

From: Lori & Sherm [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 4:55 PM
To: PUC-PUC <PUC@state.sd.us>
Subject: [EXT] EL 18-026

Dear Commissioners,

In the matter of the application for the permit for the Prevailing Wined Farm docket EL18-026, please deny the requested permit for said wind energy conversion facility.

It seems to me that the application fails to prove the second and third of the four provisions imposed upon the PUC by the state legislature.

It would seem from the many comments you have received concerning the local pheasant hunting industry that there would be no small economic impact due to negative effects on the environment. Not all of the actual land use has actually been properly identified as of this date, including native prairie remnants. How do you quantify “a threat of serious injury to the ... economic condition of inhabitants”? What parameters are used, what constitutes “serious”? How much “injury” is enough? Is the PUC, or more appropriately the state government, in a position to determine what businesses are better suited to an area than others?

Regarding “will not substantially impair the health, safety or welfare of the inhabitants”, what units are used to scientifically measure “substantially”? Has my family’s “health, safety or welfare” been somehow measured and quantified prior to construction of this wind energy conversion facility without us even knowing about it? And to what degree or standard can “health, safety and welfare” be diminished before it is “substantial”? Can I somehow measure this and admit it as empirical scientific evidence to be considered or do I just have to take the word of “wind energy experts” that it is okay? How do I measure the effect on my welfare and well-being of a horizon that will be in constant motion for nearly 300 degrees around? If constructed as proposed there will be five existing and twelve new windmills within two miles of our home, including six within one and a quarter miles. Thirty-five of the forty-eight “Beethoven” windmills are in view of our property. The majority of the proposed facility will be in view as well. What units do we use to measure that effect on our well-being?

Four members of our immediate family have doctored for ear problems in the last six months including myself for vertigo. As children, our now eighteen and nineteen year olds never had ear infections or problems. After three years of exposure to an industrial wind energy conversion facility, one really has to wonder how much can be coincidence when health problems of people near such facilities are being reported around the world. At the Oct. 19, 2017 Minnesota Senate Legislative Energy Commission hearing on wind energy and health, Dr. Alves-Periera testified that regarding health symptoms observed near turbines an alternate explanation would be to “believe there is a world-wide ‘collective hallucination’ shared by those experiencing the symptoms”. Minnesota Senator Matthews asked wind industry representatives if they were saying that people changing their attitudes and having a more positive attitude would actually give them a better night’s sleep leading to fewer health issues.

Although the politically correct crowd has a thirty year head start, more and more recent research in acoustics is casting serious doubt on the wind energy industry’s self-suggested standards for noise. Rather than relying only on the audible-only sound range of the A-weighted decibel scale, there are increasing calls for complete sound spectrum frequency analysis to uncover the total sound energy emitted by wind turbines and other low frequency sound and infrasound producing industries. Until such time as actual standards determined by someone other than wind industry proponents are established, would it not be prudent to at least slow down construction of these facilities? If the questionable economic and environmental benefits are actually tangible, will they not still be so in the future?

Regarding setbacks, should not the horizontal length of the rotor be accounted for rather than distance to the tower? A 450 foot diameter rotor takes 225 feet off of any setback. Should not all setbacks be measured from property lines rather residences? I spend a lot time on my property but not so much inside the house. What if I want to build my next house at the other end of my property? It might be within a few hundred yards of a windmill.


Regarding local support for this facility, there are twenty-four occupied residences by my count in Charles Mix County that would be in the footprint of the facility. Only seven of these residences are actually signed up to lease land to the facility. The tail seems to wag the dog!

It seems that the legislature has put the PUC in hard place with the use of terms like “substantial, injury and welfare”. Please consider this.

Please deny the permit requested in docket EL18-026.

Sincerely,

Sherman Fuerniss


Delmont, SD