

**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 EL-18-026**

**PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF BRIDGET CANTY  
ON BEHALF OF PREVAILING WIND PARK, LLC**

September 26, 2018

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2

3 **Q. Please state your name.**

4 A. My name is Bridget Canty.

5

6 **Q. Did you provide Direct Testimony in this Docket?**

7 A. Yes. I submitted Direct Testimony on May 30, 2018. I also submitted Supplemental  
8 Direct Testimony on August 10, 2018.

9

10 **Q. What is the purpose of your Rebuttal Testimony?**

11 A. The purpose of my Rebuttal Testimony is to provide updates to my Supplemental  
12 Direct Testimony concerning the following:

- 13 • The status of Prevailing Wind Park Project (“Project”) environmental  
14 surveys/studies;
- 15 • The status of the Environmental Assessment (“EA”) being prepared in  
16 conjunction with Western Area Power Administration’s (“WAPA”) review of  
17 the Project’s interconnection to WAPA facilities;
- 18 • Prevailing Wind Park, LLC’s (“Prevailing Wind Park”) re-review of potential  
19 residences within and near the Project area;
- 20 • Small shifts of two turbines locations, one to meet the property line  
21 setback with the taller turbine, and another to avoid a microwave beam  
22 path.

23

24 **Q. Are there any exhibits attached to your Rebuttal Testimony?**

25 A. The following exhibits are attached to my Rebuttal Testimony:

- 26 • Exhibit 1: Burns & McDonnell Memorandum, Potential House Field  
27 Review
- 28 • Exhibit 2: Revised Layout.

29

30 **II. UPDATES TO SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY**

31

32 **Q. In your Supplemental Direct Testimony at page 2, you indicated that Prevailing**  
33 **Wind Park intended to do additional archaeological field survey work as part**  
34 **of WAPA’s Section 106 process. Do you have an update?**

35 A. Yes. Since my Supplemental Direct Testimony, all pedestrian surveys have been  
36 completed for archaeological resources. During the three archaeological  
37 mobilizations, one newly documented archaeological site (field number PWND-D13-  
38 001) was identified. Site PWND-D13-001 consists of a historic artifact scatter and  
39 foundations identified during the pedestrian survey of the collection line and  
40 alternative crane path to Turbine 64. Additional survey and shovel testing will be  
41 completed in this area during the next archaeological mobilization. South Dakota  
42 State site forms will be completed for this site and submitted to the South Dakota  
43 Archaeological Research Center (“SDARC”).

44

45 The next archaeological mobilization will occur following the completion of the  
46 Yankton Tribal Historic Preservation Office (“THPO”) Traditional Cultural Properties  
47 (“TCP”) survey. The Yankton Sioux Tribe (“YST”) began surveying for TCPs on  
48 September 24, 2018 and is expected to conclude surveys in late October or early  
49 November of this year. The next mobilization will focus on subsurface testing (shovel  
50 testing) at locations that do not contain TCP sites and areas that were not  
51 adequately reviewed by pedestrian survey due to limited ground surface visibility. A  
52 total of 16 areas within the Project area have been identified for subsurface testing  
53 pending the results of the TCP survey.

54

55 Prevailing Wind Park does not expect that the surveying will result in the need to  
56 shift turbines. However, if archaeological surveys or TCP surveys identify sensitive  
57 resources, Prevailing Wind Park will avoid impacts by moving Project infrastructure  
58 where practicable. If complete avoidance is not practicable, Prevailing Wind Park will  
59 work with SHPO to minimize and mitigate impacts.

60

61 **Q. In your Supplemental Direct Testimony at page 2, you indicated that a**  
62 **historical/architectural survey was currently underway. Do you have an**  
63 **update?**

64 A. Yes. Prevailing Wind Park's cultural resources consultant recently completed the  
65 historical/architectural survey. During the survey, 324 properties were analyzed.  
66 One National Register of Historic Places ("NRHP")-listed property was identified.  
67 Sixteen (16) properties were identified that were recommended eligible for the  
68 NRHP. Of those 16 properties, two were fully accessed. The remaining 14 are  
69 assumed eligible for the NRHP because they are not visible from public right-of-way  
70 and right of entry was not obtained. A draft report summarizing the results is  
71 expected by mid-November and will be submitted to the State Historic Preservation  
72 Office for review and concurrence.

