

Name: My name is Paul Schoenfelder.

Address: My Home is at [REDACTED] About 8 miles east of Wagner and 8 miles north of Avon. I grew up in Mitchell, met my wife while going to school in Aberdeen. Our farm is where she grew up and it has been in her family for 122 years since it was homesteaded in 1896. That is 122 years in the same family. Interestingly, part of the house is even older. The living room is actually a cottonwood log cabin with historical significance and was built in the 1880's as a way-station for the stage line that ran from Springfield. Our house is over 130 years old.

My father-in-law deeded us part of the farm and the plan was for my brother-in-law to take over the farm. Sadly, he passed away in 2004 and our plans changed. We were living in Idaho, but we understood the importance of taking care of something so important, so we started the process of moving back in 2011.

The reason why this is unique and relevant is because that 130-year-old farmhouse is about 2/4 a mile from a proposed 590ft wind turbine. There would be at least four or five turbines within approximately 1 mile and 9 within 2 miles from our home. We both quit our jobs and moved back to South Dakota, a state that we love for its tranquil beauty.

I am against this project because it is too close to residents who have lived and worked on their farms, some all of their lives.

The Prevailing Winds application clearly states that the burden of proof that this project will not have a negative impact lies with the applicant. It would appear to me that there are too many questions and unknowns to approve this project as written.

I question the applicant's due diligence. When the turbine locations were finally made public, my home was not on any of the maps, including studies, shadow flicker, none of them. There are other impacted land owners not included.

On the land use map, our pasture was shown as tilled. That pasture has never seen a plow. We have several CRP acres on our property that are not identified. This is only one example of what I have observed for my property. How many other mistakes and flaws in their factual information are there in this application? If the PUC's decision is based on facts and the information provided is not factual, that is unfair and one-sided.

The cultural impact, we have a 130-year-old cabin not mentioned in the application. How many more such structures have been missed?

The application states that the project should not pose a serious threat to the social condition of the inhabitants. I can guarantee these turbines will have a negative impact. I currently live 3.5 miles away from the Beethoven project and in the future could live 3/4 of a mile away from the Prevailing Winds project. It is undeniable that dozens of 590' towers will change the landscape like it has done in other areas. I recently drove through Elgin, NE. This is not the landscape that the people living there have historically experienced. These large towers are intrusive. Although I may be living 3/4 of a mile away from them, they are going to be leaking onto my property every time I look out my window, every time I walk outside. Local authorities are struggling with creating ordinances and reasonable setbacks. They, like our representatives at our state level, they are relying on the wind power developers for their information. Why is 45 decibels considered acceptable. Why does 30 minutes of shadow flicker a day on a residence or 30 hours per year acceptable. Our local authorities have not had time or resources to adequately respond to these questions. They are adopting ordinances based on agreements and negotiation with the wind company. Charles Mix authorities would likely adopt a more comprehensive zoning ordinance, but due to time constraints they are being pressured by the wind company to set up a contract for their specific project. I respect the authority of our county commissioners but have concerns that sPowers only has their interest in mind when doing this negotiation.

I also have grave concerns about the process. In 2017, I read in the Press and Dakotan and Daily Republic that, "It's official!" That is was a done deal and the project was going to be constructed in 2018. This was from Prevailing Winds who made these statements with full knowledge that the WAPA was still conducting its study of the project and that the PUC would have to review the application and approve, and the public would be allowed to provide input.

Aside from completely disrespecting the authority of WAPA and the PUC, this was misleading to the public and continued pressure cause several land owners to sign easements with false information. Prevailing Winds continues to lead people to believe that this project has been approved and moving forward when they know that is false. Many people who oppose this project have told me that there is nothing that can be done about it because it has already been approved.

I assume this proposal will be going to an evidentiary hearing. It is my understanding of the process that it will be very difficult and expensive for individual citizens to have their concerns heard and considered. sPowers has millions of dollars at their disposal to provide the information they need to get this project approved. This information only provides their perspective and is not representative of many years of research across the world on issues and negative impacts from large industrial turbine facilities around residential neighborhoods.

Individuals who strongly appose this project can not be fairly represented given the time and financial requirements to successfully argue their case with factual evident. Simply put, without large sums of money, individual land owners can not be fairly represented and have their voices heard.

I am not opposed to wind or solar power, but this project will put an undue burden on residents who will receive no direct benefit. If someone wants their land used for turbines, that is their choice. But, for many working and living in the area, they will have no choice but to see and listen to the wind turbines.

I am asking the PUC to protect the citizens who will bear the brunt of this burden by denying this permit as written or at least requiring a minimum of a two-mile setback for non-participating land owners.