involve Section 56. It was not an interpretation of 56. They were talking about the same customer, the same location. Those are important factual distinctions. I believe that and the case also was looking at	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place. Didn't NorthWestern continue to provide electricity, including a three-phase service for the construction of the facility? So haven't they in essence regardless of the changing of hands, haven't they continued to provide electricity throughout the entire period of time? MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: To my knowledge
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important legal and factual distinctions between that case and this case. Probably the most significant is the issue presented to the Court. That case did not at all involve Section 56. It was not an interpretation of 56. They were talking about the same customer, the same location. Those are important factual distinctions. I believe that and the case also was looking at again just location as opposed to the words in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place. Didn't NorthWestern continue to provide electricity, including a three-phase service for the construction of the facility? So haven't they in essence regardless of the changing of hands, haven't they continued to provide electricity throughout the entire period of time? MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: To my knowledge they are providing electricity to the construction site, but they are entitled to do that because the
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important legal and factual distinctions between that case and this case. Probably the most significant is the issue presented to the Court. That case did not at all involve Section 56. It was not an interpretation of 56. They were talking about the same customer, the same location. Those are important factual distinctions. I believe that and the case also was looking at again just location as opposed to the words in Section 56 are "new location". It's new.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place. Didn't NorthWestern continue to provide electricity, including a three-phase service for the construction of the facility? So haven't they in essence regardless of the changing of hands, haven't they continued to provide electricity throughout the entire period of time? MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: To my knowledge they are providing electricity to the construction site, but they are entitled to do that because the large load is not up and running until the facility
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	with a large load. It was a foundry. And this Commission allowed that new customer at that new location with that large load facility to choose its provider. Now the actual later Supreme Court case was whether that choice could be reversed. But in the initial Petition that's the exact issue that you looked at and that is controlling law in this case. The most obviously the most significant change in the status of case law is the Black Hills case that we have talked about today. I would submit that that case is not controlling in the current case. I believe that there are important legal and factual distinctions between that case and this case. Probably the most significant is the issue presented to the Court. That case did not at all involve Section 56. It was not an interpretation of 56. They were talking about the same customer, the same location. Those are important factual distinctions. I believe that and the case also was looking at again just location as opposed to the words in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	between the parties and, second of all, because DTG has met the statutory requirements of a new customer at a new location with a large load under any interpretation of the facts and the law. NorthWestern is not entitled to judgment on the merits as a matter of law in this case. I will try to answer any questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you, Ms. Rogers. You stated during your testimony that the property was not acquired from the Deckers, that there was a number of changes of ownership that took place. Didn't NorthWestern continue to provide electricity, including a three-phase service for the construction of the facility? So haven't they in essence regardless of the changing of hands, haven't they continued to provide electricity throughout the entire period of time? MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: To my knowledge they are providing electricity to the construction site, but they are entitled to do that because the

Case Compress

	Case Comp	41		43
	1	CHAIRMAN HANSON: But they have	1	45 matter.
	2	continued serving this particular location.	2	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: I believe that
	3	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: Yeah. I don't	3	the examples that we've discussed before would be
<i>(</i>	4	know whether it's continuous but, I mean, whether	4	the restrictions on the application of this
8.	5	there was any break in there, I guess I don't know	5	particular statutory section. If I went in and
	6	that for sure.	6	purchased the Decker farm site, I would not be
	7	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. How can	7	entitled to choose my provider unless I had a large
	8	this be a service to a new location, not	8	load, even though I would be a new customer in a
	9	withstanding your arguments you've articulated here	9	new location, but I wouldn't fit under this
	10	today, if, in fact, NorthWestern still provides	10	statutory section.
	11	electricity to the location?	11	If Deckers would have expanded their site and
	12	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: Because under	12	made it into a large load, then I think that's a
	13	Section 56 when you have a new customer coming into	13	closer question and that becomes
	14	a new location with a large load, that new customer	14	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: They wouldn't
	15	is not obligated to take service from the electric	15	have been a new customer.
	16	utility that has that assigned service area.	16	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: They wouldn't
	17	That's the exception that's granted to the	17	have been a new customer, which is similar to the
	18	exclusive service rights of the territorial laws.	18	Black Hills case.
	19	CHAIRMAN HANSON: The location is	19	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: guess what
	20	new to the customer, but it's not new to the	20	I'm asking, is there any difference between your
	21	provider, the electrical provider.	21	interpretation of new customer at a new location
	22	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: The logical	22	and the statute that would say just new customers
	23	explanation of that is there would be no new	23	at a location? Would there be any difference?
	24	location for that electric provider unless it was	24	I guess it seems to me I'll tell you where
	25	just a bare ground so it would be all right to	25	I'm coming from. It seems to me you're arguing the
		42		44
	11	locate anywhere but there.	1	word "new" in front of location doesn't mean
	2	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Exactly.	2	anything. And would the Legislature have done
	3	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: So you want a	3	that? Would it have put in an adjective that
	4	developer to come in and sell off that one piece or	4	wouldn't have any meaning?
	5	not acquire it or checkerboard acquire it?	5	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: 1 think
	6	CHAIRMAN HANSON: That's not what I	6	actually what the statute says is new locations
	7	want. It's what I'm asking.	7	which develop. I think this statute was intended
	8	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: Yes. I mean	8	for the development of plants or sites such as
	9	that would be yes.	9	this, and so I think you have to read it all
	10	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Okay. So if they	10	together. And I think it modifies exactly I
	11	were to locate on half of that property, as opposed	11	mean, it addresses exactly this type of situation.
	12	to the entire property, would your argument be	12	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: You're also
	13	different?	13	asking the Commission to interpret location in 42
	14	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: No. I believe	14	different from location in 56. Why would the
	15	they are a new customer at a new location.	15	Legislature have used those two words if they
	16	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you.	16	didn't want them to mean the same thing?
	17	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Ms. Rogers,	17	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: I'm not sure
	18	•	18	
	19	really you're asking the Commission to interpret new customer, new location for that customer.	19	that I am asking the Commission to interpret them differently. I do not believe that their … the
	20	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: That's correct.	20	-
	20	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Wouldn't the	20	Supreme Court's interpretation in the Black Hills
	21		22	case is necessarily contradictory to what we're
		statute be the same if it just said a new customer		asking for in 56. I think there's a factual
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	23 24	at a location? I mean, you're basically asking the Commission to act as though the word "new" as	23 24	distinction in the sense of the way you consider it. But I don't think that the two are necessarily
	1.74		1/4	
	25	regards to location shouldn't be there, doesn't	25	contradictory.

Case Com	press		
	45		47
1	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Okay. Thank	1	MS. CREMER: I do.
2	you.	2	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Excuse me.
3	CHAIRMAN HANSON: John.	3	Ms. Cremer.
4	MR. SMITH: Just quickly, Darla. On	4	MS. CREMER: I do. Thank you. Good
5	the map that's behind you there that reflects the	5	afternoon. Karen Cremer from staff. Like all of
6	legal description and then Al NorthWestern's,	6	you, I have read the pleadings and sat here this
7	excuse me, Motion, how does that differ from	7	afternoon listening to the arguments of the parties
8	does that differ from what's in the Petition, the	8	and, you know, basically is NorthWestern correct
9	Amended Petition?	9	that there is no genuine issue of fact and they're
10	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: The Amended	10	entitled to the grant of the Motion for Summary
11	Petition did not contain the exact location	11	Disposition, or are the disputed facts raised by
12	description, but in our either in our responses	12	DTG you know, could they be termed as merely red
13	in Interrogatories or our Affidavit   believe it's	13	herrings or are they the type of issues that need
14	the same. I'm not sure if I compared word for	14	to be explored through the hearing process thereby
15	word, but I believe it's the same location as	15	ensuring that due process has been served.
16	MR. SMITH: So there's no dispute	16	I can't really answer that for you because if
17	that that description that's in the Motion and that	17	the answer were that obvious, we wouldn't be here
18	map there do describe the property we're talking	18	this afternoon. The issue falls into a gray area.
19	about.	19	Without a doubt the Territorial Act was enacted to
20	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: I believe that	20	eliminate duplication and wasteful spending in all
21	it describes the property in question, yes.	21	segments of the electric utility industry. To
22	MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.	22	accomplish that utilities were given assigned
23	That's all.	23	service areas, which has been referred to as
24	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Any other	24	Section 42. However, the Act also provided for
25	questions?	25	exceptions to these assigned service areas, and one
	46		48
1	VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: Well, I don't	1	of those exceptions is Section 56 which is intended
2	know if it would be a question but a question about	2	for large load customers to choose their provider.
3	new customer at new location. I think in your	3	Staff believes that a company such as DTG is
- 4	argument you do have new customer at new location.	4	exactly the type of customers that the drafters had
5	You're using that entire phrase. Because if	5	in mind when they enacted this legislation. They
6	someone came in and just bought the house, I don't	6	are a large load customer that would be a boon to
7	think we'd be sitting here today having this	7	either of these utilities. They should be allowed
8	discussion.	8	to have the two companies bid for their services
9	In this case it is we're not just talking	9	and then whichever one gives them the best deal in
10	about the northeast corner. I mean, we're talking	10	DTG's mind should be the one allowed to serve them.
11	about a different piece of a parcel of land. And	11	The problem of course here is what is a new
12	so I do think your argument is using both new	12	customer and a new location. And the question came
13	location and new customer. That's my understanding	13	up is that two criteria or is that one.
14	of it.	14	And I think someone used the example earlier,
15	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: That's what	15	and I think that's a very good example. I think
16	I've attempted to do, yes. Thank you.	16	the purpose of saying a new customer in a new
17	MR. SMITH: And if I also	17	location is so that a company could not grow so big
18	understand, in your view at least that phrase	18	that they merely and then they decide, well, I
19	"which develops" is a distinction between this	19	don't really like the rates of my present utility,
20	particular statute and Section 42, the use of the	20	I think I'll change my name, therefore I am now a
21	word "location" in Section 42.	21	new customer but you don't go to a new location. I
22	MS. POLLMAN ROGERS: I believe that	22	don't think that's what the statute had in mind.
23	there is a distinction there, yes.	23	And so I think they threw in the term "new
24	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Any other	24	location" to avoid that very situation.
25	questions? If not did you have anything, Karen?	25	Here I think everyone agrees DTG is without a

(	Case Compi	ress		
ſ		49		51
	1	doubt a new customer. It's also a new location if	1	it to situations where service is not already
	2	you're DTG. In NorthWestern's mind, you know, it's	2	provided.
	3	location. They are not a new location. I think if	3	Thank you.
с.	4	you believe or buy into NorthWestern's position	4	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you very
1	5	that's a very narrow reading of the statute, making	5	much, Mr. Dietrich. Are there any questions?
	6	it practically meaningless.	6	If not, the Commission is going to take a
	7	Staff believes that the legislative grant of	7	10-minute and hopefully less than 10-minute
	8	essentially monopoly privileges to the electric	8	executive meeting. We will go off the record at
	9	utilities was for the promotion of the public	9	this time.
	10	interest and not for the benefit of the utilities.	10	VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: We should
	11	Therefore, staff's position is that this is an	11	probably have a Motion for that. I would move that
	12	exception to 42, that DTG does meet the threshold	12	we go into executive session.
	13	of a new large load customer in a new location and	13	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: Second.
	14	that the Motion should not be granted.	14	CHAIRMAN HANSON: I concur.
	15	Thank you.	15	(A short recess is taken at which time the
	16	CHAIRMAN HANSON: Thank you. Any	16	Commission meets in executive session)
	17	questions?	17	CHAIRMAN HANSON: I have a Motion to
	18	Seeing none, Mr. Dietrich, we will give you an	18	read. In the matter of EL04.032, Petition for
	19	opportunity to attempt to refute any information or	19	electrical service by Dakota Turkey Growers to have
	20	provide any clarification that needs to be done.	20	Dakota Energy Cooperative assigned as its electric
	21	MR. DIETRICH: Okay. I guess I'd	21	provider in the service area of NorthWestern
	22	just like to make two small points. First of all,	22	Energy, a Motion: I move that we deny
	23	with regard to genuine issue of fact, I think the	23	NorthWestern's Motion for Summary Disposition based
	24	parties have essentially in their Affidavits now	24	upon the status of the record as it stands today
	25	and with the concessions that we make for the	25	and the Affidavits, briefs, and arguments of the
.				
. 1		50		52
		purpose of this Motion said exactly the same thing.		parties. I do not feel that we can rule as a
	2	The footprint of the home of the Deckers is not	2	matter of law that there is no genuine issue of
	3	exactly the same as the footprint of the building	3	material facts regarding Dakota Energy's right to
	4	that Dakota Turkey is going to construct. It is	4	serve the facility. It seems that Northwestern's
	5	our position that that doesn't necessarily make it	5	construction of the phrase "new location" in
	6	a new location.	6	SDCL 49-34A-56 simply does not reflect what seems
	7	And, secondly, I think essentially what staff	7	to be the clear intent of the statute. It could be
	8	and DTG are saying is providing this requirement	8	that after hearing all of the evidence in the case
	9	that it must be an area not served before renders	9	my opinion would change, and NorthWestern is free
	10	56 meaningless, I disagree with. I think we have	10	to present argument at that time as to why we
	11	to read Section 42 and Section 56, not either of	11	should rule in its favor.
	12	which trumps the other, but Section 56 provides an	12	At this time, however, I am not comfortable
	13	exception under narrowly defined terms, and this	13	with deciding this case on anything less than a
	14	situation doesn't fit those narrowly defined terms.	14	full record after hearing. That's the Motion.
	15	And I think these two sections can be read in	15	VICE CHAIRMAN SAHR: And I will
	16	harmony to give full value to the Section 42	16	second.
	17	assigned service rights and the recognition of the	17	COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: I'll concur.
	18	use of a facilities already in place and the	18	CHAIRMAN HANSON: The Motion
	19	assigned service lines and give effect to the new	19	carries. That concludes this hearing. Thank you
	20	large load customer exception in those	20	all very much for your attendance.
	21	circumstances where the customer is seeking service	21	(The hearing concluded at 4 o'clock p.m.)
	22	in a new area.	22	
	23	And so, you know, I think it does not destroy	23	
	24	this this is the correct interpretation. It	24	
	25	does not destroy the use of Section 56. It narrows	25	

