

**RECEIVED**

JUN 11 2018

SOUTH DAKOTA  
UTILITIES COMMISSION

Dear Commissioners,

Regarding EL 18-003 My husband and I have been residents and property-tax payors of Codington County for almost 50 years. We currently live along the south shoreline of Punished Woman's Lake, in the community of South Shore. We are asking that you please deny this application with the set-backs that are infringing on the rights of everyone around them.

Our City Council requested a 3-mile set-back from the city limits, the Punished Woman's Lake Association requested a 3-mile set-back from our lake and, as a board member of the South Shore Development Corporation, I feel that it would certainly be a lot less inviting to any future potential home buyers to come into an area that is flooded with these 550' turbines at anything less than the 3 mile distance.

We have two lakes here, with a road that lays between. The trees along that road house a huge eagles nest, and we frequently have eagles soaring along our shoreline. The north shoreline of the lake is owned by the State GF&P, who have always been very protective of the natural grasses and wildlife there. I can't believe that they are not requesting a further set-back. We watch deer come down to the lake to drink, we listen to coyotes at night, and in both spring and fall have hundreds of geese migrating. The home-owners and campground residents have a gorgeous sunset over the west end of the lake every night. We do not want to have these turbines in our view...we do not want to see, hear or feel them, and I do not think anyone that is honest with themselves would want to live in close distance to them either.

We have had our property appraised two times in the last five years, and would like to have a 'property value guarantee' in place, so that if we have a loss at the time of selling our property (if the turbines are allowed at only a mile away), there would be money to compensate for

that loss. The wind companies say that the property values do not go down in value, so they should not be opposed to a guarantee.

Just because a company has millions of dollars (our tax dollars at work) to send sales representatives door- to-door, pay for favoritism of media, communities and politicians...because they have enough money to hire hundreds of lawyers, to pay for full page ads and run spots on TV, getting the public to make them believe that they are the energy of the future...does not mean that they should have the right to steal people's property rights, to risk property values, or cause health concerns and safety issues. Those who are not concerned are those who live a far enough distance from the turbines, and do not think that they will be affected. Of course, those getting payment for the turbines are for them moving in, and I do not begrudge them the money. However, the set-backs should be far enough away, that others' rights are not taken away because of them being here.

Future concerns for consideration:

\*When Federal funding ends, (without those government \$\$\$) what is the financial feasibility of having the turbines to produce energy?

\*Who will be financially responsible for dis-assembling them if they become obsolete, and where would they be able to be disposed of?

\*If health or injury issues arise, who will be financially responsible for those costs?

Please treat this decision as if the turbines were being placed within these short distances, surrounding your homes.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Diane K Redlin". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned to the right of the word "Sincerely,".

Diane K. Redlin

Jerry & Diane Redlin

South Shore, South Dakota 57263

PUC (Docket # EL 18-003)  
500 E. Capital Ave.  
Pierre, SD 57501