

PLEASE POST THESE COMMENTS TO THE PREVAILING WINDS  
DOCKET NUMBER EL18-026

I AM AN ABSENTEE LANDOWNER IN PROJECT AREA. I AM OPPOSED TO  
THE WIND PARK.

COMMISSIONER CHRIS NELSON SAID THE DECISION TO APPROVE THE  
PROJECT WILL BE BASED ON FACTS AND FACTS ALONE.

LET'S LOOK AT THE FACTS THAT MUST BE COMPLIED WITH FOR THE  
APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT.

THE FOLLOWING ARE THE THREE REQUIREMENTS (FACTS) STATED BY THE  
PUC ITSELF. I DON'T BELIEVE THESE REQUIREMENTS CAN BE MET:

FACT NO. 1. Will not pose a threat of serious injury to the environment nor to the social  
and economic condition of the inhabitants or expected inhabitants in the siting area.

Economic--Inhabitants are economically affected by a bad contract. I am assuming a 30  
year contract with a royalty payment per year of \$10,000 with a 1.5% increase annually  
per turbine for the landowner. Assuming low inflation each year, using present value  
tables, the royalty income after 30 years would be approximately \$4275 (maybe lower) in  
today's dollars. That is a bad contract!

Economic--Impact studies have shown a decrease in improved and unimproved property  
in a wind farm (very serious economic injury to inhabitants).

Economic--Electric rates have increased for inhabitants in a wind farm.

Economic--Future unilateral reduction of the royalty checks to the landowner. The  
owner during bad times may decide to reduce the landowner payments leaving the  
landowner with no recourse.

Environment--Impact on pheasants, birds, migratory birds and bats.

Environment-- Road damage. Also scars on the land from holes in the ground 40 feet  
deep or more, filled with concrete that will never be totally removed.

Social--I heard the residents who live in the footprint begging the commissioners to  
decline the application. How can you possibly allow 4 or 5 turbines to be built a mile or  
less away from a residence and not be responsible for destroying the peaceful lifestyle of  
the inhabitants?

Social-- I notice that the people who talk in favor of wind turbines repeat the same general talking points such as "economic development of South Dakota" , "harvest our abundant wind resource", "reduce our dependence on fossil fuels", "advance technologically with the rest of the world" etc. None of the speaking pro turbine people live in the turbine footprint nor do they talk about what it is like to live under turbines.

FACT NO. 2 Will not substantially impair the health or welfare of the inhabitants.

Health-- Audible noise, sub audible noise, shadow flicker, sleeping problems, stray voltage, and ice throw. I heard someone say that a person will get accustomed to the noise. When we talk about the noise we have in a modern society we are talking about noise that we can turn off when we want. The noise from a turbine only stops when the wind is not blowing. The other dangers are obvious.

Welfare-- Lawsuits from neighbors. This is a real disaster for the social condition and welfare of the inhabitants.

FACT NO. 3 Will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region with due consideration having been given to the views of governing bodies of affected local units of government.

Development--There will be none. No one will build a home or business in a wind farm.

Development--The confidentiality requirement in the contract makes it almost impossible to sell the land.

Development--In the case of the technical obsolescence of the turbines or termination of the contract I find it hard to believe that money will be available for removal and restoration of the land. A bond is nothing more than a promise to pay and that promise is worthless from an insolvent company.

Development-- How much will the county increase the assessment of land with turbines? Will the county change the classification of land with a turbine?

---

Denis L Meiers

date

Denis L Meiers

[REDACTED]

San Diego, CA 92128

[REDACTED]