73

74 **Q. What is the status of WAPA's environmental review of the Project?**

75 A. Prevailing Wind Park expects that WAPA will issue the draft EA this fall.

76

77 **Q. In your Supplemental Direct Testimony at page 3, you stated that Prevailing**  
78 **Wind Park was continuing to investigate the omission of Ms. Schoenfelder's**  
79 **residence on Project figures. Do you have an update?**

80 A. Yes. As discussed in Prevailing Wind Park's response to Staff Data Request 1-2,  
81 the inhabited status of dwellings was first determined in 2016. As I understand it, at  
82 this time, the inhabited status of dwellings was determined by (1) reviewing aerial  
83 photography to determine location of residences in and around the Project footprint;  
84 (2) reviewing aerials and drawing on local knowledge of the area to determine  
85 obvious occupied residences; (3) field verifying dwellings with indeterminate status;  
86 (4) contacting landowners to verify occupancy status; and (5) using tax rolls to  
87 determine ownership and addresses of residences.

88

89 This year, on behalf of Prevailing Wind Park, Burns & McDonnell undertook a  
90 verification process that was just completed to ensure that inhabited residences

91 within the Project area and within a one-half mile of the Project (“Verification Area”)  
92 were accounted for.

93

94 **Q. What verification process did Burns & McDonnell undertake?**

95 A. The verification process is described in the September 22, 2018 memorandum from  
96 Burns & McDonnell, which is attached as **Exhibit 1**. Generally, Burns & McDonnell  
97 first reviewed aerial imagery to identify potential additional occupied residences  
98 within the Verification Area. That effort resulted in 28 potential structures. Two  
99 representatives of Burns & McDonnell then spent two days in South Dakota to  
100 evaluate the status of the 28 locations.

101

102 **Q. What were the results of Burns & McDonnell’s work?**

103 A. Burns & McDonnell identified one additional potential occupied residence in the field  
104 (for a total of 29 structures), which was also further evaluated. Of the 29 structures,  
105 Burns & McDonnell determined that there were nine additional occupied residences,  
106 including the Schoenfelder property in Wagner, within the Verification Area. Four of  
107 the additional occupied residences are located in the Project Area; five are outside  
108 the Project Area. The distances from the additional occupied residences to the  
109 nearest turbine range from 2,427 to 12,865 feet. This brings the total occupied  
110 residences in the Verification Area to 146.

111

112 **Q. How is Prevailing Wind Park using the results of the Burns & McDonnell  
113 review?**

114 A. Prevailing Wind Park directed Burns & McDonnell to conduct updated shadow flicker  
115 and sound analyses that included these receptors. The results of those analyses  
116 are provided in the rebuttal testimony of Chris Howell and Aaron Anderson.

117

118 **Q. Has Prevailing Wind Park made any changes to the Project based on the  
119 review of potential occupied residences?**

120 A. Yes. In the review, we identified an occupied residence within 900 feet of turbine  
121 location T19. While the turbine location could meet all applicable setback, shadow

122 flicker and sound requirements, and the residence is owned by a participating  
123 landowner, Prevailing Wind Park decided to eliminate this turbine location due to its  
124 proximity to an occupied residence. With the removal of this location, the closest  
125 turbine to an occupied residence is 1,556 feet (T61).

126

127 **Q. Please describe the two minor turbine shifts that Prevailing Wind Park has**  
128 **made.**

129 A. As Peter Pawlowski testified in his Rebuttal Testimony, the GE3.8-137 is being  
130 modified with a taller hub to allow the transformer to be housed within the turbine.  
131 That modification increases the total system height to 590 feet, 5.5 inches. This  
132 results in a minimum setback from property lines of non-participating landowners of  
133 649.61 feet. To meet this setback requirement, a shift of turbine location T38, which  
134 was 647 feet away from the nearest non-participating property line, was required.  
135 We moved it 10 feet to the west away from the property line, bringing the setback to  
136 657 feet.

137

138 The second move was for turbine location T40, 50 feet to the north. This move was  
139 coordinated with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to  
140 ensure no conflict with microwave beam paths.

141

142 The removal of T19 and the two minor turbine shifts were evaluated in the Project's  
143 updated shadow flicker and noise analyses I referenced above. **Exhibit 2** shows the  
144 revised Project layout that includes the additional nine occupied residences, reflects  
145 the two turbine shifts, and notes the removal of T19.

146

147

148 **III. CONCLUSION**

149

150 **Q. Does this conclude your Rebuttal Testimony?**

151 A. Yes.

152

153 Dated this 26th day of September, 2018.

154

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. Canty", is written above a horizontal line.

155

156 Bridget Canty

157

158

159 64841916