Case Compress

(

Ċ

(_____)

	Compress
1	53 STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA )
2	:SS CERTIFICATE
з	COUNTY OF HUGHES )
4	
5	I, CHERI MCCOMSEY WITTLER, a Registered
6	Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the
7	State of South Dakota:
8	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that as the duly-appointed
9	shorthand reporter, I took in shorthand the proceedings
10	had in the above-entitled matter on the 9th day of
11	February 2005, and that the attached is a true and
12	correct transcription of the proceedings so taken.
13	Dated at Pierre, South Dakota this 16th day
14	of February 2005.
15	
16	-
17	anim water
18	Cheri McComsey Wittler, Notary Public and
19	Registered Professional Reporter
20 21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## Word Index

Word Index			
1	[2] 28:24 29:5 60	Agrees [1] 48:25	10:6 11:1 11:24 12:21 13:8 13:12 13 13 14:1 14:19 14:23 19:8 25:12 33:3
A	[2] 21:16 21:20	[1] 48:25 Ailts	37:2 37:3 41:16 47:22 47:25 50:17
<b>1</b> [9] 3:13 23:19 24:10 24:24 26:14 27:	61	<b>[1]</b> 1:14	19 51:20
14 27:23 28:2 28:5	[1] 29:5	Al	Assigning [1] 8:21
10-minute	Δ	[1] 45:6	Assignment
[2] 51:7 51:7	9	Alan [2] 1:22 27:8	[1] 9:2
100 [2] 23:18 33:23	9	Allow	Attached
100-acre	[2] 1:9 3:2	[2] 15:15 23:17	[1] 53:11
[1] 16:19	<b>99</b> [2] 23:16 33:23	Allowed	Attempt [1] 49:19
122	9th	<b>[8]</b> 9:23 11:18 15:17 19:1 25:1 38:2 48:7 48:10	Attempted
[4] 31:24 32:1 32:10 32:14	[2] 2:10 53:10	Allows	[1] 46:16
<b>14</b> [1] 21:11		[1] 4:21	Attendance
16th	Α	Alternative	[1] 52:20 Attorney
[1] 53:13	Able	[1] 33:1 Aluminum	[1] 30:6
1975	[4] 9:3 24:5 25:2 25:15	[ <b>2</b> ] 10:11 10:19	Attorneys
[3] 7:2 35:22 36:9 1997	Above-entitled [2] 2:8 53:10	Amend	[1] 3:23
[1] 31:23	Accept	<b>[1] 3</b> :14	Audrey
1998	[2] 26:19 37:6	Amended	[1]2:4 Available
[1] 27:4	Acceptable	[5] 27:12 28:12 29:4 45:9 45:10 Amendment	[1] 15:7
2	[1] 28:25	[ <b>2</b> ] 28:13 28:15	Avenue
2	Accomplish [1] 47:22	Analysis	[2] 2:9 28:7
2	Accorded	[1] 30:18	Avoid
<b>[10]</b> 3:15 4:22 5:7 5:21 14:10 14:13 24:24 25:22 27:16 27:24	[1] 37:5	Animal	[1] 48:24 Awarding
2000	According	[1] 22:12 Annexed	[1] 18:18
[2] 13:25 36:11	[2] 17:15 32:2	[1] 16:4	Aware
2004	Accurate [1] 8:24	Announced	[1] 3:7
[1] 3:11	Acquire	[2] 5:15 8:13	D
<b>2005</b> [8] 1:9 2:10 3:2 3:13 3:15 3:15 53:11	[4] 19:9 19:11 42:5 42:5	Answer	В
53:14	Acquired	[3] 40:7 47:16 47:17 Apologize	Bad
21	<b>[10]</b> 13:10 16:20 16:22 28:10 35:6 35: 10 36:5 36:14 36:18 40:11	[1] 29:25	[1] 27:11
[2] 35:22 36:9	Acre	Appeal	<b>Bare</b> [4] 32:3 34:15 36:6 41:25
<b>25</b> [1] 14:25	[2] 16:10 23:19	<b>[3]</b> 10:20 10:23 15:2	Barely
2:30	Acreage	Appeals	[1] 27:11
[2] 2:11 3:2	[1] 8:2	[1] 23:2 Appear	Based
	Acres [8] 16:18 23:16 23:18 31:24 32:1 32:	[ <b>2</b> ] 31:8 31:10	[6] 8:19 10:14 11:19 11:23 30:18 5 23
3	10 32:14 33:23	Appearance	Basic
3	Act	[1] 30:9	[1] 33:17
[1] 3:15 30	[4] 13:9 42:24 47:19 47:24	APPEARANCES [1] 1:21	Becomes
<b>[5]</b> 3:11 7:19 9:5 11:24 14:24	Actual [2] 18:8 38:5	Application	[2] 34:1 43:13 Begin
	Add	[ <b>4</b> ] 6:8 23:3 34:9 43:4	[ <b>2</b> ] 3:25 4:2
4	[1] 37:25	Apply	Behind
4	Adding	[3] 15:12 22:21 38:25	[1] 45:5
<b>[3]</b> 26:14 28:20 52:21	[2] 18:22 26:12 Addition	Appreciate [2] 21:4 30:4	Believes
403	[1] 17:23	Appropriate	[2] 48:3 49:7 Benefit
[1] 28:7 42	Additional	[4] 6:16 30:22 32:21 33:9	[1] 49:10
[ <b>11</b> ] 4:18 5:11 33:20 39:9 44:13 46:20	[3] 9:22 10:15 23:19	Area	Best
46:21 47:24 49:12 50:11 50:16	Addresses	<b>[39]</b> 1:6 4:21 5:17 5:22 6:15 7:10 7: 12 7:18 8:16 9:4 9:15 10:6 10:24 11:	[2] 1:16 48:9
468	[1] 44:11 Adjective	2 11:25 13:12 13:14 16:12 18:1 19:20	Bettmann
[2] 2:9 3:3		19:23 20:1 20:22 21:6 21:12 22:13 24:	[1] 1:20 Between
<b>49-34A</b> [1] 5:11	Admit	24 24:25 25:2 25:12 33:25 37:2 37:3 39:4 41:16 47:18 50:9 50:22 51:21	<b>[6]</b> 22:6 28:6 38:14 40:1 43:20 46:
49-34A-42	[1] 7:9	Areas	Beyond
[1] 4:17	Admitted	<b>[10]</b> 7:3 8:21 14:19 16:2 16:3 16:7 21:	[2] 5:23 6:20
49-34A-56	[1] 31:9 Advantage	9 21:9 47:23 47:25	Bid
[2] 4:17 52:6	[1] 15:7	Argue [1] 12:19	[1] 48:8 Big
5	Advantageous	Arguing	[1] 48:17
5,000	[1] 35:13	[3] 7:6 34:18 43:25	Bit
15,000	Affectionately	Argument	[2] 23:13 34:11
121 16:10 16:18			Black
[2] 16:10 16:18 500	[1] 30:8	<b>[16]</b> 3:22 4:18 9:25 12:12 23:13 25:9	[17] 8.10 0.13 0.10 0.02 10.2 10.0
[2] 16:10 16:18 500 [1] 2:9	[1] 30:8 Affidavit	25:13 25:15 26:20 35:3 37:9 37:14 42:	
[2] 16:10 16:18 500 [1] 2:9 56	[1] 30:8	[16] 3:22 4:18 9:25 12:12 23:13 25:9 25:13 25:15 26:20 35:3 37:9 37:14 42: 12 46:4 46:12 52:10 Arguments	
[2] 16:10 16:18 500 [1] 2:9 56 [26] 4:18 4:20 5:12 6:7 13:3 13:16 14:	[1] 30:8 Affidavit [12] 7:15 17:16 27:9 27:22 27:23 30: 11 31:18 31:21 31:25 32:2 33:6 45:13 Affidavits	25:13 25:15 26:20 35:3 37:9 37:14 42: 12 46:4 46:12 52:10 Arguments [6] 18:12 22:4 24:3 41:9 47:7 51:25	20 18:13 20:13 21:23 22:6 22:19 3 10 39:1 39:4 43:18 44:20 BOB
[2] 16:10 16:18 500 [1] 2:9 56	[1] 30:8 Affidavit [12] 7:15 17:16 27:9 27:22 27:23 30: 11 31:18 31:21 31:25 32:2 33:6 45:13 Affidavits [6] 4:7 4:13 6:21 31:15 49:24 51:25	25:13 25:15 26:20 35:3 37:9 37:14 42: 12 46:4 46:12 52:10 Arguments [6] 18:12 22:4 24:3 41:9 47:7 51:25 Arrive	20 18:13 20:13 21:23 22:6 22:19 3 10 39:1 39:4 43:18 44:20 BOB [1] 1:12
[2] 16:10 16:18 500 [1] 2:9 56 [26] 4:18 4:20 5:12 6:7 13:3 13:16 14: 7 15:6 23:3 33:20 34:5 35:16 36:23 37:7 38:17 38:18 38:23 39:10 41:13 44:14 44:22 48:1 50:10 50:11 50:12	[1] 30:8 Affidavit [12] 7:15 17:16 27:9 27:22 27:23 30: 11 31:18 31:21 31:25 32:2 33:6 45:13 Affidavits [6] 4:7 4:13 6:21 31:15 49:24 51:25 Afternoon	25:13 25:15 26:20 35:3 37:9 37:14 42: 12 46:4 46:12 52:10 Arguments [6] 18:12 22:4 24:3 41:9 47:7 51:25 Arrive [1] 31:13	20 18:13 20:13 21:23 22:6 22:19 3 10 39:1 39:4 43:18 44:20 BOB [1] 1:12 Body
[2] 16:10 16:18 500 [1] 2:9 56 [26] 4:18 4:20 5:12 6:7 13:3 13:16 14: 7 15:6 23:3 33:20 34:5 35:16 36:23 37:7 38:17 38:18 38:23 39:10 41:13	[1] 30:8 Affidavit [12] 7:15 17:16 27:9 27:22 27:23 30: 11 31:18 31:21 31:25 32:2 33:6 45:13 Affidavits [6] 4:7 4:13 6:21 31:15 49:24 51:25 Afternoon [6] 3:6 17:1 29:19 47:5 47:7 47:18	25:13 25:15 26:20 35:3 37:9 37:14 42: 12 46:4 46:12 52:10 Arguments [6] 18:12 22:4 24:3 41:9 47:7 51:25 Arrive [1] 31:13 Articulated	20 18:13 20:13 21:23 22:6 22:19 3 10 39:1 39:4 43:18 44:20 BOB [1] 1:12
[2] 16:10 16:18 500 [1] 2:9 56 [26] 4:18 4:20 5:12 6:7 13:3 13:16 14: 7 15:6 23:3 33:20 34:5 35:16 36:23 37:7 38:17 38:18 38:23 39:10 41:13 44:14 44:22 48:1 50:10 50:11 50:12 50:25	[1] 30:8 Affidavit [12] 7:15 17:16 27:9 27:22 27:23 30: 11 31:18 31:21 31:25 32:2 33:6 45:13 Affidavits [6] 4:7 4:13 6:21 31:15 49:24 51:25 Afternoon [6] 3:6 17:1 29:19 47:5 47:7 47:18 Ago [4] 5:16 8:13 10:8 20:9	25:13 25:15 26:20 35:3 37:9 37:14 42: 12 46:4 46:12 52:10 Arguments [6] 18:12 22:4 24:3 41:9 47:7 51:25 Arrive [1] 31:13 Articulated [1] 41:9 Assigned	20 18:13 20:13 21:23 22:6 22:19 3 10 39:1 39:4 43:18 44:20 BOB [1] 1:12 Body [1] 29:23 Bonrud [1] 1:19
[2] 16:10 16:18 500 [1] 2:9 56 [26] 4:18 4:20 5:12 6:7 13:3 13:16 14: 7 15:6 23:3 33:20 34:5 35:16 36:23 37:7 38:17 38:18 38:23 39:10 41:13 44:14 44:22 48:1 50:10 50:11 50:12	[1] 30:8 Affidavit [12] 7:15 17:16 27:9 27:22 27:23 30: 11 31:18 31:21 31:25 32:2 33:6 45:13 Affidavits [6] 4:7 4:13 6:21 31:15 49:24 51:25 Afternoon [6] 3:6 17:1 29:19 47:5 47:7 47:18 Ago	25:13 25:15 26:20 35:3 37:9 37:14 42: 12 46:4 46:12 52:10 Arguments [6] 18:12 22:4 24:3 41:9 47:7 51:25 Arrive [1] 31:13 Articulated [1] 41:9	20 18:13 20:13 21:23 22:6 22:19 3 10 39:1 39:4 43:18 44:20 BOB [1] 1:12 Body [1] 29:23 Bonrud

PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.

26:3 26:8 26:18 27:6 29:14 29:17 40: Bought Companies Conveyed 9 41:1 41:7 41:19 42:2 42:6 42:10 42: [1] 48:8 [1] 35:12 [1] 46:6 16 45:3 45:24 46:1 46:24 47:2 49:16 Cooperative Boundary Company 51:4 51:10 51:14 51:17 52:15 52:18 [2] 48:3 48:17 **[3]** 1:5 12:1 51:20 [1] 15:3 Challenging Corner Compared Brand [2] 5:6 5:7 [1] 36:5 [3] 32:4 32:5 46:10 [1] 45:14 Change Complaint Corporation Break [5] 8:18 28:21 38:10 48:20 52:9 [3] 3:13 35:5 36:20 [2] 27:12 28:12 [1] 41:5 Changes Correct Brief Concept [2] 35:9 40:12 **[7]** 26:18 28:16 29:5 42:20 47:8 50:24 [2] 37:15 39:16 [1] 18:5 Changing 53:12 Concerned Briefs [1] 40:17 [2] 18:3 20:18 Correcting [1] 51:25 Chapter Bring Concerns [1] 28:23 [2] 5:11 5:14 **[1]** 18:4 Correction [1] 4:1 Chart [2] 28:22 28:22 Brown Concessions [1] 27:9 Counsel [1] 49:25 [2] 1:23 1:23 Checkerboard [2] 28:23 29:11 Concluded Build [1] 42:5 [2] 9:10 52:21 COUNTY [2] 19:22 21:20 Cheri [1] 53:3 Building Concludes [3] 1:24 53:5 53:18 [1] 52:19 Couple [10] 3:3 7:25 16:11 16:21 17:17 17:23 Choice [2] 11:16 14:6 18:8 36:3 36:6 50:3 Conclusion [1] 38:6 [2] 19:2 31:14 Course Buildings Choose [2] 20:3 48:11 [2] 7:13 18:9 Concur [3] 38:3 43:7 48:2 [2] 51:14 52:17 Court Built Choosing [18] 5:16 8:12 8:20 9:10 9:18 10:21 [4] 19:25 20:14 21:10 21:14 Connected [1] 23:20 10:21 10:23 11:5 11:10 12:2 12:4 22: Burden [1] 4:23 Circuit 18 23:7 38:5 38:16 39:2 39:6 [1] 31:2 Connections [1] 10:21 Court's [1] 11:1 Buy Circumstances [1] 44:20 **[6] 1**0:12 12:14 16:14 16:15 16:18 49: Consider [4] 15:5 18:19 36:25 50:21 Courts [3] 22:2 32:17 44:23 Cited [1] 15:3 Buying Consideration [6] 10:8 11:14 11:16 12:2 37:15 39:15 Crafted [2] 16:17 24:11 [4] 3:22 4:24 32:7 32:16 Cities [1] 34:11 Bylaws Considering [1] 16:5 Cremer [1] 30:2 [1] 22:14 **[5]** 1:15 47:1 47:3 47:4 47:5 City Consist [13] 11:17 11:18 16:3 16:4 16:5 18:1 Criteria C [1] 7:24 18:17 20:8 21:8 35:4 35:4 36:19 37:16 [5] 8:21 14:10 25:19 25:21 48:13 Consistent Cannot Clarification CRR [1] 6:4 [2] 25:19 49:20 [1] 14:3 [1] 1:24 Consists Capitol Clarify Current [1] 8:1 [3] 2:9 2:9 3:3 [1] 30:3 [7] 22:25 34:1 34:14 35:2 35:8 36:18 Constitutes Clay-Union 38:13 Car [3] 23:14 31:14 32:7 [9] 12:15 12:15 12:15 12:16 12:17 12: [4] 10:7 10:9 10:18 22:23 Customer Construct 17 27:4 27:5 27:5 **[81]** 4:22 5:4 5:8 5:20 5:21 5:23 6:1 6: 9 6:9 6:21 7:7 9:14 9:14 9:17 12:7 12: Clear [2] 32:13 50:4 Carries [2] 8:14 52:7 Constructed 19 12:19 12:22 12:23 12:24 13:7 13: [1] 52:19 Clearer [2] 7:12 20:5 14 14:7 14:11 14:12 14:16 15:8 16:13 Carry [1] 34:12 Constructing 16:16 16:24 19:2 19:12 19:18 21:24 [1] 16:8 Clearly 25:10 25:20 25:22 26:6 26:10 26:17 [1] 36:15 [5] 18:10 20:14 20:23 22:4 23:24 Carve 26:20 26:23 26:23 27:3 31:8 35:2 35: 7 35:19 35:25 36:25 37:5 37:23 38:2 Construction [1] 28:8 Closed [6] 11:20 11:22 36:21 40:16 40:21 52: [2] 20:4 20:9 Carved 38:19 39:4 39:5 39:20 39:21 40:3 41: [1] 24:6 Closer 13 41:14 41:20 42:15 42:19 42:19 42: Contain [3] 4:8 20:8 43:13 22 43:8 43:15 43:17 43:21 46:3 46:4 Case [2] 29:9 45:11 46:13 48:6 48:12 48:16 48:21 49:1 49: [52] 5:2 7:6 8:10 9:13 10:4 10:20 11: Co-op Contained 13 50:20 50:21 14 11:18 12:2 17:20 18:3 18:7 18:14 [4] 11:13 12:5 12:6 21:12 [1] 5:10 18:15 20:13 20:20 22:6 22:19 22:23 Customer's Code Contemplated 23:23 23:24 30:10 30:12 30:20 31:1 [2] 9:21 26:21 [2] 5:14 33:19 [2] 22:10 36:7 31:7 32:19 37:8 37:9 37:11 37:13 37 Customers Coexist 16 37:17 38:5 38:8 38:10 38:11 38:12 Contemplating **[13]** 6:13 13:1 13:1 16:2 16:6 21:14 [1] 19:15 38:13 38:14 38:15 38:17 38:21 38:25 [1] 20:14 34:13 34:15 35:20 35:21 43:22 48:2 Comfortable 39:12 39:24 40:6 43:18 44:21 46:9 52: Contention 48:4 [1] 52:12 8 52:13 [2] 23:16 24:23 Coming Cases Contested D [4] 29:21 39:20 41:13 43:25 [5] 11:17 14:25 15:3 37:15 39:15 [1] 33:2 Commencing Category Dakota Continue [1] 2:11 [1] 34:17 [47] 1:2 1:4 1:5 2:8 2:10 3:4 3:4 3:16 [4] 9:3 11:13 19:2 40:14 Commission 5:4 5:14 5:16 5:25 7:4 8:5 8:12 11:14 Caused Continued [34] 1:1 1:11 1:13 3:5 3:10 3:18 3:19 11:14 12:4 12:12 13:10 13:11 15:20 [2] 34:19 36:20 [4] 11:8 24:5 40:18 41:2 16:16 17:16 22:9 26:20 27:14 27:15 4:15 4:23 6:18 8:10 10:16 12:9 13:17 Center Continuing 27:23 28:4 28:10 29:17 30:6 30:10 30: 15:1 22:24 23:3 23:4 29:20 30:13 30: [1] 17:25 [1] 9:19 15 30:21 33:3 37:20 37:20 37:21 38:2 21 31:5 34:16 35:24 36:2 37:13 50:4 Certain Continuous 51:19 51:20 52:3 53:1 53:7 53:13 39:23 42:18 42:24 44:13 44:18 51:6 [1] 26:1 [1] 41:4 51:16 Darla Certainly [3] 1:22 30:5 45:4 Commission's Contract [9] 15:21 19:24 21:3 21:5 21:25 24:4 [2] 10:7 11:2 [3] 11:7 11:9 23:8 Date 24:21 25:24 34:7 Contradictory Commissioner [2] 32:18 33:7 CERTIFICATE **[15]** 1:12 3:7 3:9 23:11 24:19 25:6 25: [2] 44:21 44:25 Dated [1] 53:2 17 42:17 42:21 43:14 43:19 44:12 45: Contrary [1] 53:13 CERTIFY 1 51:13 52:17 [4] 12:3 12:10 13:8 33:17 Dave [1] 53:8 Commissioners Controlling [1] 1:17 Chairman [4] 3:8 4:5 13:22 22:25 [2] 38:8 38:12 Deal [45] 1:11 1:12 3:1 4:4 13:20 15:19 16: Communities Convenience [2] 24:13 48:9 8 16:25 17:1 17:6 17:12 17:19 19:21 [2] 16:1 21:6 [1] 12:1 Dealing 20:12 21:19 23:10 23:11 23:14 25:18

### PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.

(

Word Index

#### From Bought to Dealing

# PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.

l

Ć

From Dealing to Family

١	Nord Index			
	1] 39:18	[1] 12:3	Easier	[1] 43:3
1	Decide	Disagree	[1] 19:3	Exceed [1] 36:10
		[1] 50:10 Discussed	East [3] 2:9 20:3 21:11	Except
	11 14:13	[2] 11:15 43:3	Edge	[2] 24:24 27:15
]	Deciding	Discussion	[1] 27:10	Exception [9] 4:20 13:24 14:2 15:6 35:18 41:17
	[1] 52:13 Decision	[1] 46:8 Dismiss	Effect [2] 9:16 50:19	49:12 50:13 50:20
ſ	6 8:13 10:7 11:3 11:6 12:4 12:10	[2] 13:18 32:25	Éither	Exceptions
	Decker	Displace	[7] 3:25 13:11 16:2 37:14 45:12 48:7	[2] 47:25 48:1 Excluded
	[ <b>10</b> ] 2:2 6:22 8:2 19:4 24:10 28:2 31: 21 34:20 34:21 43:6	[1] 35.2 Displaced	50:11 EL04-032	[1] 34:21
	Decker's	[2] 16:16 25:14	[3] 1:5 3:5 51:18	Exclusive
	[2] 7:9 8:7	Displaces	Elected	[1] 41:18 Exclusively
	Deckers [8] 17:2 17:5 17:22 35:4 35:10 40:11	[1] 35.8 Disposition	[1] 19:9 Election	[1] 21:25
	43:11 50:2	[11] 3.12 3:17 3:20 30:14 30:22 30:24	[1] 25:3	Excuse
	Declined	32:20 32:24 33:8 47:11 51:23	Electric	[2] 45:7 47:2 Executed
	[1] 39:6 Deeded	Dispute [5] 31:8 31:10 31:17 32:23 45:16	<b>[20]</b> 1:6 5:10 5:18 6:11 8:7 8:15 8:18 8:24 12:1 15:9 15:10 15:16 19:1 21:8	[ <b>2</b> ] 24:23 24:25
	[1] 27:18	Disputed	24:17 41:15 41:24 47:21 49:8 51:20	Executive
	Define	[3] 31:15 33:6 47:11	Electrical	[3] 51:8 51:12 51:16
	[1] 35:18	Disputes	[3] 1:4 41:21 51:19 Electricity	Exhibit [2] 4:6 4:10
	<b>Defined</b> [ <b>2</b> ] 50:13 50:14	[4] 15:4 15:4 32:6 39:25 Distinction	<b>[9]</b> 8:17 9:21 15:24 19:7 19:10 40:15	Existed
1	Definition	[5] 31:7 35:1 44:23 46:19 46:23	40:18 40:21 41:11	[2] 9:15 26:24
	[2] 5:13 5:15	Distinctions	Elements	Existing [6] 6:12 9:9 16:12 16:24 16:24 26:5
	Demand [2] 4:23 14:11	[3] 38:14 38:20 38:24 Distinguishable	Eliminate	Expand
	Denotes	[3] 18:10 18:13 22:5	[1] 47:20	[1] 20:22
	[1] 9:10	Distribution	Enacted [4] 7:2 14:25 47:19 48:5	Expanded
	Deny	[3] 8:22 14:23 20:6	End	[2] 11:11 43:11 Expanding
	[4] 30:15 33:10 39:24 51:22 Describe	Division [1] 37:24	[1] 18:5	[2] 18:4 18:21
	[1] 45:18	Documents	<b>Energy</b> [9] 1:5 1:6 1:22 22:9 22:10 30:10 36:	Expands
	Described	[1] 4:10	2 51:20 51:22	[1] 9:21 Expansion
	[1]27:21 Describes	Dollars [1] 20:24	Energy's	[2] 18:8 19:23
	[2] 29:2 45:21	Done	[1] 52:3 Ensuring	Explained
	Description	[3] 33:14 44:2 49:20	[1] 47:15	[1]28:18 Explanation
	[ <b>12</b> ] 8:1 24:8 27:12 28:11 28:17 28:21 29:2 29:8 29:10 45:6 45:12 45:17	Dotted [1] 27:17	Entered	[1] 41:23
	Despite	Double	[ <b>2</b> ] 10:24 12:2	Explored
	[3] 6:6 9:18 9:25	[2] 14:22 14:22	Entire [14] 16:12 16:14 16:17 19:11 20:1 24:	[1] 47:14 Extent
	Destroy [2] 50:23 50:25	Doubt [2] 47:19 49:1	16 31:20 31:22 32:10 32:14 34:3 40:	[1] 21:22
	Determination	Douglas	19 42:12 46:5 Entirely	Extruding
	[4] 4:12 15:2 27:3 30:19	[1] 1:18	[3] 10:22 12:8 23:25	[2] 10:12 10:19 Eves
	Determined [1] 26:21	Down [1] 33:21	Entirety	[1] 27:10
	Develop	Drafters	[2] 16:20 24:16 Entitled	
	[3] 35:22 36:8 44:7	[1] 48:4	[10] 6:24 11:4 13:2 30:25 33:12 39:5	F
	Developer [1] 42:4	Drawing [2] 4:5 7:3	40:5 40:22 43:7 47:10	Facilities
	Developing	Driven	Entitlement [1] 31:3	[5] 8:23 9:7 14:20 18:9 50:18 Facility
	[1] 36:9	[1] 17:8	Entity	<b>[9]</b> 20:16 32:1 32:3 32:13 36:16 38:3
	Development [3] 35:5 36:19 44:8	DTG [23] 30:8 30:14 31:5 32:13 33:2 33:6	[1] 36:17	40:16 40:23 52:4
	Develops	33:13 34:19 35:2 35:6 35:7 35:10 35:	Error [1] 28:16	Fact [23] 5:6 7:5 7:21 9:20 9:25 11:5 12:5
	[1] 46:19	25 36:12 36:12 36:16 40:1 47:12 48:3	Essence	14:3 18:15 19:3 19:8 22:14 23:8 26:
	Diagram [1] 27:9	48:25 49:2 49:12 50:8 DTG's	[2] 33:21 40:17	22 31:2 31:9 32:2 32:22 39:3 40:24 41:10 47:9 49:23
	Dietrich	[2] 37:17 48:10	Essentially [12] 9:16 12:14 16:15 16:23 19:4 19:	41:10 47:9 49:23 Factors
	[35] 1:22 4:3 4:4 13:21 14:5 15:21 16:	Due	17 20:7 28:5 30:16 49:8 49:24 50:7	[1] 36:12
	13 17:2 17:4 17:9 17:15 18:24 19:24 21:5 22:8 23:12 23:22 25:4 25:8 25:	[1] 47:15 Duly-appointed	Established	Factory
	24 26:5 26:16 26:19 27:13 27:20 28:1	[1] 53:8	[1] 32:12 Evidence	[3] 10:12 10:19 22:22 Facts
	28:15 29:3 29:7 29:13 29:16 33:18 49: 18 49:21 51:5	Duplication	[1] 52:8	[18] 4:13 22:5 22:8 30:19 31:7 31:9
	Differ	[5] 8:22 9:6 14:20 22:3 47:20 Duplications	Evidenced	31:12 31:13 31:17 32:12 32:18 32:19
	[2] 45:7 45:8	[1] 20:18	[1] 6:21	33:2 33:5 37:8 40:4 47:11 52:3 Factual
	Difference [2] 43:20 43:23	Duration	Evidentiary [1] 33:3	[9] 31:6 32:6 32:15 38:14 38:20 38:24
	Differences	[1] 24:16 During	Exact	39:13 39:25 44:22 Factually
	[2] 22:5 32:15	[ <b>2</b> ] 4:17 40:10	[6] 7:11 7:20 7:24 29:9 38:7 45:11	[1] 17:20
	Different [13] 5:19 10:1 10:22 12:9 17:21 18:16	DUSTY	Exactly [13] 8:4 8:5 24:13 31:16 35:24 36:7	Faith
	19:16 22:9 23:21 39:13 42:13 44:14	[1] 1:12	36:22 42:2 44:10 44:11 48:4 50:1 50:3	[1] 8:23 Falls
	46:11	E	Example [7] 16:9 26:9 26:12 34:12 34:19 48:14	[ <b>1</b> ] 47:18
	Differently [1] 44:19	Ease	48:15	Family
	Directly	[1] 33:20	Examples	[2] 31:23 32:9

Ć

Word Index			201-00.15.14
Far		[1] 14:13	[2] 13:9 15:14 Intended
[2] 39:8 39:12		Holding [1] 39:7	[4] 5:19 25:11 44:7 48:1
Farm		Holds	Intent
<b>[16]</b> 7:23 7:24 8:1 8:1 10:13 12:6 16: 10 17:4 23:24 32:5 34:20 34:21 37:10	[2] 9:17 10:17	[1] 8:2	[4] 8:23 34:6 34:24 52:7 Intention
39:19 39:19 43:6	Grange	Home [4] 7:9 16:11 19:12 50:2	[1] 18:6
Farmer		Homeowner	Interest
[2] 8:2 24:15 Farmers	(Granc )	[1] 25:14	[1] 49:10
[1] 7:24	Granted	Homestead	Interests
Farmhouse	[4] 3:10 37:23 41:17 49:14	[ <b>2</b> ] 24:24 24:25	[1] 30:12 Interpret
[4] 10:10 21:21 22:22 23:5	Gray [1] 47:18	Hopefully [1] 51:7	<b>[6]</b> 33:15 34:8 35:15 42:18 44:13 44:
Farmland [5] 6:24 7:18 7:18 19:14 24:15	Green	Hot	
Farris	[1] 15:23	[1] 29:24	Interpretation [13] 5:19 30:2 31:13 37:7 37:18 38:18
[1] 1:17	Greg	House [6] 7:13 8:7 17:7 17:7 17:23 46:6	39:8 39:10 39:14 40:4 43:21 44:20 50:
Favor	[1] 1:15 Ground	Hub	24
[1] 52:11 February	[5] 34:15 36:4 36:6 36:7 41:25	[1] 37:15	Interrogatories [1]45:13
[7] 1:9 2:10 3:2 3:15 3:15 53:11 53:14	Grounds	HUGHES	Intervened
Felt	[1] 10:22	[1] 53:3	[1] 37:22
[2] 12:5 17:24	Groups	Huron [4] 20:4 21:11 22:13 22:15	Intervention
Few [3] 13:21 15:2 21:7	[1] 18:8 Grow	Hypothetical	[1] 3:10 Investment
[5] 15:21 15:2 21:7	[2] 14:12 48:17	[1] 23:15	[6] 6:13 22:21 22:22 22:23 24:6 25:9
[1] 15:23	Growers	Hypotheticals	Investments
Filed	<b>[10]</b> 1:5 3:16 5:4 27:14 27:16 28:4 28: 10 29:18 30:7 51:19	[2] 24:13 24:21	[2] 15:15 20:20
[9] 3:12 3:16 17:16 30:9 31:16 32:25 33:2 33:7 37:19	Growth	Ι	Involve [1] 38:17
Financially	[2] 8:25 16:1		Tssue
[1] 35:13	Guess	<b>Idea</b> [2] 19:25 20:24	[12] 7:4 7:5 11:21 30:13 30:17 37:12
First	[6] 14:18 29:10 41:5 43:19 43:24 49: 21	Illinois	38:7 38:16 47:9 47:18 49:23 52:2
<b>[11]</b> 14:6 14:18 14:21 15:15 19:9 23:4 30:16 31:6 32:24 39:25 49:22	Guidance	[2] 12:2 12:11	Issues [3] 22:2 39:18 47:13
Fit	[2] 8:11 39:17	Illustrative	[5]22:2 59:16 47:15
[3] 34:17 43:9 50:14	TT	[1] 4:9 Implied	[2] 17:17 28:19
Followed	H	[1] 35:3	
[1] 36:16	Half	Implies	J
Footprint [5] 7:11 7:14 17:16 50:2 50:3	<b>[3]</b> 18:25 24:2 42:11	[1] 14:15	Jacobson
Foreseeable	Hands [2] 35:10 40:17	Important [5] 4:14 32:7 32:15 38:13 38:20	[1] 1:17
[1] 20:21	Hanson	INC	January [2] 3:13 8:13
Forney	<b>[32]</b> 1:11 3:1 3:8 4:5 13:20 15:19 16:	[1] 1:5	Jay
[1] 1:18 Forth	8 16:25 25:18 26:3 26:8 26:18 27:6	Included	<b>[3]</b> 2:3 27:23 31:18
[1] 9:1	29:14 29:17 40:9 41:1 41:7 41:19 42: 2 42:6 42:10 42:16 45:3 45:24 46:24	[3] 4:7 4:10 13:5	Jeff
Foundry	47:2 49:16 51:4 51:14 51:17 52:18	Includes [1] 28:1	[2] 2:2 2:3 Jeffrey
[1] 38:1	Hanson's	Including	[ <b>2</b> ] 6:22 31:21
<b>Free</b> [1] 52:9	[1] 23:15	[2] 10:15 40:15	John
Front	Hard   [2] 32:9 34:8	Increasing	[3] 1:14 27:7 45:3
[2] 29:23 44:1	Harlan	[1] 26:14 Indeed	Johnson [14] 1:12 3:8 23:11 24:19 25:6 25:17
Frozen	[1] 1:16	[1] 5:4	42:17 42:21 43:14 43:19 44:12 45:1
[1] 9:14 Full	Harmony	Indicated	51:13 52:17
<b>[3]</b> 37:22 50:16 52:14	[1] 50:16 Hearing	[1] 28:25	Joinder
Furthermore	[9] 3:5 23:1 33:4 37:22 47:14 52:8 52	[2] 17:11 17:18	[1] 30:11 Joined
[1] 37:6	14 52:19 52:21	Indices	[2] 3:8 30:10
Future [5] 8:18 8:25 9:18 19:23 20:25	Heather	[1] 36:22	Joining
	[1] 1:18 Held	Individually	[1] 3:6
G	[1] 2:7	[1] 23:23	Judgment [5] 30:25 31:3 33:11 33:12 40:5
Gary	Helps	Indulgence [1] 30:4	Juncture
[ <b>2</b> ] 1:11 3:7	[1] 4:9	Industrial	[1] 31:11
General	HEREBY [1] 53:8	[1] 16:3	Jurisdiction
[4] 6:4 24:8 28:19 29:8	Herewith	Industry	[1] 39:17
Generally [1] 15:14	[1] 33:2	[1] 47:21 Information	K
Generating	Herrings	[2] 32:25 49:19	Karen
[1] 21:16	[1] 47:13 Higher	Infrastructure	[3] 1:15 46:25 47:5
Generator	[ <b>1</b> ] 14:4	[2] 20:1 20:10	Keith
Generator		Initial	[1] 1:16
[1] 21:20	Highway	151 0.2 11.2 25.2 20.11 28.7	
[1]21:20 Genuine	Highway [4] 21:11 21:11 21:13 28:6	[5] 9:2 11:3 25:2 30:11 38:7 Tnguisitive	Ken
[1]21:20 Genuine [4]7:547:949:2352:2 Geographical	Highway [4] 21:11 21:11 21:13 28:6 Hills	Inquisitive	Ken [1] 31:25
[1] 21:20 Genuine [4] 7:5 47:9 49:23 52:2 Geographical [2] 5:17 8:16	Highway [4] 21:11 21:11 21:13 28:6 Hills [17] 8:10 9:13 9:19 9:23 12:3 12:8 1 20 18:13 20:13 21:23 22:6 22:19 38:	Tinquisitive 7: [1] 4:2 Instance	Ken [1]31:25 Kick
[1] 21:20 Genuine [4] 7:5 47:9 49:23 52:2 Geographical [2] 5:17 8:16 Georgia	Highway [4] 21:11 21:11 21:13 28:6 Hills [17] 8:10 9:13 9:19 9:23 12:3 12:8 1 20 18:13 20:13 21:23 22:6 22:19 38: 10 39:1 39:4 43:18 44:20	Inquisitive           7:         [1] 4:2           Instance         [4] 4:25 18:12 18:14 23:4	Ken [1]31:25 Kick [1]15:17 Kilowatt
[1] 21:20 Genuine [4] 7:5 47:9 49:23 52:2 Geographical [2] 5:17 8:16 Georgia [1] 11:18	Highway [4] 21:11 21:11 21:13 28:6 Hills [17] 8:10 9:13 9:19 9:23 12:3 12:8 1 20 18:13 20:13 21:23 22:6 22:19 38: 10 39:1 39:4 43:18 44:20 Historically	Inquisitive 7: [1] 4:2 Instance [4] 4:25 18:12 18:14 23:4 Instead	Ken [1] 31:25 Kick [1] 15:17 Kilowatt [2] 13:25 36:11
[1] 21:20 Genuine [4] 7:5 47:9 49:23 52:2 Geographical [2] 5:17 8:16 Georgia [1] 11:18 Given	Highway [4] 21:11 21:11 21:13 28:6 Hills [17] 8:10 9:13 9:19 9:23 12:3 12:8 1 20 18:13 20:13 21:23 22:6 22:19 38: 10 39:1 39:4 43:18 44:20 Historically [1] 19:22	Inquisitive 7: [1] 4:2 Instance [4] 4:25 18:12 18:14 23:4 Instead [1] 8:15	Ken [1] 31:25 Kick [1] 15:17 Kilowatt [2] 13:25 36:11 Kind
[1] 21:20 Genuine [4] 7:5 47:9 49:23 52:2 Geographical [2] 5:17 8:16 Georgia [1] 11:18	Highway [4] 21:11 21:11 21:13 28:6 Hills [17] 8:10 9:13 9:19 9:23 12:3 12:8 1 20 18:13 20:13 21:23 22:6 22:19 38: 10 39:1 39:4 43:18 44:20 Historically	Inquisitive 7: [1] 4:2 Instance [4] 4:25 18:12 18:14 23:4 Instead	Ken [1] 31:25 Kick [1] 15:17 Kilowatt [2] 13:25 36:11

PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.

From Far to Kind

-	Word Index			
	Kinds [1] 24:3	Locating [2] 13:13 26:10	[3] 3:11 30:1 51:8 Meets	Negate [1] 37:9
	Knowledge	Location	[1] 51:16	Nelson
	[ <b>2</b> ] 36:2 40:20	<b>[113]</b> 4:22 5:8 5:9 5:17 5:24 6:1 6:2 6: 3 6:14 6:20 6:23 7:1 8:11 8:14 8:20 9:	Megawatt [7] 4:22 5:7 5:21 14:10 21:16 21:20	[1] 2:3
[	L	9 9:10 9:23 11:9 11:25 12:13 12:13	26:14	Nettie [1] 2:4
-1		12:17 12:18 12:18 12:20 12:24 13:7 14:14 14:15 15:17 16:12 18:5 18:22	Megawatts	Never
í	Laid [1] 4:13	18:23 20:15 21:1 21:18 21:24 22:11	[3] 14:13 25:20 25:22 Members	[ <b>2</b> ] 34:3 34:13 New
	Land	22:19 23:6 23:14 24:14 24:18 25:21 25:23 26:7 26:11 26:12 26:22 26:25	[1] 29:20	[142] 4:21 4:22 5:4 5:8 5:8 5:20 5:23
	<b>[26]</b> 7:10 7:11 7:16 8:4 8:5 10:3 10: 13 10:14 10:15 11:12 15:20 18:16 19:	27:1 30:17 31:12 31:14 31:20 31:20	Memorandum [4] 3:16 4:14 10:9 11:16	5:24 5:25 6:2 6:9 6:19 6:21 9:9 9:22
	5 21:21 27:15 28:19 28:20 32:4 33:22	31:22 31:24 32:8 33:16 34:3 34:4 34: 15 35:16 35:18 35:21 36:4 36:9 36:17	Mentioned	9:24 10:2 10:25 11:11 11:13 12:7 12: 12 12:13 12:15 12:16 12:16 12:19 12:
	33:24 33:25 34:4 35:4 35:6 35:11 46: 11	36:22 36:23 37:24 38:3 38:19 38:22	<b>[1]</b> 18:14	20 12:22 12:23 12:24 13:7 13:7 14:11 14:14 14:15 14:16 23:25 24:1 25:20
	Language	38:23 39:21 39:22 40:3 41:2 41:8 41: 11 41:14 41:19 41:24 42:15 42:19 42:	Merely [3] 6:8 47:12 48:18	25:20 25:22 25:23 26:6 26:10 26:11
	[2] 4:15 13:5 Large	23 42:25 43:9 43:21 43:23 44:1 44:13	Merits	26:12 26:17 26:20 26:21 26:21 26:22 26:25 27:1 27:4 27:5 27:5 30:17 31:8
	[22] 6:9 14:8 16:1 18:5 21:22 23:15	44:14 45:11 45:15 46:3 46:4 46:13 46: 21 48:12 48:17 48:21 48:24 49:1 49:3	<b>[5]</b> 18:11 30:25 31:4 33:12 40:6	31:12 31:14 32:8 33:15 34:4 34:13 34:
	31:10 35:18 35:23 37:5 38:1 38:3 40: 3 40:23 40:25 41:14 43:7 43:12 48:2	49:3 49:13 50:6 52:5	Met [4] 6:17 31:2 36:12 40:2	13 34:14 34:15 35:7 35:15 35:19 35: 20 35:21 35:21 35:21 35:25 36:3 36:4
	48:6 49:13 50:20	Locations [4] 34:13 35:22 36:8 44:6	Meyers	36:5 36:8 36:9 36:15 36:17 36:22 36:
	Larger	Logical	[1] ² :4 Michele	23 36:25 37:5 37:23 37:24 38:2 38:2 38:23 38:23 39:20 39:21 39:21 40:2
	[7] 4:6 8:16 9:20 10:14 11:11 14:12 16:6	[1] 41:22	[1] 1:17	40:3 41:8 41:13 41:14 41:14 41:20 41:
	Last	Look [10] 4:12 4:15 11:2 15:8 17:22 22:17	Might	20 41:23 42:15 42:15 42:19 42:19 42: 22 42:24 43:8 43:9 43:15 43:17 43:21
	[1] 17:4 Late	31:6 31:15 31:16 37:8	[1] 16:4 Mile	43:21 43:22 44:1 44:6 46:3 46:3 46:4 46:4 46:12 46:13 48:11 48:12 48:16
	[1] 29:25	Looked [2] 23:23 38:8	[1] 21:17	48:16 48:21 48:21 48:23 49:1 49:1 49:
	Law	Looking	Miles	3 49:13 49:13 50:6 50:19 50:22 52:5 None
	<b>[25]</b> 3:16 4:14 4:21 5:10 7:2 8:12 9:6 9:16 14:24 18:7 22:18 24:17 27:2 30:	[4] 18:7 26:6 29:2 38:21 Looks	[1] 21:7 Mind	[ <b>2</b> ] 22:24 49:18
	22 31:1 31:4 33:13 34:6 37:11 37:13	<b>[2]</b> 4:2 17:24	[8] 17:20 18:22 19:23 23:12 48:5 48:	Nonjurisdictional
	38:8 38:10 40:4 40:6 52:2 Laws	Lotensburg	10 48:22 49:2 Mind, if	[1] 11:17 North
	[2] 13:9 41:18	[1] 2:2 Lower	[1] 20:20	[2] 21:12 28:5
	Leaned [1] 18:18	[1] 7:14	Minimizing	Northeast
	Least	М	[1] 22:3 Modifies	[6] 7:10 17:11 24:7 28:20 32:5 46:10 Northrup
	[2] 31:11:46:18		[1] 44:10	[1] 1:23
	Leaving [1] 30:1	Maintain [1] 15:14	Monopoly [1] 49:8	Northwest [1] 37:21
Ĩ.	Legal	Manner	Months	NorthWestern
( 	[7] 8:1 23:13 28:16 29:1 29:9 38:14 45:6	[2] 33:16 35:16 Manufacturing	[1] 22:15	<b>[37]</b> 1:6 1:22 3:11 3:12 3:13 4:2 5:1 6:
	Legislation	[1] 37:25	Morris [3] 2:3 27:23 31:18	23 6:25 7:9 9:3 14:9 19:18 19:22 22: 10 24:4 24:18 25:1 27:21 28:25 31:2
	[1] 48:5		Most	31:9 31:19 32:22 33:1 33:5 33:15 34: 18 36:1 37:11 37:16 40:5 40:14 41:10
	Legislative [1] 49:7	[3] 31:21 45:5 45:18 March	[4] 16:1 38:9 38:9 38:15 Motion	47:8 51:21 52:9
	Legislature	[2] 35:22 36:9	[29] 3:12 3:17 3:19 3:22 4:8 4:12 5:5	Northwestern's
	[5] 5:18 13:4 29:23 44:2 44:15 Less	Marginal	7:8 13:18 27:21 27:22 30:14 30:15 32: 20 32:24 33:10 34:22 39:24 45:7 45:	<b>[13]</b> 5:12 13:13 27:22 30:14 30:18 32: 23 37:6 37:14 45:6 49:2 49:4 51:23
	[3] 14:25 51:7 52:13	[1] 23:19 Margo	17 47:10 49:14 50:1 51:11 51:17 51:	52:4
	Level	[1] 1:23	22 51:23 52:14 52:18	Notary [2] 53:6 53:18
	[2] 8:14 20:19 Limited	Martin [1] 1:20	Move [3] 4:8 51:11 51:22	Noted
	<b>[1]</b> 21:7	Material	Moving	[1] 8:20 Notice
		[1] 52:3	[3] 30:24 33:11 36:17 Must	[1] 30:9
	[2] 21:8 34:7 Line	Matter [18] 1:4 2:8 10:8 12:25 13:24 13:25	<b>[9]</b> 6:3 6:10 14:7 14:8 14:9 14:10 14:	November
	[7] 15:3 20:24 21:10 21:22 27:10 27:	14:4 28:8 29:21 30:25 31:4 33:13 37:	11 14:14 50:9	[1] 3:11 Number
	17 28:7 Lines	16 40:6 43:1 51:18 52:2 53:10 Matters	Ν	[2] 20:9 40:12
	[15] 8:22 9:6 9:8 14:22 14:23 18:20	[2] 3:24 14:5	Name	0
	19:19 19:25 20:6 20:6 20:14 21:14 25: 1 25:10 50:19	McComsey [3] 1:24 53:5 53:18	[2] 30:5 48:20	
	Listening	Mean	Narrow	O'clock [1] 52:21
	[1] 47:7	<b>[15]</b> 5:17 8:14 18:11 20:23 24:22 24:	[1] 49:5 Narrowly	Objection
	LLC [1] 1:5	22 26:4 32:8 41:4 42:8 42:23 44:1 44: 11 44:16 46:10	[2] 50:13 50:14	[1] 6:6
	Load	Meaning	Narrows [1] 50:25	<b>Obligated</b> [2] 37:1 41:15
	<b>[27]</b> 5:7 5:21 9:20 11:13 13:23 14:4 14:4 14:5 14:11 31:10 35:18 35:23 36:	[4] 6:18 22:20 22:20 44:4	Nature	Obvious
	10 36:10 37:5 38:1 38:3 40:3 40:23	[4] 6:7 34:7 49:6 50:10	[3] 26:15 28:19 29:8	[1] 47:17
	40:25 41:14 43:8 43:12 48:2 48:6 49: 13 50:20	Means	Necessarily [3] 44:21 44:24 50:5	Obviously [2] 28:24 38:9
	Loads	[6] 5:15 6:8 8:11 8:15 26:2 26:23 Meant	Need	Occupant
(	[1] 20:25	[1] 36:23	[7] 3:24 19:14 22:17 32:17 37:4 37:7	[1] 35:8 Occupied
×	[Locate [3] 16:6 42:1 42:11	Measures	47:13 Needed	[ <b>2</b> ] 7:10 31:22
	Located	[1] 6:17 Meet	[1] 5:20	Occupy
	<b>[10]</b> 7:8 7:13 7:25 9:11 10:1 13:12 17: 10 32:1 32:3 36:13	[4] 14:9 15:11 25:25 49:12	Needs [2] 23:23 49:20	[2] 32:9 32:14 Occurred
	L.,	Meeting		
	PRECISION REPORTIN			From Kinds to Occurred

PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.

From Kinds to Occurred

Word Index

(

Ć

(

	Word Index		
	[1] 29:20	Person	Γ
	old	[1] 36:17	Ľ
	[1] 34:21 Once	Persons	L
	[1] 7:21	[2] 7:19 7:20	ŀ
	One	Perspective	.
	<b>[18]</b> 3:6 4:7 7:23 7:23 13:21 17:21 24:	Petition	ŀ
	15 25:18 25:22 29:22 34:2 34:3 37:14	<b>[24]</b> 1:4 3:14 4:23 5:3 5:21 12:23 13:	.
	42:4 47:25 48:9 48:10 48:13	2 13:17 13:18 15:12 28:18 29:3 29:4	ľ
	Ones	29:8 29:11 30:11 30:18 37:19 37:23	Ŀ
	[1] 22:7	38:7 45:8 45:9 45:11 51:18	Ľ
	Operations	Phase	
	[1] 22:13	[1] 40:15	l
	Opinion	Phone	
	[2] 33:16 52:9 Opportunity	[1]3:6 Phrase	
	[ <b>2</b> ] 8:25 49:19	[4] 6:20 46:5 46:18 52:5	1
	Opposed	Physical	١.
	<b>[6]</b> 12:8 19:11 26:11 32:4 38:22 42:11	[1] 7:25	ŀ
	Opposition	Piece	١.
	<b>[2]</b> 3:17 11:15	[8] 7:17 21:21 33:24 34:2 34:4 34:23	ŀ
	Option	42:4 46:11	ŀ
	[1] 23:20	Pierre	Ľ
	Order	[3] 2:9 3:4 53:13	
	[2] 14:6 15:7	Place	L
	Original	<b>[12]</b> 3:21 6:10 6:12 9:11 10:1 14:16 15:8 15:10 18:2 36:6 40:13 50:18	
	[1] 37:19	Places	
	Otherwise [2] 13:7 21:3	[1] 5:11	
	Outlot	Plain	١.
	<b>[5]</b> 24:10 27:16 27:18 28:2 28:5	[1] 6:18	ŀ
	Outlots	Plan	١.
	[4] 27:14 27:23 28:3 28:3	<b>[2]</b> 22:16 24:1	ŀ
	Outside	Planning	ŀ
	<b>[2]</b> 16:3 21:7	[2] 16:14 22:15	Ľ
	Outskirts	Plant	L
	[1] 16:5	<b>[9]</b> 7:7 7:11 8:6 17:17 20:3 20:7 22: 11 36:15 37:25	
	Own	Plants	1
	[2] 19:4 35:11	[1] 44:8	Ι.
	Owned	Plat	E
•	<b>[8]</b> 6:24 7:19 7:22 8:3 15:20 15:21 18: 17 24:15	[2] 33:22 33:22	١.
	Owner	Platted	ŀ
· ·	[2] 36:18 39:22		
		[1] 24:9	L
		[1]24:9 Pleadings	
	<b>Owners</b> [2] 17:3 17:4		
	Owners	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 <b>P</b>	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Pollman	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Poliman [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Pollman [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12 41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43:	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Poliman [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Pollman [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12 41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43: 16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46: 22 Portion	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Polints [3] 9:27 9:24 49:22 [3] 9:27 9:24 49:22 [3] 9:27 9:24 49:22 [3] 9:27 9:24 49:24 [3] 9:27 9:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20:	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Polints [3] 9:25 9:24 49:22 Polints [3] 9:27 9:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49:24 49	:
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21:	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Pollman [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12 41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43: 16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46: 22 Portion [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4 24:6 32:1 Position	:
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Pollman [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12 41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43: 16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46: 22 Portion [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4 24:6 32:1 Position [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties	Pleadings         [2] 5:2 47:6         Plot         [1] 18:16         Plots         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 52:21         Point         [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3         Pointed         [1] 38:25         Points         [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22         Pollman         [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12         41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43:         16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46:         22         Portion         [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4         24:6 32:1         Position         [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22         49:4 49:11 50:5	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties [6] 3:15 10:24 40:1 47:7 49:24 52:1	Pleadings         [2] 5:2 47:6         Plot         [1] 18:16         Plots         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 52:21         Point         [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3         Pointed         [1] 38:25         Points         [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22         Pollman         [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12         41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43:         16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46:         22         Portion         [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4         24:6 32:1         Position         [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22         49:4 49:11 50:5         Possible	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties [6] 3:15 10:24 40:1 47:7 49:24 52:1 Party	Pleadings         [2] 5:2 47:6         Plot         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 52:21         Point         [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3         Pointed         [1] 38:25         Pointed         [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22         Pollman         [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12         41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43:         16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46:         22         Portion         [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4         24:6 32:1         Position         [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22         49:4 49:11 50:5         Possible         [2] 13:6 32:11	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties [6] 3:15 10:24 40:1 47:7 49:24 52:1	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Pollman [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12 41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43: 16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46: 22 Portion [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4 24:6 32:1 Position [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22 49:4 49:11 50:5 Possible [2] 13:6 32:11 Practically [1] 49:6	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties [6] 3:15 10:24 40:1 47:7 49:24 52:1 Party [3] 3:25 30:24 33:11	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Pollman [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12 41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43: 16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46: 22 Portion [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4 24:6 32:1 Position [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22 49:4 49:11 50:5 Possible [2] 13:6 32:11 Practically [1] 49:6 Precise	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties [6] 3:15 10:24 40:1 47:7 49:24 52:1 Party [3] 3:25 30:24 33:11 Past [2] 3: 28:19 Pasture	Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Pollman [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12 41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43: 16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46: 22 Portion [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4 24:6 32:1 Position [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22 49:4 49:11 50:5 Possible [2] 13:6 32:11 Practically [1] 4:15	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties [6] 3:15 10:24 40:1 47:7 49:24 52:1 Party [3] 3:25 30:24 33:11 Past [2] 3:2 8:19 Pasture [1] 32:3	Pleadings         [2] 5:2 47:6         Plot         [1] 18:16         Plots         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 52:21         Point         [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3         Pointed         [1] 38:25         Points         [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22         Pollman         [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12         41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43:         16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46:         22         Portion         [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4         24:6 32:1         Position         [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22         49:4 49:11 50:5         Possible         [2] 13:6 32:11         Practically         [1] 49:6         Precise         [1] 4:15	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties [6] 3:15 10:24 40:1 47:7 49:24 52:1 Party [3] 3:25 30:24 33:11 Past [2] 3:2 8:19 Pasture [1] 32:3 Perhaps	Pleadings         [2] 5:2 47:6         Plot         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 52:21         Point         [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3         Pointed         [1] 38:25         Points         [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22         Pollman         [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12         41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43:         16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46:         22         Portion         [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4         24:6 32:1         Position         [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22         49:4 49:11 50:5         Possible         [2] 13:6 32:11         Practically         [1] 49:6         Precise         [1] 4:15         Precisely         [3] 7:17 22:11 22:12	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [1] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties [6] 3:15 10:24 40:1 47:7 49:24 52:1 Party [3] 3:25 30:24 33:11 Past [2] 3:2 8:19 Pasture [1] 3:23 Perhaps [1] 13:22	Pleadings         [2] 5:2 47:6         Plot         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 52:21         Point         [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3         Pointed         [1] 38:25         Pointed         [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22         Pollman         [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12         41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43:         16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46:         22         Portion         [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4         24:6 32:1         Position         [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22         49:4 49:11 50:5         Possible         [2] 13:6 32:11         Practically         [1] 49:6         Precisely         [3] 7:17 22:11 22:12         Predecessors	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties [6] 3:15 10:24 40:1 47:7 49:24 52:1 Party [3] 3:25 30:24 33:11 Past [2] 3:2 8:19 Pasture [1] 3:23 Perhaps [1] 13:22 Period	Pleadings         [2] 5:2 47:6         Plot         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 52:21         Point         [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3         Pointed         [1] 38:25         Pointed         [1] 38:25         Pointed         [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22         Pollman         [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12         41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43:         16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46:         22         Portion         [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4         24:6 32:1         Position         [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22         49:4 49:11 50:5         Possible         [2] 13:6 32:11         Practically         [1] 49:6         Precise         [1] 49:6         Precisely         [3] 7:17 22:11 22:12         Predecessors         [2] 6:24 8:3	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties [6] 3:15 10:24 40:1 47:7 49:24 52:1 Party [3] 3:25 30:24 33:11 Past [2] 3:2 8:19 Pasture [1] 32:3 Perhaps [1] 13:22 Period [1] 40:19	Pleadings         [2] 5:2 47:6         Plot         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 11:12         Point         [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3         Pointed         [1] 38:25         Points         [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22         Pollman         [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12         41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43:         Portion         [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4         24:6 32:1         Position         [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22         49:4 49:11 50:5         Possible         [2] 13:6 32:11         Practically	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [1] 4:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties [6] 3:15 10:24 40:1 47:7 49:24 52:1 Party [3] 3:25 30:24 33:11 Past [2] 3:2 8:19 Pasture [1] 3:22 Perhaps [1] 13:22 Period [1] 40:19 Permanent	Pleadings         [2] 5:2 47:6         Plot         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 11:12         PM         [1] 12:2:1         Point         [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3         Pointed         [1] 38:25         Pointed         [1] 38:25         Pointed         [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22         Pollman         [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12         41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43:         16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46:         22         Portion         [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4         24:6 32:1         Position         [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22         49:4 49:11 50:5         Possible         [2] 13:6 32:11         Practically         [1] 49:6         Precise         [1] 4:15         Precisely         [3] 7:17 22:11 22:12         Predecessors         [2] 6:24 8:3         Preliminary         [1] 3:24 <td></td>	
	Owners [2] 17:3 17:4 Ownership [2] 7:20 40:12 P.m. [2] 2:11 3:2 Packing [2] 20:3 20:7 Pam [1] 1:19 Parcel [1] 46:11 Park [1] 16:3 Part [7] 14:18 16:4 18:16 24:8 25:5 27:17 27:18 Particular [15] 4:25 18:12 18:22 19:12 19:23 20: 15 20:16 21:1 21:17 21:21 21:24 21: 24 41:2 43:5 46:20 Parties [6] 3:15 10:24 40:1 47:7 49:24 52:1 Party [3] 3:25 30:24 33:11 Past [2] 3:2 8:19 Pasture [1] 32:3 Perhaps [1] 13:22 Period [1] 40:19	<pre>Pleadings [2] 5:2 47:6 Plot [1] 18:16 Plots [1] 11:12 PM [1] 52:21 Point [6] 10:2 17:6 17:13 34:3 34:7 39:3 Pointed [1] 38:25 Points [3] 9:22 9:24 49:22 Pollman [19] 1:22 29:19 30:5 40:20 41:3 41:12 41:22 42:3 42:8 42:14 42:20 43:2 43: 16 44:5 44:17 45:10 45:20 46:15 46: 22 Portion [8] 7:15 10:14 16:15 16:22 17:18 24:4 24:6 32:1 Position [9] 5:12 5:25 6:3 12:21 22:20 29:22 49:4 49:11 50:5 Possible [2] 13:6 32:11 Practically [1] 49:6 Precise [1] 4:15 Precisely [3] 7:17 22:11 22:12 Predecessors [2] 6:24 8:3 Preliminary [1] 3:24 Presence</pre>	

PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.

