

JoAnne Blank Direct Testimony, Ex. A_____

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

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION BY DEUEL HARVEST WIND ENERGY LLC
FOR ENERGY FACILITY PERMITS OF A WIND ENERGY FACILITY AND A
345-KV TRANSMISSION LINE IN DEUEL COUNTY, SOUTH DAKOTA FOR THE
DEUEL HARVEST NORTH WIND FARM**

SD PUC DOCKET NO. _____

**PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JOANNE BLANK
ON BEHALF OF DEUEL HARVEST WIND ENERGY LLC**

November 30, 2018

1 **I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS**

2 **Q. Please state your name, employer, and business address.**

3 A. My name is JoAnne Blank. I am a senior scientist and project manager in the
4 energy market sector at Stantec Consulting Services Inc. ("Stantec"). My
5 business address is 1165 Scheuring Road, De Pere, Wisconsin 54115.

6 **Q. Briefly describe your educational and professional background and your
7 current work for Stantec.**

8 A. I have a Bachelor of Science degree in Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, a
9 Master of Science degree in Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, and a Master
10 of Science degree in Environmental Monitoring. I have more than 20 years of
11 professional experience and have been with Stantec for 8.5 years.

12 I specialize in feasibility, permitting and compliance of power and renewable
13 energy projects across the United States. I have been involved in the design and
14 permitting of more than 3.0 gigawatts of wind and other renewable energy
15 projects. My project and management experience include federal, state and local
16 permitting, feasibility analyses, expert witness testimony, project siting,
17 shadow/flicker analyses, sound studies, environmental permitting, NEPA
18 documents (EA and EIS), CPCN and CA applications, FAA permits, preliminary
19 engineering design, Phase I site assessments, property surveys, erosion control
20 plans, geospatial information analysis and management, and post-construction
21 compliance. I also have management experience with contractors, utilities,
22 regulatory agencies and energy developers that has provided me with a broad
23 understanding of the processes and requirements necessary for the successful
24 development, monitoring and post-construction compliance of energy projects. A
25 copy of my curriculum vitae is provided as Exhibit 1.

26 **Q. What is Stantec’s role with respect to the Deuel Harvest North Wind Farm**
27 **(“Project”)?**

28 A. Stantec was retained by Deuel Harvest Wind Energy LLC (“Deuel Harvest”) to
29 conduct a shadow flicker study for the Project. I conducted shadow flicker
30 modeling for the Project’s proposed layout and prepared the associated shadow
31 flicker analysis, which is provided in Appendix F of the Project’s Application for
32 Facility Permits (“Application”).

33 **II. OVERVIEW**

34 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

35 A. The purpose of my testimony is to discuss the methodology and the results of the
36 shadow flicker modeling conducted for the Project.

37 **Q. Please identify which sections of the Application you are sponsoring for**
38 **the record.**

39 A. I am sponsoring the following sections of the Application:

- 40 • Section 15.5: Shadow Flicker
- 41 • Appendix F: Shadow Flicker Study

42
43 **III. SHADOW FLICKER AND APPLICABLE STANDARDS**

44 **Q. Could you please explain what shadow flicker is?**

45 A. Yes. Shadow flicker is a term used to describe the intermittent change in the
46 intensity of light cast on an area resulting from the rotation of an operating wind
47 turbine’s blades. When the wind turbine blades rotate and pass in front of the
48 sun, a flickering or flashing effect may occur when the shadows of the rotating
49 blades cause alternating changes in light intensity at a given stationary location,
50 a receptor, such as the window of a home.

51 Shadow flicker occurs only under very specific conditions. For example, shadow
52 flicker only occurs during the day-time, when skies are not overcast or cloudy.
53 Turbines must be operational, as the flicker effect is caused by rotation of the

54 blades as they intercept the sunlight cast on a receptor. When a turbine is not
55 operating, it may cast a stationary shadow, similar to the shadow cast by other
56 objects such as trees or utility poles. Shadow flicker does not occur when the
57 sun-angle is less than three degrees above the horizon, due to atmospheric
58 diffusion.

