

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION BY CROCKER WIND FARM, LLC FOR A  
PERMIT FOR A WIND ENERGY FACILITY AND A 345 KV TRANSMISSION LINE  
IN CLARK COUNTY, SOUTH DAKOTA, FOR CROCKER WIND FARM

SD PUC DOCKET EL-17-055

PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF MELISSA SCHMIT  
ON BEHALF OF CROCKER WIND FARM, LLC

April 13, 2018

1 **I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS**

2

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

4 A. My name is Melissa Schmit. I am the Senior Permitting Specialist at Geronimo  
5 Energy, LLC (“Geronimo”), located at 7650 Edinborough Way, Suite 725, Edina,  
6 Minnesota.

7

8 **Q. Briefly describe your educational and professional background.**

9 A. I hold a Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies and Geography from Gustavus  
10 Adolphus College and a Juris Doctor from Hamline University School of Law. I have  
11 ten years of experience permitting various infrastructure at the local, state, and  
12 federal level. A copy of my curriculum vitae is provided as **Exhibit 1**.

13

14 **Q. Did you provide Direct Testimony in this Docket on December 15, 2017?**

15 A. No.

16

17 **II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

18

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

20 A. The purpose of my Rebuttal Testimony is to address statements made in the prefiled  
21 Direct Testimony of Sheldon Stevens regarding Comsearch studies and related  
22 communications with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration  
23 (“NOAA”), National Telecommunications and Information Administration (“NTIA”),  
24 and Western Area Power Administration (“WAPA”); alleged impacts on the social  
25 condition of the community; coordination with South Dakota Game Fish and Parks  
26 (“GFP”); and statements regarding Project accessibility. I will also address  
27 comments made in the Direct Testimony of Tom Kirschenmann regarding potential  
28 mitigation considerations, and comments made in the Direct Testimony of Darren  
29 Kearney regarding turbine flexibility.

30

31 **Q. What exhibits are attached to your Rebuttal Testimony?**

- 1 A. The following exhibits are attached to my testimony:  
2 • **Exhibit 1**: Curriculum Vitae  
3 • **Exhibit 2**: Microwave Study Report  
4 • **Exhibit 3**: Communication Tower Study  
5 • **Exhibit 4**: Land Mobile & Emergency Services Report  
6 • **Exhibit 5**: AM and FM Radio Report  
7 • **Exhibit 6**: Off-Air TV Analysis  
8 • **Exhibit 7**: Constraints Maps  
9

10 **III. COMSEARCH STUDY AND RELATED COMMUNICATIONS**  
11

12 **Q. In his testimony, Mr. Stevens takes issue with the Comsearch Study**  
13 **conducted for the Project because it did not include specific turbine locations**  
14 **and did not include the current Project boundary (see In. 124-148). Has an**  
15 **updated Comsearch study been conducted for the current Project**  
16 **configuration and boundary?**

17 A. Yes. Although it is not typical for turbine locations to be provided for a Comsearch  
18 study, Crocker provided the current configuration and Project boundary to  
19 Comsearch and requested updated microwave path and communication tower  
20 studies. The updated studies are attached to my testimony as Exhibit 2 and Exhibit  
21 3, respectively. In addition, we asked Comsearch to conduct land  
22 mobile/emergency services, AM/FM radio, and television reception studies, which  
23 are attached as Exhibit 4, Exhibit 5, and Exhibit 6, respectively.  
24

25 **Q. Could you please discuss the results of the updated microwave path study?**

26 A. The Microwave Study identified 120 microwave paths intersecting the Crocker Wind  
27 Farm ("Project") Area. The Fresnel Zones of the microwave paths were calculated  
28 and mapped. Turbine 155 was found to intersect the two dimensional Fresnel Zone  
29 of one microwave path. Based on a cross sectional analysis, the turbine will clear  
30 the microwave path if it is built with the minimum blade size and maximum hub  
31 height. If not, the turbine location has a risk of obstructing the microwave path and

1 potentially causing signal degradation. Turbine 7 was found to be sited close to, but  
2 not within, an existing path.