## From Occurred to Refute

	[1]7:25 Present	Qualify
	<b>[5]</b> 2:1 8:17 26:9 48:19 52:10	[3] 13:16 14:7 14:8 Qualifying
	Presented	<b>[4]</b> 6:17 6:20 14:10 15:12
	[2] 22:7 38:16 Presently	Quarter
	[1] 26:13	[3] 21:17 28:7 28:20 Questions
5:21 12:23 13:	Prevent	<b>[8]</b> 13:19 29:14 30:2 40:7 45:25 46:25
28:18 29:3 29:4 18 37:19 37:23	[3] 9:6 14:20 14:21 Prevention	49:17 51:5
51:18	[1] 8:22	Quickly
	Previously	
	[3] 27:17 28:18 36:1 Primarily	R
	[1] 21:9	Race
2:5	Privileges	[1] 14:21 Rademacher
2.5	[1]49:8 Problem	[1] 2:5
	<b>[1]</b> 48:11	Railroad
34:2 34:4 34:23	Proceeding	[1]28:6 Raised
	[1] 28:9 Proceedings	[4] 6:6 7:4 30:17 47:11
	[4] 1:8 2:7 53:9 53:12	Ranch
	Process	[3] 16:10 23:15 23:17 Range
:11 10:1 14:16	[3] 36:21 47:14 47:15 Processing	[3] 28:17 28:24 29:6
40:13 50:18	[1] 22:11	Rapid
	Professional [2] 53:6 53:19	[1] 18:1 Rates
	Promotion	[1] 48:19
	[1] 49:9	Read [8] 25:21 27:1 37:4 44:9 47:6 50:11
	Properties [1] 24:11	50:15 51:18
	Property	Reading
	<b>[15]</b> 17:3 17:18 19:1 23:24 27:20 28:9 34:19 34:23 36:14 36:14 40:11 42:11	[1] 49:5 Real
20:3 20:7 22:	42:12 45:18 45:21	[1] 15:23
	Proposed	Really [7] 20:21 22:18 34:8 37:17 42:18 47:
	[2] 17:13 24:1 Proven	16 48:19
	[1] 22:1	Reason
	Provide	[3] 30:16 33:9 33:10 Reasonable
	<b>[8]</b> 8:24 12:6 20:11 25:11 39:17 40:14 40:18 49:20	[2] 8:25 34:9
	Provided	Reasons
	<b>[9]</b> 6:16 6:17 10:9 10:10 11:3 11:12 15:24 47:24 51:2	[3] 9:1 9:2 30:16 Receives
	Provider	[1] 6:2
	[ <b>18</b> ] 1:6 4:25 5:1 8:19 15:13 15:18 19: 8 23:21 24:1 25:3 34:2 38:4 41:21 41:	Receiving [2] 6:22 6:25
	21 41:24 43:7 48:2 51:21	Recent
	Provides	[1] 22:15
4:3 34:7 39:3	[3] 36:24 41:10 50:12 Providing	Recess [1] 51:15
	<b>[5]</b> 10:4 19:10 34:2 40:21 50:8	Recognition
	Provisions [1] 5:10	[1] 50:17
	Public	Recognize
	<b>[8]</b> 1:1 1:11 3:5 31:19 33:1 49:9 53:6	Recognized
40:20 41:3 41:12 4 42:20 43:2 43:	53:18 Publicly	[1] 11:10 Recollection
5:20 46:15 46:	[1] 18:4	[1] 20:13
	Purchase	Record
16:22 17:18 24:4	[1] 23:18 Purchased	[5] 20:2 30:6 51:8 51:24 52:14
	<b>[6]</b> 18:25 23:25 24:2 24:10 25:5 43:6	Red [1] 47:12
1 22:20 29:22	Purchasing	Refer
1 22.20 29.22	[1] 23:16 Purpose	[3] 4:16 30:7 30:8 Reference
	<b>[10]</b> 7:8 9:5 13:8 14:1 14:2 14:19 16:	[1] 33:20
	20 35:17 48:16 50:1 Purposes	Referred
	[ <b>3</b> ] 4:9 5:5 36:15	[1]47:23 Referring
	Put	[1] 33:19
	[3] 9:9 12:22 44:3 Putting	Refers
	[1] 8:6	[2] 28:19 31:20 Reflect
5	0	[1] 52:6
	Q	Reflects
	Quadrant	[1] 45:5 Refute
	[2] 17:11 24:7	

Word Index [1] 49:19 [1] 2:5 Senses Situations Regard Rogers [1] 14:6 [1] 51:1 [1] 49:23 **[23]** 1:22 1:22 1:23 29:19 30:5 40:10 40:20 41:3 41:12 41:22 42:3 42:8 42: Separate Size Regarding [1] 25:7 14 42:17 42:20 43:2 43:16 44:5 44:17 [2] 7:20 24:14 [1] 52:3 Serve Slaughter 45:10 45:20 46:15 46:22 Regardless [20] 6:13 9:19 9:24 10:19 11:4 11:8 [1] 22:12 Rolayne [2] 39:22 40:17 11:13 12:7 19:19 20:1 21:6 21:14 21: [1] 1:14 Small Regards 20 21:23 22:21 22:22 25:10 39:5 48: [2] 28:3 49:22 Roll [1] 42:25 10 52:4 Smith [2] 9:8 19:18 Registered Served [12] 1:14 27:8 27:19 27:25 28:11 29:1 Rolled [2] 53:5 53:19 [16] 5:18 8:8 9:17 13:11 15:13 15:22 29:4 29:12 45:4 45:16 45:22 46:17 [1] 28:4 Rely 20:4 20:8 21:9 24:17 31:19 34:13 36: Sold [1] 9:1 Room 1 36:2 47:15 50:9 [2] 35:4 35:5 [2] 2:9 3:3 Service Remain Someone [3] 19:12 19:13 19:14 RPR [91] 1:4 1:6 4:21 4:24 4:25 5:1 5:22 5: [12] 14:3 14:14 14:16 15:10 15:13 15: [1] 1:24 22 6:2 6:10 6:11 6:15 6:15 6:22 6:25 Remaining 20 15:22 16:9 26:12 35:12 46:6 48:14 8:8 8:15 8:19 8:19 8:21 8:24 9:3 9:4 Rule [1] 25:2 Somewhat 9:9 9:15 9:22 9:22 9:24 10:2 10:4 10: [2] 52:1 52:11 Remember 6 10:9 10:10 10:17 10:17 10:24 11:1 [1] 4:6 Rules [1] 39:6 11:11 11:19 11:20 11:24 11:25 12:18 Somewhere [2] 30:20 30:21 12:21 13:9 13:12 13:13 14:3 14:13 14: 19 15:9 15:11 15:13 16:7 16:24 19:1 Remove [1] 7:14 Ruling [1] 23:20 Sort Removed [2] 39:2 39:7 19:8 19:20 20:1 20:11 21:6 21:8 21: [3] 20:17 20:20 29:24 Run 12 23:5 23:5 23:6 25:3 25:11 25:12 [2] 8:7 16:23 South [1] 21:8 26:6 27:2 31:19 33:1 33:25 34:2 37:1 Rendered [18] 1:2 2:8 2:10 3:4 3:4 5:14 5:16 8: 37:2 37:3 40:15 41:8 41:15 41:16 41: Running [3] 6:11 15:9 15:11 12 11:14 12:4 15:20 21:13 28:6 30:21 18 47:23 47:25 50:17 50:19 50:21 51: [2] 40:23 40:24 Renders 37:13 53:1 53:7 53:13 1 51:19 51:21 Rural [2] 6:7 50:9 Southeast Services [2] 12:1 21:8 Replaced [2] 7:15 32:4 [1] 48:8 Rutledge [1] 10:11 Southeastern Serving [1] 31:25 Replatted [1] 17:18 [11] 7:1 9:13 10:5 12:6 12:25 13:14 [5] 7:21 7:22 24:7 34:20 36:20 14:17 19:6 19:25 20:25 41:2 Southern Replatting S [1] 16:21 Session [1] 37:12 Special [2] 51:12 51:16 Sahr Reported Several [1] 4:20 [13] 1:12 3:9 17:1 17:6 17:12 17:19 [1] 1:24 Specific 19:21 20:12 21:19 23:10 46:1 51:10 [1] 35:9 Reporter 52:15 Shall [2] 15:4 37:8 [3] 53:6 53:9 53:19 Specifically Sake [1] 3:19 Represented [1] 4:19 [2] 37:20 39:6 Shape [1] 3:23 Specificity Sale [1] 7:20 Requirement [2] 24:23 24:25 [1] 29:9 Share [3] 36:10 36:11 50:8 Speculate Sales [1] 24:21 Requirements [1] 25:2 [1] 34:10 Short [1] 40:2 Spending Sat [1] 51:15 Requires [1] 47:20 [2] 23:1 47:6 Shorthand [1] 9:22 Spent Schedule [2] 53:9 53:9 Respond [1] 20:24 [1] 33:3 Shown [1] 18:25 Scheduled Spot [1] 33:11 Response **12** 16:11 29:24 [1] 3:21 Shows [1] 5:3 Square SDCL [1] 7:3 Responses [1] 27:16 [1] 52:6 Side [1] 45:12 SS [4] 20:3 21:12 21:13 31:5 Second Restricted [1] 53:2 [6] 23:2 25:22 33:10 40:1 51:13 52:16 Significant [2] 10:23 10:25 Staff Secondly [4] 20:23 37:12 38:9 38:15 Restrictions [5] 1:13 47:5 48:3 49:7 50:7 [1] 50:7 Significantly [1] 43:4 Section Staff's [1] 17:21 Restrictive [1] 49:11 [35] 4:18 4:20 5:11 5:12 6:7 13:3 13: Similar [1] 23:9 16 14:7 15:6 23:3 28:7 28:20 33:20 Stands [2] 30:12 43:17 Result 33:20 34:5 35:16 36:23 37:5 37:7 38: [1] 51:24 Simplicity 17 38:23 39:9 39:10 41:13 43:5 43:10 [1] 12:8 Started [1] 4:19 46:20 46:21 47:24 48:1 50:11 50:11 Reticence Simply [2] 36:21 40:24 50:12 50:16 50:25 [1] 24:20 Starting [1] 52:6 Sections Return Single [1] 36:13 [4] 4:18 5:9 33:19 50:15 [1] 22:13 State [1] 24:14 See Reversal **[6]** 1:2 2:8 3:3 34:12 53:1 53:7 Sit [4] 14:21 15:8 20:12 27:11 [1] 11:6 States [1] 34:10 Seeing Reversed [2] 31:18 31:22 Site [2] 4:1 49:18 [2] 10:20 38:6 Station [32] 7:23 7:23 9:12 10:1 11:20 13:11 Seeking Ricketts 15:23 15:23 16:14 16:17 16:19 16:23 [1] 21:16 [4] 6:10 6:10 11:18 50:21 [1] 2:4 17:13 18:2 19:7 19:9 19:11 29:10 32: Status Seem 2 32:5 34:21 34:21 36:3 36:4 36:13 Rights [2] 38:10 51:24 [1] 20:19 37:9 37:10 39:19 39:19 40:22 43:6 43: [6] 10:17 11:19 11:22 12:7 41:18 50: Statute Segments 11 17 [20] 6:5 6:19 33:18 34:6 34:11 34:12 Rise [1] 47:21 Sited 34:25 35:20 36:11 36:24 37:4 37:18 Selection [1] 37:11 [1] 20:19 42:22 43:22 44:6 44:7 46:20 48:22 49: [1] 23:18 Sites 5 52:7 Rislov [1] 1:15 Sell [3] 15:25 22:14 44:8 Statutes [3] 25:16 34:23 42:4 Sitting [2] 4:16 4:17 Riter Senger [2] 1:22 1:23 [1] 46:7 Statutory Situation River [1] 1:16 [5] 33:19 39:13 40:2 43:5 43:10 [8] 13:16 19:16 24:22 26:9 35:7 44:11 Sense Steps [5] 17:20 18:13 18:19 20:13 22:6

48:24 50:14

PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.