59 The presence and intensity of shadow flicker are dependent on many factors,
60 including but not limited to the position of the sun in relation to the turbine and
61 receptor, distance of receptor from turbine, physical characteristics of the turbine
62 and blades, time of day, season of year and topography of the Project area. The
63 amount of shadow flicker received in an area is dependent on the alignment of
64 the rotor blades in relation to the sun and receptor. Maximum shadow flicker is
65 received when both the sun and rotor plane are perpendicular to the receptor.
66 This alignment occurs when the wind is blowing directly from a source turbine
67 towards a receptor. At times when the wind is blowing from other directions, the
68 shadow cast on the target receptor is diminished and the shadow flicker effect
69 passes more quickly.

70 The total number of hours that turbines may cause shadow flicker is also
71 dependent on time that the turbine is operational (i.e., blades turning). The total
72 number of hours that turbines are able to cause shadow flicker takes into account
73 non-operational time due to low or high wind speeds. The turbine type that
74 Deuel Harvest proposes to use will generally operate when winds at hub-height
75 are between 3 meters per second ("m/s") and 20 m/s.

76 Shadow flicker also diminishes as the distance between the source turbine and
77 receptor increases. It is generally accepted that between a distance of
78 approximately 10 times the rotor diameter and 1,500 meters (4,921 feet), the
79 flicker effect is less pronounced due to dissipation and the relative ratio of the
80 turbine blade to the sun disk area. Shadow flicker becomes nearly imperceptible
81 beyond approximately 1,500 meters (4,921 feet).

82 **Q. Are you aware of any federal, state, or local shadow flicker regulations for**
83 **wind energy facilities located in South Dakota?**

84 A. Shadow flicker is not currently regulated in applicable state or federal law.
85 However, Deuel County's Zoning Ordinance limits shadow flicker from wind
86 turbines.

87 **Q. Please describe Deuel County's shadow flicker requirement for wind**
88 **energy facilities to be located in that county.**

89 A. Pursuant to Section 1215 of Deuel County's Zoning Ordinance, shadow flicker at
90 permanent residential dwellings may not exceed 30 hours annually.

91 **IV. SHADOW FLICKER ANALYSIS**

92 **Q. Was the Shadow Flicker Study provided as Appendix F to the Application**
93 **prepared by you or under your supervision and control?**

94 A. Yes.

95 **Q. What was the purpose of the shadow flicker modeling and analysis**
96 **discussed in the Shadow Flicker Study?**

97 A. The purpose of the Shadow Flicker Study was to estimate the potential annual
98 frequency of shadow flicker associated with the operation of the Project wind
99 turbines and to assess compliance with the shadow requirements of the Deuel
100 County Zoning Ordinance.

101 Modeling was completed for the two turbine models proposed by Deuel Harvest:
102 General Electric ("GE") 2.82-127 (2.8 megawatt ("MW")) and GE 2.3-116 (2.3
103 MW). The modeling was completed assuming 111 GE 2.82-127 turbines and 13
104 GE 2.3-116 turbines. Although up to 112 turbines are expected to be installed,
105 modeling was conducted at all 124 potential turbine locations of the proposed
106 configuration to ensure that any location selected has been considered in the
107 shadow flicker analysis and represented in the results of such analysis.
108 Modeling was done to assess shadow flicker durations at 231 potential receptors

109 (i.e., inhabited residences) located within approximately 1.25 miles of
110 representative turbine locations.

111 **Q. Could you provide an overview of the methodology used in conducting the**
112 **shadow flicker modeling?**

113 A. I used WindPRO's Version 3.1 Shadow Module software to predict the expected
114 amount of shadow flicker. WindPRO is an industry-accepted modeling program
115 that calculates the number of hours per year that any given receptor will receive
116 shadow flicker from the source turbines. The results provided by WindPRO
117 include the number of annual hours that shadow flicker is expected to occur at
118 each receptor, given the climatological conditions of the area. Climatological
119 information was acquired from the National Climatic Data Center regional
120 meteorological stations.

