

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing today to plead for a denial of the Dakota Range I & II project, Docket EL18-003. My family listened to the Evidentiary Hearing with interest and attended the Crocker Wind Farm Evidentiary Hearing as well. I am completely familiar with the four "burdens of proof" points an applicant must meet in order for their application to be approved by the commission. Further, I understand that the commission must make their ruling based upon laws and rules set forth by the South Dakota Legislature. We were reminded of this by a commissioner in the hallway after the decision to approve EL17-055 was made. It was suggested that we approach our Legislators and work with them to get the laws and rules changed. However, I believe that SDCL 49-41B-22 includes wording that allows much latitude. Words like "serious injury", "substantially impair", and "unduly interfere" leave room for you to use your wisdom and discretion precisely because they are unmeasurable. There are locations, projects, and developers that are a better fit for our state than others, and you have the authority to choose to deny those that do not meet their burden of proof. This location, this project, and this developer is not a good fit.

I could go on about how six months is a grossly inadequate amount of time for a person, an Intervenor, to prepare a case against a Goliath like Industrial Wind Energy. I could mention how extremely costly it is to even attempt to take an opposing position – costly in terms of finances, time, mental and emotional energy, relationships, lost sleep, and yes, health – all things that Intervenors risk every day. I could talk about the enormous investment Intervenors put into research. (It was shocking to me that the four participating landowner witnesses, two from this docket and two from the Crocker docket, couldn't even locate their own homes on the maps. One didn't even know what the turbine symbol looked like on the map. It was painfully obvious that these "witnesses" had no understanding of the application, maps, studies, laws and rules, etc. In contrast, Intervenors are forced to be ultra-familiar with such things in order to point out the omissions, errors, and lies that are frequently presented as "facts". (Think about the safety manuals as just one example.) Intervenors know the maps because they care deeply about the location of each turbine.) I could and should assert that the rights of ALL landowners must be weighed, not just the rights of those "hosting" turbines. I could go on and on. But for the sake of time I will limit this letter to the issue of Aircraft Detection Lighting Systems (ADLS).

In Clark County, our commissioners affirmed that the peace and tranquility of county residences matters. Not so with Dakota Range. The applicant asserts that because it is not required by state or federal law they won't be utilizing it. Mr. Mauersberger testified that the applicant does not intend to use ADLS because it is "new technology". They claim that "the record does not support its use". I disagree on all counts. This technology is not new or untested or a liability risk (informational table attached). Vestas even offers it as an option in the sales literature available on their website. ADLS is approved by the FAA, it is currently operational on a windfarm in Wyoming, and it is required by law on all new windfarms in ND and will be required retroactively (NDCC 49-22-16.4). I suspect that South Dakota is not far behind. Furthermore, it will indeed benefit both participating and non-participating

landowners. The relative cost to the developer is small, yet it makes all landowners happy. Why wouldn't a "good neighbor" wish to install ADLS? There is only one reason: Apex Clean Energy Holdings, LLC of Charlottesville, Virginia is not our good neighbor.

Commissioners, you can stop this. Intervenors and Staff did a fantastic job of pointing out areas where the developer failed to prove the project is worthy of being permitted. Again, there are locations, projects, and developers that are a better fit for our state. This developer, this project, is not a good fit for South Dakota. I pray that discernment and wisdom to prevail.

Sincerely,

Darci Adam

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Darci Adam.

Clark, SD 57225