

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

---

|                                     |                                  |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION )  | EL19-027                         |
| BY CROWNED RIDGE WIND II, LLC FOR ) |                                  |
| A PERMIT OF A WIND ENERGY )         | <b>APPLICANT'S RESPONSES TO</b>  |
| FACILITY IN DEUEL, GRANT )          | <b>STAFF'S THIRD SET OF DATA</b> |
| AND CODINGTON COUNTIES )            | <b>REQUESTS TO APPLICANT</b>     |

---

- 3-1) Referring to Appendix N, Decommissioning Plan, please explain why the MN DNR and the MN Board of Water and Soil Resources is referenced on page 6.

**Response:** The references to MN DNR and the MN Board of Water and Soil Resources were not intended to be included, and, therefore, have been deleted in Attachment 1 to Data Request 3-1 (revised Decommissioning Plan).

**Respondent:** Tyler Wilhelm, Senior Project Manager

- 3-2) Please provide a detailed breakdown for the \$10-15 million decommissioning cost estimate provided in Appendix N.

**Response:** A detailed breakdown for the \$10-15 million decommissioning cost is set forth in Attachment 1.

**Respondent:** Tyler Wilhelm, Senior Project Manager

- 3-3) When decommissioning the collector system, the Decommissioning Plan reads as if the landowners can decide if they want the cables removed. If a landowner requests the collector system and fiber optic cables removed, will Crowned Ridge II be obligated to remove those cables? Please explain.

**Response:** Yes, if during decommissioning a landowner requests the collector system and fiber optic cables be removed, CRW II will remove these facilities located up to four (4) feet below surface. However, if a landowner requests that the collector system and fiber optic cables located up to four (4) feet below surface on their property remain in place and not be removed, then CRW II will coordinate with the landowner and county, as needed, to have these facilities remain in place.

**Respondent:** Tyler Wilhelm, Senior Project Manager

- 3-4) Please provide updated shapefiles of the project facilities that account for the changes presented in Crowned Ridge's supplemental testimony.

**Response:** The updated shapefiles are provided as Confidential Attachment 1.

**Respondent:** Sarah Sappington, Consultant

- 3-5) (a) Referring to Crowned Ridge's response to DR 2-1 and Exhibit TW-S-2 attached to Mr. Wilhelm's supplemental testimony, is the property with the possibility of losing a collection line easement the property of Michael Raml? (b) If so, does Exhibit TW-S-2 identify that the collection line was rerouted off Mr. Raml's property? (c) Does Crowned Ridge commit to not crossing Mr. Raml's property that is of concern?

**Response:**

- a. No, because the collection line proposed for Mr. Raml's property has already been removed. The property with the possibility of losing a collection easement belongs to landowner Jeffrey M. Lenards which is located just west of Mr. Raml's property. Mr. Lenards has verbally agreed to the location of collection on his property, and is expected to execute an easement agreement with CRW II by January 31, 2020.
- b. Exhibit TW-S-2 accurately identifies that the collection line was removed from Mr. Raml's property.
- c. Yes, CRW has committed to not crossing Mr. Raml's property.

**Respondent:** Tyler Wilhelm, Senior Project Manager

- 3-6) Does Crowned Ridge plan to use any turbine models not identified in the application or used in the sound modeling completed by Mr. Haley? Please explain.

**Response:** No.

**Respondent:** Tyler Wilhelm, Senior Project Manager

- 3-7) Please confirm that Crowned Ridge will comply with SDCL 49-41B-25.2.

- i) Has Crowned Ridge received approval from the FAA for the ADLS? If not, please identify when Crowned Ridge expects to receive approval.
- ii) If Crowned Ridge does not receive approval from the FAA for the ADLS, please explain how the project will comply with SDCL 49-41B-25.2.
- iii) Will the ADLS be installed and operating by the commercial operation date of 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter 2020?

**Response:** Yes, Crowned Ridge Wind II will comply with SDCL 49-41B-25.2.

- i) No. CRW II anticipates receiving FAA approval of the ADLS by July 10, 2020.
- ii) CRW II objects to Data Request 3-7, because it calls for a legal conclusion. Subject to and without waiving the objection, CRW II commits to have the ADLS operational prior to commercial operations.
- iii) Yes, provided (1) the FAA approves the use of ADLS at the Project, and (2) there are no issues that result in delays that are beyond CRW II's control.

