Exhibit G21

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF DEUEL HARVEST WIND ENERGY LLC FOR A PERMIT OF A WIND ENERGY FACILITY AND A 345-KV TRANSMISSION LINE IN DEUEL COUNTY	* * * * * * * *	**APPLICANT'S RESPONSES TO INTERVENOR GARRETT HOMAN'S FIRST SET OF DATA REQUESTS TO DEUEL HARVEST WIND ENERGY LLC (APPLICANT)** **EL18-053**

Below, please find Applicant's responses to Garrett Homan's First Set of Data Requests to Deuel Harvest Wind Energy LLC ("Applicant").

1-1) Please provide copies of all data requests submitted by PUC staff to Deuel Harvest Wind Energy LLC in this proceeding and copies of all responses to those data requests. Provide this information to date and on an ongoing basis.

Lisa Agrimonti: Response documents will be provided.

1-2) When responding to the requests below, please indicate the individual making each response by name, company, role of involvement in the Deuel Harvest North Wind Farm project (Project), and qualifications for answering.

Lisa Agrimonti: The name of the individual or company responding to each request is provided below.

1-3) Regarding Section 3.1 of the project application, it is stated that "Wind turbines will be illuminated as required by Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations and will also employ an Aircraft Detection Lighting System (ADLS), subject to availability and FAA approval;" As qualified by "subject to availability", this statement does not definitively state whether an Aircraft Detection Lighting System (ADLS) will or will not be used for all wind turbines included in the Project, and therefore is misleading and incomplete information. Will ADLS lighting be used for illuminating all wind turbines in the project, yes or no?

Michael Svedeman: Deuel Harvest will use ADLS for the Project.

1-4) Regarding Section 6.0 of the project application:

a) It is stated "The Project would also provide electricity with zero emissions costs to the grid." What is the estimate of carbon emissions created by the materials manufacturing, parts transportation, construction, turbine maintenance, and project decommissioning activities required over the entire project lifetime?

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it is vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Deuel Harvest further objects to this request because it seeks information not in the custody of control of Deuel Harvest.

b) It is stated "Over the estimated 30-year life of the Project, the Project is expected to directly generate more than $4.5 million in annual local revenue, including taxes, lease payments, and local staff salaries."

i) Please provide a detailed accounting of how the $4.5 million in annual local revenue was calculated.

Michael Svedeman: The $4.5 million projection is an average over the 30-year life of the Project that includes the following: annual local revenue calculated utilizing South Dakota generation and nameplate capacity tax requirements (assuming a 47% net capacity factor, as described in Section 20.1.2.1 of the Application), Deuel Harvest's projections of lease payments to landowners, and Deuel Harvest's projected staff salaries.

ii) Of the tower lease payments dollar amount claimed, what percentage of that will be paid to county residents vs. others.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it is ambiguous and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. In addition, the information sought by the request is confidential.

1-5) Regarding Section 6.1 of the project application:

a) From the onsite data collected at the Project's MET towers, what percentage of the time will the Project provide

i) full rated generator output on all turbines (300 MW rated output),

ii) at least 75% of rated output,

iii) at least 50% of rated output, and

iv) at least 25% of rated output? Please provide objective evidence in the form of data collected from the Project's MET towers.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it is ambiguous and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. In addition, the information sought by the request is proprietary and highly confidential.

b) It is stated "Up to 124 potential turbine locations within the Project area." However, section 1.0 states "Up to 112 wind turbines." Please definitively state the maximum number of wind turbines being requested in the application and explain why the discrepancy exists.

Michael Svedeman: As explained in the Application, Deuel Harvest will construct up to 112 turbines. The 124 turbine locations included in the Application include 112 primary turbines and 12 alternate turbine locations.

1-6) Regarding section 8.2 of the project application:

a) Please provide a detailed description of all fluids and consumable materials, including quantity and specifications, used in the wind turbines during operation.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it seeks confidential information

i) Of those fluids and consumables, what types of servicing will be required during operations (i.e. replenishment, filtering, replacement, etc.) and what service intervals will be used. For any "on condition" servicing, please provide average servicing intervals from previous field experience.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it seeks confidential information

1-7) Regarding section 8.2 of the project application:

a) Do the General Electric turbine models specified belong to the "Wind Turbine Generator Systems 1&2 MW Platform" as referred to by GE Power and Water technical publications?

Jacob Baker: Yes.

b) Please provide all documentation relating to the safe operation of the proposed General Electric turbine modes specified, i.e. Safety Manual or similar documentation.

