
From: PUC

Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 9:48 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: EL18-026

Ms. Kaufman,

Thank you for sharing your concerns regarding the Prevailing Wind docket currently pending before the commission.

Your letter and my response will be filed under Comments and Responses in docket EL18-026, <http://puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2018/EL18-026.aspx>, so my fellow commissioners and others may read them. Here is a link to the commission's Siting Info Guide on our website that you may find helpful: <http://puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/sitinghandout.pdf>.

Kristie Fiegen, Chairperson
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Christine Sawinsky [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 8:55 AM

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

Subject: [EXT] EL18-026

To whom it may concern,

Please post attached comment on docket EL18-026 Prevailing Winds.

Thank you,

Christine Sawinsky

[REDACTED]

Selby, SD 57473

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

As a resident of Walworth County that adopted the 2 mile set back, I have been watching the Prevailing winds docket closely. Part of the reason I believe our county commissioners did choose a 2 mile setback, was the lack of evidence on health effects/studies on current wind tower technology (i.e. larger towers). Many of the studies that the wind industry used, were paid for by pro-wind groups and were based on smaller towers. Evidence is important, but how can you truly prove what is safe or not, when wind turbines have recently doubled in height and megawatts produced. Also, why does every contract I have heard of, make the people who want them and believe them to be safe, sign a contract specifically stating that they cannot speak about health problems after they are built? If the problems don't exist....why do they exist in their contract? Big wind's story is that the people who don't like them are the only ones who have problems with them. That is easy to assert when a legal contract forbids those people that might have problems, from talking. Another reason Walworth County was able to provide a safe setback is because of our proximity to Campbell County. We had the ability to watch that project and what the impact was to our neighbors. One thing that caught our attention, was how the wind industry broke the state minimum setback law and instead of trying to make it right with the injured party, they tried to change the law in S.D. legislature. Because of people paying attention and contacting legislators, it did not pass. The wind industry did not care about safety. They cared about money. They rolled through Campbell County and almost rolled through the legislature. Please don't let their money and influence roll through the PUC. They don't care about safety now either...it's still all about the money. The PUC has to decide if money for the state coffers and bowing to "Big Wind" is more important than people's health, safety and welfare. I believe wind farms can still be built with 2 mile setbacks from non participants, and if they can't, then they have chosen a too highly populated area. Please deny the Prevailing Winds permit.

Christine Sawinsky
Walworth County Resident

From: PUC

Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 1:31 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: EL18-026

Ms. Sawinsky,

Thank you for sharing your concerns regarding the Prevailing Wind docket currently pending before the commission.

Your letter and my response will be filed under Comments and Responses in docket EL18-026, <http://puc.sd.gov/Dockets/Electric/2018/EL18-026.aspx>, so my fellow commissioners and others may read them. Here is a link to the commission's Siting Info Guide on our website that you may find helpful: <http://puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/sitinghandout.pdf>.

Kristie Fiegen, Chairperson
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov