

November 8, 2018

To: South Dakota PUC

From: Alan Meiers-**Please Post My Comments to Docket EL 18-026**

As an owner of land located in the middle of the Prevailing Wind Park Farm proposal, I paid close attention to the evidentiary hearing on this project.

The evidence and testimony by Prevailing Winds clearly provided no solid proof beyond reasonable doubt that this proposed project passes all 4 criteria statements that the PUC has listed to be met for their approval.

Correspondingly, the opposition presented a strong and convincing case that would raise a high level of reasonable doubt even in the mind of a disinterested bipartisan person.

There is no doubt that if this proposal was presented in front of a jury of peers, a civil case jury, or a single Judge, it would be denied as presented. But this is not the case and I am very concerned that this project is already rubber stamped for approval.

The setback distance is one of the most critical issues in these Wind Farm projects and is paramount in meeting and passing criteria #3 - "will not substantially impair the health, safety or welfare of the inhabitants".

Testimony showed that the Bon Homme County Commission hadn't done any setback research on their own and just approved/rubberstamped the meager 500/1000 ft. setback distance that the Wind Farm proponents suggested or rather demanded. Consider that these proposed wind turbines are 586 ft. tall and even taller when adding the blade length (350 ft.). This huge height is equivalent to the median of the setback distance!

The footprint is inhabited by a fairly large number of residents with the overwhelming majority being non-participating but yet will be forced to live near the wind turbines. Exhibit A42 presented by Prevailing Winds provides evidence to this as it reflects that 67% of the residents and landowners are opposed non-participating parties. These wind farms realistically should only be built in very sparsely populated or open range areas.

The health related testimony of 4 individuals was enough to raise heavy doubt and serious concerns that wind turbine related health issues are real and will only continue to increase as more wind farms are built. So what distance is safe? It is surely obvious from this hearing that a much larger setback is needed to potentially minimize health related problems. The footprint's wildlife has received more setback attention and concern than the people being forced to live within the footprint. Why shouldn't the people in this footprint be given the same consideration and respect? Shouldn't the high probability of endangering just one person's quality of life and health be worth reconsidering a much larger setback distance than living with the enormous burden of approving a flawed project for decades?

The integrity of the PUC and even our elected officials of South Dakota are being tested in making a decision on a proposal of this magnitude. The evidentiary hearing clearly exposed the numerous critical health and environmental issue concerns that remain unproven and unknown. This high level of lingering reasonable doubt cannot be overlooked, consequently it should not be difficult to make the safe decision and deny the approval of this project.

Cordially,

Alan Meiers

[REDACTED]

Scottsdale. AZ 85258

[REDACTED]