Lisa Agrimonti: Pursuant to an agreement with General Electric, Deuel Harvest is only allowed to provide these documents on an "Attorneys Eyes Only" basis. These documents have previously been produced to Commission Staff (Safety Manual and Operating Manual).

c) What training, including safety related training, does the manufacturer (General Electric) recommend for service technicians/personnel operating, maintaining, working in proximity to, or otherwise servicing the turbine models specified? Please provide copies of the training material.

Jacob Baker: Deuel Harvest is not aware of a General Electric document outlining training requirements. Deuel Harvest imposes the following requirements:

- New Hire training: Advanced First Aid with AED, Electrical Awareness, Basic Troubleshooting, Tower Rescue Training, Self-Rescue Training, Substation Training.

- Long term: Advanced Turbine Course, Converter Course, and the Tech Progression Program.

d) Do the models proposed include any ice detector systems? If so, please provide installation, operation, and performance details.

Jacob Baker: Deuel Harvest has committed to the same condition that the Commission has imposed in recent dockets (see Docket EL 18-026 and Docket EL 18-046) related to ice throw. Specifically, Deuel Harvest will use two methods to detect icing conditions on turbine blades: (1) sensors that will detect when blades become imbalanced or create vibration due to ice accumulation; and (2) meteorological data from on-site permanent meteorological towers, on-site anemometers, and other relevant sources that will be used to determine if ice accumulation is occurring. These control systems will either automatically shut down the turbine(s) in icing conditions (per the sensors) or Applicant will manually shut down turbine(s) if icing conditions are identified (using referenced data). Turbines will not return to normal operation until the control systems no longer detect an imbalance or when weather conditions either remove icing on the blades or indicate icing is no longer a concern. Applicant will pay for any documented damage caused by ice thrown from a turbine.

e) Do the models proposed include any anti- or de-icing systems for the turbine blades? If so, please provide installation, operation, and performance details.

Jacob Baker: See response to Request 1-8(d).

1-8) Regarding Figure A-4 Project Layout:

a) Please explain what criteria are used when determining the relative positions of neighboring turbines.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because "determining the relative positions of neighboring turbines" is vague.

Michael Svedeman: To the extent this request seeks information regarding the criteria for selecting proposed turbine locations, each turbine location is sited based upon a variety of siting factors, including but not limited to wind resource, participating landowner preferences, county and state setbacks, cultural and historical resources, turbine separation requirements, and wetlands and waterbodies.

b) Please explain how downstream wake aerodynamics can affect the performance, structural integrity, fatigue life, or other aspects of neighboring turbines. How are those effects accounted for when determining turbine locations?

Steven Gordon (Senior Staff Engineer, Invenergy): The effects of downstream waking are accounted for during layout design by using appropriate turbine-to-turbine spacing and confirmed using energy modeling software to quantity performance effects. The structural integrity of each turbine in the layout will be validated by the turbine supplier through a Mechanical Load Analysis. This analysis will incorporate on-site wind data to confirm that the long term fatigue loading as well as loads due to extreme wind events fall within the design envelope of each turbine.

1-9) Regarding Appendix S – Aviation Study:

a) What is Linden Goldfarb's position in the company Aviation Systems, Inc?

Kevin Justis (President): Mr. Goldfarb is a Senior Airspace Analyst at ASI.

b) Please provide a detailed description of all education, training, and experience Linden Goldfarb has regarding aviation and airspace in the United States.

Kevin Justis: Mr. Goldfarb has a Bachelor of Science in Aeronautics and Certification in Aviation Safety Management Systems ("ASMS"). All projects are also reviewed by one or more for quality assurance: Kevin Justis (President) who has more than 12 years doing obstruction evaluations and aviation constraint studies at AS/. Kevin has studied thousands of structures and been part of the process of seeing the structures receive Determination of No Hazard ("DNH") from the FAA. Jerry Chavkin (Vice President) who retired from the FAA as Regional Administrator of the Western Region and was also Regional Administrator of the Central Region. Jerry has been with AS/ and involved in obstruction evaluation and constraint studies for over 26 years.

c) Please provide a detailed list of all US wind energy system projects Linden Goldfarb and Aviation Systems, Inc. has produced aviation studies for in the last 5 years.