[2] 35:17 44:23

Robert

From Refute to Steps

[1] 36:16

Word Index

	Word Index			
	Steve	Together	[1] 19:6	Word
	[1] 1:19 Still	[3] 7:22 26:1 44:10	Utilities [8] 1:1 1:11 3:5 8:24 47:22 48:7 49:9	<b>[10]</b> 5:9 5:14 5:17 6:5 27:1 42:24 44:
	<b>[9]</b> 10:2 12:17 15:6 16:22 24:25 25:9	<b>Took</b> [4] 11:7 23:8 40:13 53:9	<b>[8]</b> 1:1 1:11 5:5 8:24 47:22 48:7 49:9 49:10	1 45:14 45:15 46:21
	25:15 29:24 41:10	Tough	Utility	
	Stipulation	[1] 24:12	[10] 5:18 6:12 9:15 11:7 15:16 34:14	Words
	[1] 3:14	Tougher	37:1 41:16 47:21 48:19 Utilization	[10] 6:12 6:19 6:19 7:1 11:10 12:5 12:
	Stop [1] 30:3	[1] 25:16	[ <b>1</b> ] 15:15	20 33:17 38:22 44:15
	Strained	Towards [1] 18:18	Utilize	Written
	[1] 37:7	Tracks	[1] 24:5	[1] 13:4
	Subject	[1] 28:6	Utilized	
	[1] 28:8	Tract	[1] 7:23	⊥ Y
	Subjective [1] 27:3	[3] 7:10 10:3 10:13	V	
	Submit	Tracts [1] 10:15	•	Year
	[ <b>2</b> ] 33:13 38:12	Transactions	Vacated	[2] 5:16 8:13
	Submits	[1] 25:7	[2] 28:3 28:3 Value	Years
	[1] 14:9	Transcript	[1] 50:16	[7] 7:19 9:5 10:8 11:24 14:24 20:4 20:
	Submitted	[2] 1:8 2:7	Various	9
	[3] 3:14 32:18 33:5 Substations	Transcription [1] 53:12	[1] 8:20	Yourself
	[1] 20:5	Transferred	Versus	
	Summary	[1] 8:4	[1] 33:23 VICE	[1] 29:23
	<b>[12]</b> 3:12 3:17 3:19 30:14 30:22 30:24	Transmission	<b>[12]</b> 1:12 17:1 17:6 17:12 17:19 19:21	
	32:20 32:24 33:8 33:11 47:10 51:23 Supports	[3] 14:22 20:6 21:10	20:12 21:19 23:10 46:1 51:10 52:15	
	[3] 35:17 37:14 37:17	Treatment [1] 17:25	Vicinity	
	Supreme	Tried	[1] 15:25	
	[12] 5:16 8:12 8:20 9:10 10:21 11:5	[1] 39:1	View [2] 4:6 46:18	
	11:10 12:4 23:7 38:5 39:2 44:20	True	[2] 4:0 40:18	
	Т	[2] 35:17 53:11	$\mathbf{W}$	
	L	Trumps		-
ſ	Taurus	[1] 50:12 Try	Waiting [1] 30:4	
ſ	[1] 27:4	[1] 40:7	Warren	
	Temporary [2] 11:19 11:22	Trying	[1] 2:2	
	Term	[2] 20:16 23:12	Waste	
- 	[2] 6:4 48:23	Turkey	[3] 17:25 20:18 22:2	
	Termed	<b>[23]</b> 1:4 3:16 5:4 7:4 8:5 11:15 13:10 13:11 16:16 17:16 22:10 27:14 27:15	Wasteful [1]47:20	
1	[1] 47:12	27:23 28:4 28:10 29:17 30:6 31:5 34:	Water	
	Terms [4] 27:1 27:8 50:13 50:14	16 35:25 50:4 51:19	[1] 17:25	
	Territorial	Turkey's	Wattier	
1	<b>[9]</b> 5:10 7:2 8:12 9:16 14:23 24:17 27:	[3] 5:25 12:12 26:20 Turn	[2] 1:23 1:23	
1	2 41:18 47:19	[1] 29:5	Ways [1] 13:12	
	Territories	Two	Weaker	
	[1] 14:1 Territory	<b>[13]</b> 5:9 5:11 13:12 25:7 25:20 25:21	[1] 25:13	
	[2] 12:22 13:9	30:16 44:15 44:24 48:8 48:13 49:22 50:15	Wednesday	
	Testimony	Tying	[1] 3:1	
	[1] 40:10	[1] 26:1	Wegman [1] 1:19	
	Thereby	Туре	Weigh	
	[1] 47:14 Therefore	<b>[3] 4</b> 4:11 47:13 48:4	[1] 31:4	
	<b>[6]</b> 6:1 8:16 12:24 33:7 48:20 49:11	<b>Typo</b> [1] 28:14	Wells	
	They've	Typographical	[1] 16:11	
	[1] 16:22	[2] 28:16 28:22	West [5] 17:20 18:13 18:19 20:13 22:6	
	Thoughts [1] 21:3	TT T	Western	
	Three	$\mathbf{U}$	[2] 18:25 24:2	
	[3] 14:9 25:19 40:15	Under	Whereas	
			[2] 24:11 24:14	
	Three-phase	<b>[16]</b> 8:11 13:2 14:7 15:6 18:19 30:20		
	Three-phase [1] 40:15	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40:	Whichever	
	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold			
	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold [1] 49:12	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40: 3 41:12 43:9 50:13 Unique [1] 33:16	Whichever [1] 48:9 Whole [5] 7:18 16:22 24:12 25:12 37:4	
	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40: 3 41:12 43:9 50:13 Unique [1] 33:16 Unless	Whichever [1] 48:9 Whole [5] 7:18 16:22 24:12 25:12 37:4 Wide	
	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold [1] 49:12 Threw [1] 48:23 Throughout	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40: 3 41:12 43:9 50:13 Unique [1] 33:16 Unless [2] 41:24 43:7	Whichever [1] 48:9 Whole [5] 7:18 16:22 24:12 25:12 37:4 Wide [1] 18:5	
	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold [1] 49:12 Threw [1] 48:23 Throughout [2] 20:22 40:19	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40: 3 41:12 43:9 50:13 Unique [1] 33:16 Unless [2] 41:24 43:7 Up	Whichever [1] 48:9 Whole [5] 7:18 16:22 24:12 25:12 37:4 Wide [1] 18:5 Wiest	
	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold [1] 49:12 Threw [1] 48:23 Throughout [2] 20:22 40:19 Thwarting	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40: 3 41:12 43:9 50:13 Unique [1] 33:16 Unless [2] 41:24 43:7	Whichever [1] 48:9 Whole [5] 7:18 16:22 24:12 25:12 37:4 Wide [1] 18:5 Wiest	
	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold [1] 49:12 Threw [1] 48:23 Throughout [2] 20:22 40:19 Thwarting [1] 18:6	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40: 3 41:12 43:9 50:13 Unique [1] 33:16 Unless [2] 41:24 43:7 Up [13] 4:1 9:8 12:9 18:6 19:13 19:18 27: 9 29:21 30:1 36:4 36:7 40:23 48:13 Upgrades	Whichever [1] 48:9 Whole [5] 7:18 16:22 24:12 25:12 37:4 Wide [1] 18:5 Wiest [1] 1:14 Wife [2] 6:22 8:3	
	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold [1] 49:12 Threw [1] 48:23 Throughout [2] 20:22 40:19 Thwarting [1] 18:6 Tied	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40: 3 41:12 43:9 50:13 Unique [1] 33:16 Unless [2] 41:24 43:7 Up [13] 4:1 9:8 12:9 18:6 19:13 19:18 27: 9 29:21 30:1 36:4 36:7 40:23 48:13 Upgrades [1] 20:15	Whichever [1] 48:9 Whole [5] 7:18 16:22 24:12 25:12 37:4 Wide [1] 18:5 Wiest [1] 1:14 Wife [2] 6:22 8:3 Willingness	
	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold [1] 49:12 Threw [1] 48:23 Throughout [2] 20:22 40:19 Thwarting [1] 18:6 Tied [1] 30:1 Tina	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40: 3 41:12 43:9 50:13 Unique [1] 33:16 Unless [2] 41:24 43:7 Up [13] 4:1 9:8 12:9 18:6 19:13 19:18 27: 9 29:21 30:1 36:4 36:7 40:23 48:13 Upgrades [1] 20:15 Upheld	Whichever [1] 48:9 Whole [5] 7:18 16:22 24:12 25:12 37:4 Wide [1] 18:5 Wiest [1] 1:14 Wife [2] 6:22 8:3 Willingness [1] 8:23	
(	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold [1] 49:12 Threw [1] 48:23 Throughout [2] 20:22 40:19 Thwarting [1] 18:6 Tied [1] 30:1 Tina [1] 1:18	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40: 3 41:12 43:9 50:13 Unique [1] 33:16 Unless [2] 41:24 43:7 Up [13] 4:1 9:8 12:9 18:6 19:13 19:18 27: 9 29:21 30:1 36:4 36:7 40:23 48:13 Upgrades [1] 20:15 Upheld [3] 10:18 10:21 11:6	Whichever [1] 48:9 Whole [5] 7:18 16:22 24:12 25:12 37:4 Wide [1] 18:5 Wiest [1] 1:14 Wife [2] 6:22 8:3 Willingness [1] 8:23 Wishes	
	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold [1] 49:12 Threw [1] 48:23 Throughout [2] 20:22 40:19 Thwarting [1] 18:6 Tied [1] 30:1 Tina [1] 1:18 Title	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40: 3 41:12 43:9 50:13 Unique [1] 33:16 Unless [2] 41:24 43:7 Up [13] 4:1 9:8 12:9 18:6 19:13 19:18 27: 9 29:21 30:1 36:4 36:7 40:23 48:13 Upgrades [1] 20:15 Upheld	Whichever [1] 48:9 Whole [5] 7:18 16:22 24:12 25:12 37:4 Wide [1] 18:5 Wiest [1] 1:14 Wife [2] 6:22 8:3 Willingness [1] 8:23 Wishes [1] 3:25	
(	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold [1] 49:12 Threw [1] 48:23 Throughout [2] 20:22 40:19 Thwarting [1] 18:6 Tied [1] 30:1 Tina [1] 1:18 Title [1] 36:18	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40: 3 41:12 43:9 50:13 Unique [1] 33:16 Unless [2] 41:24 43:7 Up [13] 4:1 9:8 12:9 18:6 19:13 19:18 27: 9 29:21 30:1 36:4 36:7 40:23 48:13 Upgrades [1] 20:15 Upheld [3] 10:18 10:21 11:6 Urge [2] 30:15 39:24 Usage	Whichever [1] 48:9 Whole [5] 7:18 16:22 24:12 25:12 37:4 Wide [1] 18:5 Wiest [1] 1:14 Wife [2] 6:22 8:3 Willingness [1] 8:23 Wishes	
	Three-phase [1] 40:15 Threshold [1] 49:12 Threw [1] 48:23 Throughout [2] 20:22 40:19 Thwarting [1] 18:6 Tied [1] 30:1 Tina [1] 1:18 Title	30:21 34:4 35:16 36:23 37:7 39:8 40: 3 41:12 43:9 50:13 Unique [I] 33:16 Unless [2] 41:24 43:7 Up [13] 4:1 9:8 12:9 18:6 19:13 19:18 27: 9 29:21 30:1 36:4 36:7 40:23 48:13 Upgrades [1] 20:15 Upheld [3] 10:18 10:21 11:6 Urge [2] 30:15 39:24	Whichever [1] 48:9 Whole [5] 7:18 16:22 24:12 25:12 37:4 Wide [1] 18:5 Wiest [1] 1:14 Wife [2] 6:22 8:3 Willingness [1] 8:23 Wishes [1] 3:25 Withstanding	

PRECISION REPORTING, LTD.

From Steve to Yourself