

South Dakota PCU

I am Jeff Kalo, a land owner in woodland township Clark County that is contained in and surround by the proposed industrial windmill project.

I began purchasing land in this area in 2006 for the purpose of establishing a conservation heritage for my family and future generations. I have witnessed significant loss of grassland/ wetland habitat. Now, with a proposed industrial windmill project a significant loss of value of the land and home we have constructed.

Make no mistake; this is an industrial project in an agricultural and rural residential setting. Geronimo energy had started with proposed +/-

70 turbine project that evolved, changed positions, then directions and finally ended up with proposed 219 turbines without consideration of private landowners homes, airstrips, telecommunications, and easements.

Geronimo energy initially indicated they were not interested in grassland or wetland easement ground

but wanted landowners to sign off on tower positions with adjacent land to eliminate any challenge to tower location. Geronimo even suggesting to me that local financial institutions were pushing for this project in lieu of farm credit.

Geronimo energy is now pursuing placement of industrial turbines on easements that were designed for the sole purpose of protection of the grassland/wetland and the wildlife benefit that they were designed. They have done this without knowledge of the USFWS environmental impact studies which will not be finished until March of 2018.

An industrial project of this size and configuration has not been seen/studied within the Central Flyway and this close to a waterfowl rest area. (Reid Lake)
Currently there are NO turbines operating in northeast South Dakota on easements, but this project could include 35 plus turbines on protected lands. Biologists and common sense would suggest that gravel rounds, a 500 foot tower and the ground disturbance during the construction and maintenance of turbines will diminish the implied reason behind the easement in the first place.

There are no studies within the Central Flyway to document the impact of this size of project with 219 proposed turbines turning during the annual spring and fall migration. Geronimo has stated in public meetings that turbines do not affect migration patterns. How can they make these statements about a project of which they have not seen in size in a critical waterfowl transition area? With the majority of migration birds moving at night how will they measure its effect before the project has been built?

Geronimo has suggested that there are no eagles that travel through this corridor. The same day they made that statement; 5 federally protected eagles were sitting on the ice less than 1 mile east of Clark city limits. I have personally witnessed more than 70 eagles sitting on Reid Lake during the fall migration. Who is doing Geronimo's environmental studies?

How is it that Geronimo energy has changed course in pursuing easement ground? One needs only to look at our own elected officials and see each current representative has received financial support from some component of the wind industry.

Now Geronimo energy wants to change the easement rules for their own benefit. Each of these contracts has NO provision for any buildings or road construction. The rules for these same easements limit use during the nesting season; will Geronimo energy limit their activity during this time or turn off the turbines at the same time the remaining easement owners have to stay within the rules that were set at the time the contract was signed.

It appears Geronimo energy clearly wants to change the rules to their benefit. Why is it Geronimo is in such a rush to get their towers placed before gathering important information? The answer is clearly financial; knowing there is a 20% reduction in the federal payment and a continued decrease each year an additional by 20%, Geronimo is not interested in finding facts but in finding additional federal funding.

Please consider the purpose of these easements when considering Geronimo energy's application. Many people in this and other states have contributed financially to make these easements possible (my family included) and to allow this program exist. I would suggest few if any of the contributors would

agree an industrial wind tower to be beneficial to the land or wildlife.

My selfish issue is with land value and associated real estate value loss by proximity to the Industrial turbines.

Please read the enclosed documentation that list multiple studies in both the united states and United Kingdom that show value loss that approaches 40% , IF the property can be sold.

Personal communication with Mossy oaks properties has echoed the negative property value of MC Cann Appraisal and Sotheby's International Realty. Mossy oak has suggested the property may not have resale value to wildlife enthusiasts with turbine proximity.

Geronimo energy has on multiple occasions stated that land values do not diminish but may actually increase. This appears to almost laughable unless you have a home within the footprint area. What if I want to develop my land for future home sites or have one of my family members decide to have a recreational or

retirement home in this proposed area? This is no way anyone would build within the area of industrial turbines creating constant noise, vibration and loss of value the day their project is finished.

This process by default will eliminate future tax growth on property improvements. Listed studies also demonstrate a potential loss of taxation on future growth beyond the lifespan of the wind turbines. Will monies gained in the short term by wind energy be offset by lack of future growth and loss of community within the impact area?

How will the real estate value of these lands be fairly assessed? Has Geronimo accounted for this loss of property value and the lack of taxation in its financial windfall for the "community"?

Will land with wind turbines have increased taxation because of the "improvement" on the property?

I believe common sense would suggest that any home built within the turbine area including my own would not have been constructed in the recent past and these same turbines would essentially eliminate further home sites and make current homes value so poor as to demand taxation relief. This process has

been referred to inverse condemnation; relegating property values by virtue of neighboring landowners taking property rights by the physical changes in appearance or negative value of caused by these changes.

An interesting concept has taken place in local states (ILLINOIS) where wind turbine companies have had to purchase bonding to compensate non participating land owners for value loss. If Geronimo truly believes that land value does not change, this concept should be easily acceptable as there would be minimal business expense with a 2 MILE impact area.

Non participants have never heard of these proposals from a company who says they have "worked" with landowners, if they chose not to sign a contract with Geronimo.

Geronimo does not care about local land or real estate values.

Their only goal is cheap land acquisition, place subsidized towers as quickly as possible to achieve maximum federal payment. They are asking for an open box to place towers without environmental

impact knowledge, changes in land value to adjacent landowners and consideration of the community.

The PCU should demand Geronimo should have planned better, established better relationships with surrounding neighbors, and protected the environment in lieu of profits.

This project has too many holes and questions to be accepted and should be denied until these issues can be resolved including potential litigation against local government officials.

Thank you,

Jeff Kalo`

Nevada journal.com 2013/04/02 wind-farm-could –
reduce =propertys-values-25-60-percent

WWW.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2117429/wind-farms -DO hit -hosueprices-government agency admits
thousands wiped value homes

www.scribd.com/doc/23858538/Ago -Wind-Turbine-
Property-Value-Impact-Study

[www.thestar.com/business/2012/11/01/antiwind law suits stacking up in ontario](http://www.thestar.com/business/2012/11/01/antiwind_law_suits_stacking_up_in_ontario)

http://papers.ssm.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2114216