
From: Alan Case [<mailto:aecase@comcast.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2018 6:20 PM
To: 'puc@state.sd.us'
Subject: Prevailing Winds Docket EL18-026

Please post the attached letter on the docket relating to the application of Prevailing Wind Park, LLC. This PDF is signed.

My email address is: aecase@comcast.net

The text of my letter without signature is below:

July 10, 2018

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

Re: EL18-026 - In the Matter of the Application by Prevailing Wind Park, LLC for a Permit of a Wind Energy Facility in Bon Homme County, Charles Mix County and Hutchinson County, South Dakota, for the Prevailing Wind Park Project

Dear Commissioners,

I own agricultural land in Charles Mix County. This land includes an acreage that contains a house and a tenant living in the house, along with farming and livestock facilities.

As a taxpayer in the county, and one who loves the pristine prairie landscape and wildlife of South Dakota, I am vehemently opposed to the Prevailing Wind Park project that is currently being considered for Charles Mix County. The application filed before the PUC for this project includes attachments that are non-conclusive and non-persuasive. The LLC can afford to hire consultants to create studies that support the project, without really saying anything. Is there expert critique of these studies? I don't see that there is. How can the landowners afford to pay for it?

Industrial wind farms are not about energy or a "green" environment. Wind farm LLC's are vehicles for investors to capitalize on government subsidies to make money. The lack of real energy benefits from wind is well known. Industrial wind farms are the result of tax incentives driven by global warming advocates, and investors who take advantage of the incentives. Few, if any, of these investors live where the turbines are located.

The detrimental effects of industrial wind farms are also well known, including health risks to the proximate population, damage to local wildlife, and reduction of real estate values. Moreover, large turbines are a blight on the landscape. I know the latter personally, because I also own agricultural land in Buena Vista County, Iowa. The large wind farm located there is nothing less than visual pollution in an area that previously was gorgeous Iowa farmland.

This letter is not intended to document these issues for the Commission. I am sure that the PUC is aware of the health, environmental and aesthetic downsides of wind turbines. And I am sure that the PUC is well aware of the information in regard thereto available online and elsewhere.

Rather, this letter is to state my opinion that wind farm turbines compromise the peace and wellbeing of the folks living nearby, and destroy the landscape that South Dakota is known for. And this destruction is for no purpose. These turbines only enrich investors and others who benefit financially.

I suggest the focus of your deliberations should be on South Dakota and the welfare of the landowners in the three counties that comprise the footprint of this project. Please focus on the application and review it critically, based on all the contrary information that is available, knowing that specific scientific critique to oppose the Prevailing Wind Park project is not available.

The Prevailing Wind Park project is not good for these three counties and industrial wind parks are not good for South Dakota. In light of the adverse effects on the population and real estate values, and lack of any real value to the environment or society in general, I urge the PUC to deny the permit to build this project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Alan Case
President, Nine Quarter Circle, Inc.
2950 Kingston Drive
Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089

July 10, 2018

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

Re: EL18-026 - In the Matter of the Application by Prevailing Wind Park, LLC for a Permit of a Wind Energy Facility in Bon Homme County, Charles Mix County and Hutchinson County, South Dakota, for the Prevailing Wind Park Project

Dear Commissioners,

I own agricultural land in Charles Mix County. This land includes an acreage that contains a house and a tenant living in the house, along with farming and livestock facilities.

As a taxpayer in the county, and one who loves the pristine prairie landscape and wildlife of South Dakota, I am vehemently opposed to the Prevailing Wind Park project that is currently being considered for Charles Mix County.

The application filed before the PUC for this project includes attachments that are non-conclusive and non-persuasive. The LLC can afford to hire consultants to create studies that support the project, without really saying anything. Is there expert critique of these studies? I don't see that there is. How can the landowners afford to pay for it?

Industrial wind farms are not about energy or a "green" environment. Wind farm LLC's are vehicles for investors to capitalize on government subsidies to make money. The lack of real energy benefits from wind is well known. Industrial wind farms are the result of tax incentives driven by global warming advocates, and investors who take advantage of the incentives. Few, if any, of these investors live where the turbines are located.

The detrimental effects of industrial wind farms are also well known, including health risks to the proximate population, damage to local wildlife, and reduction of real estate values. Moreover, large turbines are a blight on the landscape. I know the latter personally, because I also own agricultural land in Buena Vista County, Iowa. The large wind farm located there is nothing less than visual pollution in an area that previously was gorgeous Iowa farmland.

This letter is not intended to document these issues for the Commission. I am sure that the PUC is aware of the health, environmental and aesthetic downsides of wind turbines. And I am sure that the PUC is well aware of the information in regard thereto available online and elsewhere.

Rather, this letter is to state my opinion that wind farm turbines compromise the peace and wellbeing of the folks living nearby, and destroy the landscape that South Dakota is known for. And this destruction is for no purpose. These turbines only enrich investors and others who benefit financially.

I suggest the focus of your deliberations should be on South Dakota and the welfare of the landowners in the three counties that comprise the footprint of this project. Please focus on the application and

review it critically, based on all the contrary information that is available, knowing that specific scientific critique to oppose the Prevailing Wind Park project is not available.

The Prevailing Wind Park project is not good for these three counties and industrial wind parks are not good for South Dakota. In light of the adverse effects on the population and real estate values, and lack of any real value to the environment or society in general, I urge the PUC to deny the permit to build this project.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Alan Case
President, Nine Quarter Circle, Inc.
2950 Kingston Drive
Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089

From: South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
Sent: Tuesday, July 10, 2018 7:52 PM
To: PUC-DOCKET FILINGS
Subject: General Information

Last Name: Christensen

First Name: Todd

Company: retired

Address: [REDACTED]

City: Vermillion

State: SD

Zip: 57069

Phone: [REDACTED]

Fax:

Email: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am writing in support of the Prevailing Winds wind farm project. South Dakota has a huge opportunity to finally take advantage of a natural resource, our almost non-stop wind. The development of our wind resources will be comparable to what the ethanol industry has done for our state! Clean and green, free fuel to power our state and nation's energy grid!

From: PUC

Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2018 3:03 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: EL18-026

Mr. Christensen:

Thank you for your message regarding Prevailing Wind siting permit request, docket EL18-026.

Your message and my response will be posted in the open docket so my fellow commissioners and others may read them. Here is a link to the docket,

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2018/EL18-026.aspx>, and a link to the Siting Guide which helps explain the commission's processing of such dockets, <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/sitinghandout.pdf>.

I appreciate you sharing your views.

Kristie Fiegen, Chairperson

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

www.puc.sd.gov

From: Wallace Kost [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2018 2:57 PM

To: PUC-PUC <PUC@state.sd.us>

Subject: [EXT] Fwd: This email is to request to post public comments for the Prevailing Winds Docket EL 18-026

Just one quick update. My farmland is in Bon Homme County and located just east of the Highway 37 and Highway 46 intersection.

Wallace Kost

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Wallace Kost [REDACTED]

Date: Wed, Jul 11, 2018 at 11:14 AM

Subject: This email is to request to post public comments for the Prevailing Winds Docket EL 18-026

To: puc@state.sd.us

Please add my name to the list of those who oppose permitting this wind project. . Too many studies bare out the following concerning wind farms and this one will be no different.

- **Fragmentation of the land and resultant displacement of wildlife.** Given the number of wind farms established and those under consideration, the fragmentation effect must be expanded to cover the entire family of wind farms and not simply evaluating one wind farm at a time in a piecemeal fashion.

- **Killing of birds and bats which are important parts of the ecosystem.** These losses can translate into reduced production or an increased use of insecticides and pesticides to control insects. These measures carry with them additional environmental and health-related issues. The US Fish and Wildlife Service has been unable to provide me with baseline numbers of total bat losses because much of the reporting is voluntary. Whether or not a particular study, such as the one included in the application showing there were few bat passes, may only substantiate the fact that too many bats have already been killed. At a minimum, more study is required. Furthermore, these studies are based on a very short observation period. That, too, is unacceptable to me.

- **Insufficient wind turbine setbacks to alleviate health risks.** Studies show annoyance and lack of sleep are primary effects along with increased stress. The minimum setback to avoid these issues is 1.4 km.