**Respondent:** Tyler Wilhelm, Senior Project Manager

- 3-8) Please provide updated Figures 3a and 3b that account for the changes made in Crowned Ridge's supplemental testimony or any updates since the supplemental testimony was filed.

**Response:** Updated Figures 3a and 3b that account for the changes made in CRW II's supplemental testimony or any updates since the supplemental testimony was filed is provided as Attachment 1. Also, see response to Data Request 3-5 for current status of Lenards.

**Respondent:** Tyler Wilhelm, Senior Project Manager

- 3-9) Please provide a map identifying the turbines that will have a 2.1 MW nameplate rating and the turbines that will have a 2.3 MW nameplate rating. Further, please identify on the map what turbines will have an 80-meter hub height and what turbines will have a 90-meter hub height.

**Response:** A map identifying the turbines that will have a 2.1 MW nameplate rating (i.e., safe harbor turbines) and the turbines that will have a 2.3 MW nameplate rating is provided as Attachment 1 to Data Request 3-8, which is the same map provided in response to Supplemental Response to Intervener 2-15 as Attachment 2 identifying turbines with an 80 and 90-meter hub height.

**Respondent:** Tyler Wilhelm, Senior Project Manager

- 3-10) Referring to page 1 of Exhibit JH-S-1 (Sound Study), please explain how the model calculates sound pressure levels at a distance of 50 feet from the perimeter of a structure.

**Response:** Coordinates for the structures were provided by CRW II. I used the coordinates to create a 50-foot radius ring of 12 noise receptors around each structure. The highest sound pressure level predicted for the 12 receptors was taken as the predicted sound pressure level for the structure.

**Respondent:** Jay Haley, Winder Engineer

- 3-11) Referring to the response to data request 2-12, what is the intent of the additional bat acoustic surveys being completed and when will the results be available?

**Response:** CRW II has completed a second round of acoustic surveys in September 10, 2019 – November 12, 2019 to be responsive to a request by the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The objective of the survey was to determine the bat species present within areas of potentially suitable northern long-eared bat habitat during the survey period. Consistent with results of the CRW II initial acoustic survey, no northern long-eared bat calls were recorded during the 2019 effort. These results support the overall conclusion that northern long-eared bats are unlikely to be present in the Project Area as described in the Application, Section 11.3.1.2.2. The survey report is being prepared and will be filed in the CRW II docket in early February 2020.

**Respondent:** Sarah Sappington, Consultant

- 3-12) Are all turbine locations sited based on the required setback distances for turbines with a 90-meter hub height? If not, please explain.

**Response:** Yes, all turbine locations that were sited using the 90-meter hub height turbine meet required setback distances.

**Respondent:** Tyler Wilhelm, Senior Project Manager

- 3-13) Referring to Exhibit SS-S1, please provide a copy of the Level III archaeological survey report. Further please provide a project map showing places of historical significance in accordance with ARSD 20:10:22:11.

**Response:** Copies of the Level III Archaeological Survey reports and the Architectural report are provided as Confidential Attachment 1. Places of historical significance are provided in shapefiles, which are provided as Confidential Attachment 2.

**Respondent:** Sarah Sappington, Consultant

- 3-14) Please provide the amendment to the aquatic resources survey as identified in Crowned Ridge's response to Staff DR 1-28.

**Response:** CRW II originally intended to complete an addendum to the aquatic resources survey report, which provides the tabular and graphic results of the surveys. However, CRW II since elected to follow the process used by CRW I, whereby the Applicant has prioritized developing the Nationwide Permit 12 Self-Verification memorandum over a survey report addendum. The Nationwide Permit 12 Self-Verification memorandum provides results in the context of all potential intersections with the Project Construction Easement and project infrastructure. Additionally, the memorandum also provides CRW II's construction team with guidance regarding best management practices that must be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts to aquatic resources. The proposed approach essentially accomplishes the same goal of documenting all existing potential wetlands or waters that an addendum would accomplish, and adds in impacts and demonstrates in a tabular and map form how each complete crossing complies with the requirements of the Nationwide Permit 12. CRW II will submit the Nationwide Permit 12 Self-Verification memorandum during the compliance phase as it did in CRW I, Docket No. EL19-003.

**Respondent:** Sarah Sappington, Consultant