

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

## IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION BY PREVAILING WIND PARK, LLC FOR A PERMIT FOR A WIND ENERGY FACILITY IN BON HOMME, CHARLES MIX, AND HUTCHINSON COUNTIES, SOUTH DAKOTA, FOR PREVAILING WIND PARK ENERGY FACILITY

**SD PUC DOCKET EL18-026** 

PRE-FILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF BRIDGET CANTY ON BEHALF OF PREVAILING WIND PARK, LLC

August 10, 2018

1	I.	INTRODUCTION
2		
3	Q.	Please state your name.
4	Α.	My name is Bridget Canty.
5		
6	Q.	Did you provide Direct Testimony in this docket on May 30, 2018?
7	Α.	Yes.
8		
9	Q.	What is the purpose of your Supplemental Direct Testimony?
10	Α.	I will address the following topics in my Supplemental Direct Testimony:
11		• An update regarding the wetland and cultural resource survey work for the
12		Prevailing Wind Park Project ("Project");
13		• Lisa Schoenfelder's comments at the July 12, 2018, public input meeting
14		regarding the identification of her residence; and
15		• The National Telecommunications and Information Administration's ("NTIA")
16		review of the Project.
17		
18	Q.	What exhibits are attached to your Supplemental Direct Testimony?
19	Α.	The following exhibit is attached to my Supplemental Direct Testimony:
20		• Exhibit 1: NTIA correspondence regarding the Project, dated June 7, 2018.
21		
22	II.	WETLAND AND CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY UPDATE
23		
24	Q.	In your Direct Testimony at page 4, you indicated that wetland field
25		delineations for the Project were "in process." Have wetland field delineations
26		now been completed?
27	Α.	Yes. Wetland field delineations were completed in June 2018 for the Project. Based
28		on these delineations, the Project will result in no permanent impacts to wetlands
29		and only approximately 18.5 acres of temporary impacts. Prevailing Wind Park will
30		utilize best management practices (such as the use of construction mats) to mitigate
31		potential temporary impacts.

Exhibit A13

32

## Q. In your Direct Testimony at page 4, you indicated that the cultural resources archaeological survey was pending. Do you have an update?

A. Yes. To date, the archaeological survey has included three mobilizations: June 11-15, June 18-27, and July 9-18, 2018. During those mobilizations, pedestrian field surveys were completed in all portions of the Project Area for which access was confirmed. Only one newly-documented archaeological site was identified; this site consists of a historic artifact scatter and foundations, and additional survey and shovel testing will be completed in this area during the next archaeological mobilization.

42

# 43 Q. Does Prevailing Wind Park intend to do additional cultural resources 44 archaeological survey?

- A. Yes. The next archaeological mobilization will focus on shovel testing at 16 areas,
  including the newly-documented archaeological site referenced above, consisting of
  approximately 39 acres (less than five percent of the Project Area). Prevailing Wind
  Park will continue to coordinate with the South Dakota Historic Preservation Office
  ("SHPO") regarding these surveys.
- 50

51 In addition, Prevailing Wind Park is coordinating with the Western Area Power 52 Administration ("WAPA") to support WAPA's compliance with Section 106 of the 53 National Historic Preservation Act. As part of the Section 106 process, Prevailing 54 Wind Park anticipates that certain interested tribes will conduct a Traditional Cultural 55 Properties survey in the Project Area this fall.

56

### 57 Q. Your Direct Testimony at page 5 also indicated that the historical/architectural 58 survey was pending. Do you have an update?

A. Yes. The historical/architectural survey is currently underway and is expected to be
completed in September 2018. Prevailing Wind Park will coordinate with SHPO
regarding this survey, as well.

62

2

63 64

#### 63 III. RESIDENCE IDENTIFICATION

Q. At the July 12, 2018, public input meeting, Ms. Lisa Schoenfelder noted that
 the Project maps did not include her residence in the vicinity. Have you
 investigated this issue?

68 A. Yes. Prevailing Wind Park recognizes that Ms. Schoenfelder's residence at 40228 69 296th Street, Wagner, South Dakota, was not identified in the maps submitted with 70 the Project's Application. However, we have determined that the owner of record of 71 Ms. Schoenfelder's residence was sent the required notice of the public input 72 hearing for Project. Ms. Schoenfelder's residence is approximately 4,200 feet away 73 from turbine 58, which is the nearest proposed turbine location to the residence. 74 Additionally, based on the shadow flicker level contours shown in Appendix G 75 (Shadow Flicker Duration Maps) to the Shadow Flicker Analysis report already 76 prepared for the Project, Ms. Schoenfelder's residence would experience less than 77 30 hours of shadow flicker per year from the Project. Also, based on Appendix D 78 (Sound Level Contours) to the Sound Study already prepared for the Project, sound 79 levels from the Project at Ms. Schoenfelder's residence would be less than 45 dBA. 80 Prevailing Wind Park continues to investigate the reason that Ms. Schoenfelder's 81 residence was not previously included, and will provide an update in further 82 testimony.

83

#### 84 IV. NTIA CORRESPONDENCE

85

# Q. On page 15-17 of the Application, it notes that Prevailing Wind Park submitted a notification to NTIA and expected a determination in early June 2018. Do you have an update?

A. Yes. In correspondence dated June 7, 2018, NTIA indicated that the Department of
Energy ("DOE") "identified concerns regarding blockage of their radio frequency
transmissions." A copy of the NTIA correspondence is attached as <u>Exhibit 3</u>. DOE
requested that Prevailing Wind Park coordinate with WAPA's Western Spectrum
Program Manager.

3

94	
95	Q. Has Prevailing Wind Park initiated coordination with WAPA?
96	A. Prevailing Wind Park has directed its consultant to coordinate with WAPA regarding
97	this issue. On August 8, the Project's consultant sent a letter via electronic mail to
98	WAPA's Western Spectrum Program Manager requesting additional review per the
99	NTIA response letter.
100	
101	V. CONCLUSION
102	
103	Q. Does this conclude your Supplemental Direct Testimony?
104	A. Yes.
105	
106 107	Dated this 10 <sup>th</sup> day of August, 2018.
108	
109	3. (WW
110	
111	Bridget Canty