3  
4 **Q. How will Crocker ensure the two turbines identified do not obstruct microwave**  
5 **paths?**

6 A. Crocker will shift turbine 155 within the existing survey corridor if the dimensions of  
7 the final turbine selected would cause interference. Additionally, per the Comsearch  
8 recommendation, caution will be taken if turbine 7 requires adjustment to ensure the  
9 turbine does not intersect the beam path.

10  
11 **Q. Could you please discuss the results of the updated communication tower**  
12 **study?**

13 A. The Communication Tower Study identified three tower structures and ten  
14 communication antennas within or near the Project Area. These structures and  
15 antennas are used for microwave, TV, and land mobile services. The report  
16 recommended an impact assessment should be performed for each service type,  
17 which Crocker has completed.

18  
19 **Q. Could you please summarize the results of the land mobile/emergency**  
20 **services study?**

21 A. The Land Mobile and Emergency Services Study indicated the Project is not  
22 anticipated to adversely impact first responder, industrial/business land mobile sites,  
23 area-wide public safety, or commercial E-911 communications. Each network is  
24 designed to operate reliably in a non-line-of-sight environment and many land mobile  
25 systems are designed with multiple base transmitter stations that cover a large  
26 geographic area with overlap between adjacent transmitter sites in order to provide  
27 handoff between calls. This means any signal blockage caused by the wind turbines  
28 does not materially degrade the reception, as the end user is likely receiving signals  
29 from multiple transmitter locations. In addition, the frequencies of operation for  
30 these services have characteristics that allow the signal to propagate through wind  
31 turbines.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

**Q. Is there a recommended setback from land mobile fixed-base stations to avoid impacts to communication services?**

A. Yes. As long as turbines are located more than 77.5 meters from the land mobile stations, they will meet the setback distance criteria for the Federal Communications Commission (“FCC”) interference emissions in the land mobile bands.

**Q. Does the Project configuration meet this setback distance?**

A. Yes. The closest turbine distance from a land mobile station is 440 meters. Any additional micrositing that may be required for the Project will be completed to remain in compliance with the FCC setback distance.

**Q. Could you please summarize the results of the AM/FM radio study?**

A. No impacts on the licensed and operational AM or FM broadcast stations were identified.

**Q. Could you please summarize the results of the off-air TV study?**

A. The study identified four full-power digital stations that may have their reception disrupted in and around the Project. Impacts could result from obstruction of the line-of-sight between the residences relying on transmission sent over the air for TV reception and the TV station antennas. However, the actual impact isn’t known, since modern digital TV receivers may mitigate the effects of signal scattering. Television reception at homes relying on cable or satellite television service will not be impacted by construction or operation of the Project.

**Q. How will Crocker mitigate potential reception disruption?**

A. If interference to a residence’s or business’s television service is reported to Crocker, Crocker will work with affected parties to determine the cause of interference and, when necessary, reestablish television reception and service. Crocker will address any post-construction television interference concerns on a case-by-case basis and resolution could include installing a combination of high gain

1 antenna and/or a low noise amplifier or entering into an agreement to provide a  
2 monetary contribution toward comparable satellite television services.

3  
4 **Q. Could you please address Mr. Stevens' comments regarding potential Project**  
5 **impacts to the Aberdeen weather radar, including Crocker's communications**  
6 **with the NOAA?**

7 A. Mitigation measures will not be required for the Aberdeen weather radar. While the  
8 response received from the NOAA dated April 4, 2016 indicated a portion of the  
9 Project falls within the Notification Zone and outlines mitigation strategies that can  
10 be implemented to reduce impacts to radar, the response also states "NOAA will not  
11 request mitigation of impacts for this project configuration."