- **Size of the footprint.** Wind energy companies attempt to minimize the impact by using only the small land surface area on which the turbine sits or the road leading to it. However, the impact area is much greater and extends outward from each turbine for miles; this could be characterized as "the area of annoyance." My senses are comprised of more than just hearing. If I can see it and it has a negative effect, it's an annoyance at a minimum. A single turbine can affect tens of thousands of acres. On a clear night, flashing lights are visible for miles. I wouldn't be surprised if a calculation showed that a single wind turbine affects 20-50 square miles and a wind farm hundreds, if not thousands, of square

miles. It is not okay to approve an annoyance of this nature which I cannot mitigate short of moving. Putting up a new barn 30'-50' high is one thing and fits in with the landscape. Putting up a single grain elevator 100'-200' usually captures one's attention but, because of its singular nature, can be overlooked. Putting up 300'-500' spinning turbines visible in every direction is entirely foreign.

Wallace Kost



Sedro Woolley, WA 98284



From: Gregg Hubner [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2018 12:39 PM

To: PUC-PUC <PUC@state.sd.us>

Subject: [EXT] public comment

Please post the attachment on Prevailing Winds Docket EL-18 026

--

Gregg C. Hubner

[REDACTED]

Avon, SD 57315

001384

A few months ago, when I heard Prevailing Winds forced Basin Electric to buy the electricity from the proposed project, and after seeing Prevailing Winds was bought out by SPower, all before WAPA was to finish their environmental assessment study, I got pretty depressed about any possibility that the PUC would deny this permit. So, I emailed the PUC staff and asked them if the Avon public input meeting, when it occurred would just be a charade, and all of this was already cut and dried. They assured me that it would not be a charade and that they would be working overtime to assure everybody got a fair opportunity in this process. I was ok with that answer. Then a few weeks ago the Governor gave SPower, owner of Prevailing Winds 4.3 million dollars of economic development (taxpayer) money. This is all very troubling.

Two years ago, in August, the PUC held a similar meeting for the same project in Avon. After a lot of opposition, a week or so later PW withdrew their project, saying “the motion to withdraw the application cited misinformation surrounding the project. The organizers said they plan to better inform the community on the wind project and allow Prevailing Winds to revisit their options regarding the project” (Yankton Press and Dakotan). They also said in that article that they would not break up the project into smaller units. But in December 2016 they formed 13 different LLC’s and did break up the project. They had no public information meetings.

I knew the reason that they pulled their application was because they saw 65 names as party status, and these were names that they thought they would sign up for easements but found out these people were not going to sign up, in fact they would oppose them in Pierre at a future hearing. I spelled this out in my book “Paradise Destroyed” on page 72.

But after 2 years, they finally admitted the truth, on page 5, lines 133-137 of James Damon ‘s testimony in the present application, they stated they didn’t have the land signed up they needed, nor did they have a buyer for the electricity.

So, we see that the whole meeting in August of 2016 was about a bluff. The map was a bogus map, the projections of money were bogus, and the tower locations were bogus. It was all a bluff. (Pages 73-75 Paradise Destroyed). They were bluffing the community, the county officials and the PUC. Now they are coming back again. Is there any more reason to believe them now than two years ago?

When raising my children, I tried to give them some moral training. I have told them “If you always tell the truth, I can always trust you, but lie to me once and I can never trust you again.”

That statement really hit home when I listened to the Crocker Wind Farm people lie under oath more than once, but at the hearing when they got their permit approved, I heard the Commission say to them “I am going to give them the benefit of the doubt”.

So, put yourself in our shoes. All we are trying to do is save our homes and quality of life. And who is watching out for us? I would like to think at some point we, the residents and taxpayers should get the “benefit of the doubt”, not the multinational corporations that build and use these wind projects for tax shelters.

One thing is certain. I think the PUC knows a whole lot more about wind energy since August of 2016. And each public input meeting and evidentiary hearing brings more truth out and puts a human face on what is really happening. I just hope the PUC doesn’t wake up too late to all the negative effects on people that these giant turbines produce. The wind industry puts confidentiality clauses and neighbor agreements in contracts for a reason: To prevent people from complaining about the ill effects of living near a wind turbine. Your decisions on these projects are going to affect people’s lives for a long, long time. I hope the PUC yearns to learn more and puts people before money, taxes, and before politics.

Gregg Hubner



Avon, SD 57315