

RECEIVED

FEB 26 2018

**SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION**

Dave Adam, Clark County Resident
[REDACTED] Clark, SD 57225
February 5, 2018

Crocker's

My name is Dave Adam, and I am here tonight to ask you to deny Geronimo's permit application. I am a resident of Clark County and am very committed to our community and state. Living in the Crocker Hills has been a blessing to my family me.

Several weeks ago, we met with our County Commissioners. We were wondering about several conditions that had been voted on at the March 27th Conditional Use Permit hearing last year. The Commissioners said that because of the lawsuit that the Applicant has put against our County, they are not able to discuss anything regarding the project. How are we supposed to communicate with our Commissioners? How can concerned citizens gather information in order to build a case without access to facts from our local government officials?

Another issue I have is with how the Applicant is promoting this potential project to the community. Geronimo is inflating their numbers to make the project look more financially beneficial than might be possible. They haven't even settled on the number of turbines or turbine model. If the project were to produce 400 megawatts, the only turbine choice possible is the Vestas 3.45 for the majority of the sites. Why then are there four turbine options in the application? Are they really going to use several different models?

And I'm wondering, of the 10-20 full time jobs they are forecasting, how many of these people would actually live in Clark County? Is that something Geronimo is able to control? Has the Applicant even opened an office in Clark County yet? Or are they still in Watertown where most of these full-time workers would live?

And another issue with the application is with figure 4 and the "additional evaluated transmission line" on the map that they are presenting. This shows a line going through land owner's property that is not signed up - this line is very misleading. Where will the line actually go if property owners are not wanting anything to do with this applicant?

But one of the biggest concerns I have is with the Northern Border Pipeline crossing. Your staff has inquired about fly-overs in their First Set of Data Requests. [REDACTED] states that Crocker has coordinated with Northern Border Pipeline Company. I checked with [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and he told me that the last time Crocker reached out to him was back in 2016. [REDACTED] himself had to reach out to Crocker last month in order to get an update on the project.

When [REDACTED] viewed the project layout in the application (Figure 5), he said that he has concerns with the access roads that go over top of the Pipeline. [REDACTED] has told the Applicant that they will not be able to have any access roads going over the pipeline, but that they could have a one-time use permit to cross over the pipeline with a crane as long as it was properly applied for and had proper supervision from pipeline employees.

[REDACTED] communicated with the Applicant about these access roads that are going over the pipeline and he was told that, "This isn't a final map". One has to wonder - how many more maps are there going to be? [REDACTED] has also told me that there are cases where a pipeline break has occurred and caused deaths. Are they wanting this project so bad that they willing to minimize the potential risks and take a chance at someone losing a life?

The Applicant must demonstrate better communication with various agencies. Once a final map is settled upon – once the US Fish and Wildlife easement issue is settled, once the definition of "residence" is settled on, once the access roads over Northern Border's Pipeline is settled on – then the PUC and concerned citizens will be able to assess the application.

I, along with many others, encourage you to deny the Applicants application.

Thank you for your time.