12  
13 Crocker submitted an updated request to the NTIA based on the expanded Project  
14 boundary on November 16, 2017. The response received on January 11, 2018  
15 stated input was received from numerous agencies, including the Department of  
16 Commerce, and NOAA is within the Department of Commerce. All agencies stated  
17 No Harmful Interference Anticipated ("NHIA") and no agencies had issues with the  
18 turbine placement in the Project Area.

19  
20 **IV. SOCIAL CONDITION OF COMMUNITY**

21  
22 **Q. Mr. Stevens makes a number of allegations regarding impacts of the Project**  
23 **on the "social condition of the community" at lines 89-109 of his testimony. In**  
24 **particular, Mr. Stevens states that "Crocker directly, and through its**  
25 **surrogates, orchestrated intimidation and harassment of individual**  
26 **intervenors and non-participants" (ln. 99-100) and then describes alleged**  
27 **incidents (ln. 100-109). Are Mr. Stevens' allegations true?**

28 A. No. Crocker has no knowledge of or information regarding the alleged incidents.  
29 Moreover, Crocker has not engaged in or asked others to engage in any form of  
30 intimidation or harassment.

1 **Q. Has Crocker engaged in community outreach?**

2 A. Yes. As Mr. Stevens acknowledges in his testimony, Crocker held monthly coffee  
3 meetings in Clark (see Stevens Direct Testimony, In. 33). Crocker also attended  
4 Clark County Commission Meetings to provide updates on the Project throughout  
5 development, held meetings with business and civic community stakeholders,  
6 hosted an ice cream social for the community, and participated in numerous  
7 community charity events.

8  
9 Additionally, Crocker representatives met with individuals to provide Project  
10 information and address concerns. Jay Hesse and Michael Morris met with Mr.  
11 Stevens several times to address his concerns. Crocker then voluntarily eliminated a  
12 turbine and moved another turbine to try to address Mr. Stevens' concerns regarding  
13 the use of his private airstrip (see Stevens Direct Testimony, In. 31-47; see Morris  
14 Rebuttal Testimony, p. 1, In. 21-30).

15  
16 **V. PROJECT ACCESSIBILITY**

17  
18 **Q. Mr. Stevens states in his testimony that it would be “extremely difficult” to**  
19 **construct and maintain a wind farm in some of the Project footprint because**  
20 **some of the land is only accessible by low-maintenance and no-maintenance**  
21 **dirt roads (In. 203-205). Does Crocker agree with this assertion?**

22 A. No. Construction of the proposed access roads within the Project Area, combined  
23 with any necessary upgrades to the existing road system, will enable construction  
24 and operation of the Project as proposed.

25  
26 **VI. COORDINATION WITH GFP AND MITIGATION**

27  
28 **Q. Mr. Stevens testifies that he “spoke with the local GFP Conservation Officer**  
29 **last fall and was surprised to hear him say that he was never contacted for**  
30 **information on area wildlife, waterfowl migration, eagle nest sites, etc.” (In. 61-**  
31 **63). Do you have a response?**

1 A. Yes. At this point, Crocker has been coordinating with the GFP for several years  
2 regarding wildlife and avian use in and around the Project Area through letters and  
3 e-mails, in-person meetings, a site visit with GFP representatives, and conference  
4 calls. This coordination included providing Project updates, engaging in discussions  
5 on and receiving approval of survey protocol, and discussions on Project siting.  
6

7 **Q. In his testimony, Mr. Kirschenmann discusses potential “mitigation**  
8 **considerations” for the Project, particularly with respect to native prairie.**  
9 **Does the Project plan to provide mitigation for impacts to native prairie?**

10 A. As discussed in Brie Anderson’s Rebuttal Testimony, Crocker is providing a 2:1  
11 offset for permanent impacts to USFWS grassland easements, although only a 1:1  
12 offset is required (see Anderson Rebuttal Testimony, p. 4, ln. 26-29). Additionally,  
13 while Crocker does not believe mitigation is required, Crocker will provide a  
14 voluntary donation of \$25,000 to a local non-profit conservation organization to be  
15 used for local conservation efforts.  
16