121 The WindPRO software considers the attributes and positions of the wind
122 turbines in relation to receptors within the area. The shadow flicker calculation
123 also considers the percentage of sunshine based on local regional sunshine
124 statistics; the alignment of the blades in relation to the receptor due to wind
125 direction; and the amount of time that the blades would not be rotating due to
126 wind speeds outside of the turbines operating parameters. The percentage of
127 sunshine probability was estimated from an analysis of average sunshine
128 statistics for the Huron, South Dakota weather station. The modeling used a 90
129 percent operational-time, based on available Project-specific wind data, for
130 purposes of calculating the potential expected hours of shadow flicker. Wind
131 data was acquired at on-site meteorological towers.

132 The modeling was completed for two different turbine models, the GE 2.82-127
133 and the GE 2.3-116, assuming 111 GE 2.82-127 turbines and 13 GE 2.3-116
134 turbines. The GE 2.82-127 turbines were modeled with an 88.6-meter (290-foot)
135 hub height and a rotor diameter of 127 meters (416 feet). The GE 2.3-116
136 turbines were modeled with an 80-meter (262-foot) hub height and a 116-meter
137 (380.6-foot) rotor diameter. The model input parameters include inhabited,

138 permanent residences within approximately 1.25 miles (approximately 2,000
139 meters) of representative turbine locations.

140 **Q. What assumptions were included in your model?**

141 A. The modeling was performed using a conservative approach with Project site-
142 specific conditions. For example, the model utilizes a “greenhouse” approach
143 which defines each receptor as a one meter glass cube, representing a window
144 able to receive shadow from all directions. This means that each receptor was
145 modeled as having windows on all sides and effectively causing the home to be
146 susceptible to flicker effects in all directions. The model also accounts for
147 topography.

148 Obstacles located between a receptor and a turbine, such as vegetation or
149 buildings, may reduce or eliminate the duration and/or intensity of shadow flicker.
150 Our analyses were performed using conservative model inputs and do not
151 include the blocking of shadow flicker due to vegetation or other obstacles.
152 Obstacles such as barns, garages or silos may further reduce the effect of
153 shadow flicker on an individual receptor.

154 Shadow flicker is widely considered imperceptible beyond 1,500 meters (4,921
155 feet), which is less than the 1.25-mile (approximately 2,000-meter) study distance
156 used in the model. Further, the model conservatively analyzed the impact at all
157 distances when more than 20 percent of the sun would be covered by a turbine
158 blade.

159 Further, the results discussed in the Shadow Flicker Study assume that wind
160 turbines at all 124 potential turbine locations are operational. However, Deuel
161 Harvest is proposing to construct 112 of the 124 sites included in the model;
162 therefore, the overall expected shadow from the final 112-turbine Project will be
163 less than the predicted shadow flicker of 124 turbines summarized in the Shadow
164 Flicker Study.

165 **Q. Could you summarize the results of the shadow flicker modeling?**

166 A. The majority of residences within the area of analysis are expected to receive
167 between 0 and 10 hours of shadow flicker each year. Of the 231 potential
168 receptors analyzed, none is expected to receive more than 30 shadow hours
169 annually. The expected hours of shadow on many receptors will be less than
170 predicted, as not all the potential turbines will be constructed. Due to the
171 conservative approach of the analysis, the actual duration and intensity of
172 shadow flicker experienced at each receptor is expected to be less than those
173 reported in the Shadow Flicker Study.

174
175 **Q. Based on the results of the shadow flicker analysis set forth in the Study,
176 will the Project comply with the Deuel County shadow flicker limit?**

177 A. Yes, even using the conservative modeling methodology described above, the
178 Project is not projected to result in shadow flicker levels above 30 hours per year
179 at any residential inhabited building. Therefore, the Project will comply with the
180 Deuel County ordinance.

181 **V. CONCLUSION**

182 **Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?**

183 A. Yes.

184 Dated this 30th day of November, 2018.

185


186 JoAnne Blank
187
188 65213445