

From: PUC

Sent: Thursday, November 8, 2018 8:48 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: EL18-026

Mr. and Ms. Kaufman,

Thank you for sharing your concerns regarding the Prevailing Wind project.

Your message and my response will be filed under Comments and Responses in docket EL18-026, <http://puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2018/EL18-026.aspx>, so my fellow commissioners and others may read them. Here is a link to the commission's Siting Info Guide on our website that you may find helpful: <http://puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/sitinghandout.pdf>.

Kristie Fiegen, Chairperson
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

From: PUC

Sent: Thursday, November 8, 2018 8:45 AM

To: Bartunek, Katie [REDACTED]

Subject: EL18-026

Ms. Bartunek,

Thank you for sharing your view regarding the Prevailing Wind project.

Your message and my response will be filed under Comments and Responses in the docket, EL18-026 at <http://puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2018/EL18-026.aspx>, so my fellow commissioners and others may read them. Here is a link to the commission's Siting Info Guide on our website that you may find helpful:

<http://puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/sitinghandout.pdf>.

Kristie Fiegen, Chairperson
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

From:



Sent: Thursday, November 8, 2018 1:04 PM

To: PUC-PUC <PUC@state.sd.us>

Subject: [EXT] Letter from Alan Meiers for Docket EL 18-026

Please post the attached public comments to Docket EL 18-026'

Thank You.

Alan Meiers

018231

November 8, 2018

To: South Dakota PUC

From: Alan Meiers-**Please Post My Comments to Docket EL 18-026**

As an owner of land located in the middle of the Prevailing Wind Park Farm proposal, I paid close attention to the evidentiary hearing on this project.

The evidence and testimony by Prevailing Winds clearly provided no solid proof beyond reasonable doubt that this proposed project passes all 4 criteria statements that the PUC has listed to be met for their approval.

Correspondingly, the opposition presented a strong and convincing case that would raise a high level of reasonable doubt even in the mind of a disinterested bipartisan person.

There is no doubt that if this proposal was presented in front of a jury of peers, a civil case jury, or a single Judge, it would be denied as presented. But this is not the case and I am very concerned that this project is already rubber stamped for approval.

The setback distance is one of the most critical issues in these Wind Farm projects and is paramount in meeting and passing criteria #3 - "will not substantially impair the health, safety or welfare of the inhabitants".

Testimony showed that the Bon Homme County Commission hadn't done any setback research on their own and just approved/rubberstamped the meager 500/1000 ft. setback distance that the Wind Farm proponents suggested or rather demanded. Consider that these proposed wind turbines are 586 ft. tall and even taller when adding the blade length (350 ft.). This huge height is equivalent to the median of the setback distance!

The footprint is inhabited by a fairly large number of residents with the overwhelming majority being non-participating but yet will be forced to live near the wind turbines. Exhibit A42 presented by Prevailing Winds provides evidence to this as it reflects that 67% of the residents and landowners are opposed non-participating parties. These wind farms realistically should only be built in very sparsely populated or open range areas.

The health related testimony of 4 individuals was enough to raise heavy doubt and serious concerns that wind turbine related health issues are real and will only continue to increase as more wind farms are built. So what distance is safe? It is surely obvious from this hearing that a much larger setback is needed to potentially minimize health related problems. The footprint's wildlife has received more setback attention and concern than the people being forced to live within the footprint. Why shouldn't the people in this footprint be given the same consideration and respect? Shouldn't the high probability of endangering just one person's quality of life and health be worth reconsidering a much larger setback distance than living with the enormous burden of approving a flawed project for decades?

The integrity of the PUC and even our elected officials of South Dakota are being tested in making a decision on a proposal of this magnitude. The evidentiary hearing clearly exposed the numerous critical health and environmental issue concerns that remain unproven and unknown. This high level of lingering reasonable doubt cannot be overlooked, consequently it should not be difficult to make the safe decision and deny the approval of this project.

Cordially,

Alan Meiers

[REDACTED]

Scottsdale, AZ 85258

[REDACTED]

From: PUC

Sent: Thursday, November 8, 2018 3:49 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: EL18-026

Mr. Meiers,

Thank you for sharing your view regarding the Prevailing Wind siting permit request currently pending before the commission.

Your letter and my response will be filed under Comments and Responses in docket EL18-026, <http://puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2018/EL18-026.aspx>, so my fellow commissioners and others may read them. Here is a link to the commission's Siting Info Guide on our website that may be helpful: <http://puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/sitinghandout.pdf>.

Kristie Fiegen, Chairperson
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

From: Wanda Oorlog [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 8, 2018 3:09 PM
To: PUC-PUC <PUC@state.sd.us>
Subject: [EXT] Prevailing Winds Docket EL18-026

South Dakota PUC:

Please post the attachment on docket EL18-026 Prevailing Winds.

Wanda Oorlog

[REDACTED]
Frisco, TX 75034
[REDACTED]

To: South Dakota PUC

From Wanda Oorlog

Please post to Docket EL18-026

As a landowner in the footprint of the proposed Prevailing Winds project, I am very concerned that this project will be rubber stamped by the PUC in spite of the opposition from the many residents and landowners.

The PUC should be protecting the people in this area. Massive towers have no place in areas where people live, especially when all of the residents are not in favor. Why should this project be forced on the residents and landowners who are within the footprint but are not in favor. The health of the people in this area is at stake. Every day new studies show that living near and under turbines create health problems for many people. The participating residents can't talk about health problems due to the confidentiality clause in their contract. I feel that the benefits of wind turbines are overstated and the risks of living near turbines is understated.

During the evidentiary hearing last month, testimonies were given regarding many health issues from residents living near the Beethoven project. Protection is provided for the eagles and whooping cranes, but not for the people. These taller turbines have not been proven beyond a reasonable doubt to be safe and without negative effects on the health of the residents.

I have read the comments on the PUC website that are in favor of this project, and I am amazed that most of the favorable comments are from investors and even employees of Prevailing Winds. These comments should not be taken into consideration because of conflict of interest.

Approving this project will negatively impact the area. Land values will decline, the health and safety of the residents will be in jeopardy, as well as the lives of the many forms of wildlife that inhabit the area. We should be good stewards of this great land in the state of South Dakota. Approving this project ABSOLUTELY SHOULD NOT HAPPEN. There are too many negatives, concerns, and possible dangers to the people's health. If building this project would harm just one resident's health, it would be a travesty.

Please do the right thing for the people and deny the approval of this project.

Thank you

Wanda Oorlog

[REDACTED]
Frisco, TX 75034
[REDACTED]

From: PUC

Sent: Thursday, November 8, 2018 4:11 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: EL18-026

Ms. Oorlog,

Thank you for sharing your comments regarding the Prevailing Wind docket currently pending before the commission.

Your letter and my response will be filed under Comments and Responses in docket EL18-026, <http://puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2018/EL18-026.aspx>, so my fellow commissioners and others may read them. Here is a link to the commission's Siting Info Guide on our website that you may find helpful: <http://puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/sitinghandout.pdf>.

Kristie Fiegen, Chairperson
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

018238