17 **VII. TURBINE FLEXIBILITY**  
18

19 **Q. In his testimony, Mr. Kearney states that he cannot support Crocker’s request**  
20 **for the flexibility to shift turbines within 1,000 feet of their proposed location**  
21 **even if specified noise and shadow flicker thresholds at occupied residences**  
22 **are not exceeded, cultural resources and sensitive species habitat are**  
23 **avoided, and wetland impacts are avoided. Could you explain in more detail**  
24 **why Crocker is requesting this turbine flexibility?**

25 A. Yes. There are several reasons why Crocker is making this request:  
26 • First, while the cultural resource survey work completed to date has been  
27 incorporated into the proposed turbine configuration, additional shovel testing  
28 will be completed in the spring of 2018, which is likely to result in some  
29 turbine shifts (see Holven Rebuttal Testimony, p. 8, ln. 4-28).  
30 • Second, in order to determine the appropriate foundation design, Crocker will  
31 complete geotechnical evaluations at each turbine site to identify the soil



1 structure. Based on the geotechnical information, it may be necessary to shift  
2 turbine locations.

- 3 • Third, although landowners are aware of the proposed turbine locations,  
4 when the turbine locations and associated access roads are staked on their  
5 property prior to construction, the landowners may see shifts they would like  
6 us to make. When possible, Crocker tries to accommodate landowner  
7 requests, but it would be difficult to do so without some assurance that the  
8 move could be accomplished without additional approval that may delay  
9 construction.
  
- 10 • Fourth, any adjustment to a turbine location must comply with a host of  
11 constraints. For example, Crocker must meet property line and residence  
12 setback requirements, must meet sound and shadow flicker requirements,  
13 and has committed to avoiding impacting cultural resources and wetlands.  
14 Without the requested 1,000 feet of turbine flexibility, it may be impossible to  
15 meet all of the applicable constraints. This is illustrated in the constraints  
16 maps attached to my testimony as Exhibit 7. The maps depict the applicable  
17 setbacks and environmental avoidance areas, as well as the proposed 1,000  
18 foot micro-siting area. The maps also include call-out boxes that show  
19 individual turbines and the constraints within 325 feet, 500 feet, and 1,000  
20 feet of the proposed turbine locations. As can be seen from the call-outs,  
21 there are situations where it may be difficult or impossible to shift a turbine  
22 within 325 feet or 500 feet and comply with setbacks and environmental  
23 avoidances, but it would be possible to shift the turbine with 1,000 feet of  
24 flexibility (see, for example, turbine 7). Notably, these maps do not account  
25 for the sound or shadow flicker requirements, which are additional  
26 constraints. Further, based on the shovel testing conducted in the fall of  
27 2017, turbine shifts of up to 1,200 feet were required to avoid the cultural  
28 resources identified and comply with or avoid all other applicable constraints  
29 (see Holven Rebuttal Testimony, p. 8, ln. 14-28).

1           • Fifth, in the past, wind project developers have had substantial micro-siting  
2 flexibility, as they did not have to identify final turbine locations until 30 days  
3 prior to construction. Here, Crocker is only asking for 1,000 feet of flexibility.

4           Given the reasons outlined above, Crocker believes its request for turbine flexibility  
5 of 1,000 feet, with the specified limitations, is reasonable and necessary to enable  
6 compliance with applicable requirements and Crocker's commitments to avoid  
7 cultural resources and wetlands. Crocker hopes this additional information helps to  
8 further clarify for Staff the need for the 1,000 foot turbine flexibility that Crocker is  
9 requesting.

10 **VIII. CONCLUSION**

11

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

13 A. Yes.

14

1 Dated this 13th day of April, 2018.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Melissa Schmit".

3 \_\_\_\_\_

4 Melissa Schmit