Kevin Justis: Linden Goldfarb has produced hundreds of Aviation Constraint Studies ("ACS") and ASI has produced thousands of ACSs in the last five years. These studies are for planning purposes only, while using the same criteria used by the FAA, for siting structures and height restrictions that may be imposed by the FAA. ASI uses the following documents/resources to conduct an ACS:

• FAR Part 77 (14 CFR 77), the Safe, Efficient Use and Preservation of the Navigable Airspace;

• FAA Order 8260.3D, the United States Standard for Terminal Instrument Procedures (referred to as "TERPs");

• FAA Order 8260.58A Change 1 & 2, the United States Standard for Performance Based Navigation ("PBN") Instrument Procedure Design;

• FAA Order JO 7400.2L, the Procedures for Handling Airspace Matters;

• FAA Order 7610.4, Special Military Operations;

• DoD Flight Information Publication AP/1B, Military Training Routes, North and South America; and

• FAR Part 95 (14 CFR Part 95), Subpart B, Designated Mountainous Areas.

• DoD Preliminary Screening Tool for FAA/DoD Radar, NEXRAD, and Military Airspace

The criteria in the documents comprise the factors the FAA will use in evaluating the aeronautical compatibility and regulatory compliance of the Project when it is submitted for their official regulatory review under FAR Part 77 as specified in Title 49 U.S. Code Section 44718."

d) Please provide all correspondence Linden Goldfarb or Aviation Systems, Inc. has had with Invenergy, Deuel Harvest Wind, LLC, any Deuel County officials or representatives, the South Dakota state Department of Transportation, or the Federal Aviation Administration regarding the Invenergy Deuel Harvest North wind energy system project. For written (including electronic) correspondence, please provide copies. For verbal correspondence, please provide a detailed description of the party names, date of correspondence, purpose or subject of correspondence, and a detailed description of the discussion topics or information transferred.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request to the extent it seeks information or documents protected as attorney-client privileged and/or work product. Deuel Harvest also objects to the definition of "correspondence".

Kevin Justis: Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Linden Goldfarb did the analysis and prepared the report for the Project. The only correspondence with the entity Mr. Goldbarb had was an email showing the Project boundaries. State or County zoning and permitting are not included in the ACSs provided by ASI. However, Kevin Justis and Jerry Chavkin of ASI did some additional research after corresponding with Michael Svedeman (Invenergy) and Steven Gordon (Invenergy) with questions about Private Airports/Airstrips and regulations concerning zoning and permitting. The FAA does not protect the airspace around Private Airports/Airstrips or Private Heliports unless they have an approved Instrument Approach for that particular facility. According to the State of South Dakota Law 50-9-1 (also Jerry Chavkin and I confirmed via telephone call with Jon Dokken from the South Dakota Department of Transportation), there are no special zoning or setbacks required for permitting around private facilities. I also reached out to the Deuel County Zoning Officer, Jodi Theisen, who also confirmed there is nothing written in the County Zoning Ordinance for zoning setbacks or runway protection zones for airports. See **Attachment 1-9(d)**.

e) Please list all wind turbine related effects on aviation operations or safety known to Linden Goldfarb or Aviation Systems, Inc.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it is vague, unduly burdensome, and seeks information outside the custody or control of Deuel Harvest.

Kevin Justis: Notwithstanding the foregoing objection, wind turbines are obstructions just like any other category of obstruction such as radio towers, antennas, mountains, etc. They may, or may not, penetrate airspace protected by Federal Aviation Administration Regulations.

f) Please provide a detailed description of the methods, tools, analyses, or assessments, including objective evidence of validation and verification means and results, used by Linden Goldfarb or Aviation Systems, Inc. to make the determination that "The Project will not impact NEXRAD weather radar."

Kevin Justis: ASI uses the DoD Preliminary Screening Tool to determine impact of NEXRAD weather radar. The tool returned a light green polygon that encompassed the entire project area which relates to no impact.

i) Does the statement referenced above apply to all Doppler-effect measurements associated with NEXRAD radar capabilities?

Kevin Justis: Yes. All NEXRAD radars are doppler radars.

g) Please provide a detailed description of the aviation use of the ASR and ARSR regional radar stations FSD and QJC (Table 2). And please provide a status report on the "in-depth FAA radar impact study" referred to in the Radar Systems Interference section of the report.

Kevin Justis: FSD - Joe Foss Field Airport used for terminal radar for Air Traffic Control (TRACON).

QJC - Tyler Common Air-Route Surveillance Radar (CARSR).

FAA/DoD joint use for Enroute Air Traffic Control as well as homeland security.

Michael Svedeman: ASI did not file the Project with the FAA. However, the turbines for this project did receive Determinations of No Hazard from the FAA. As such, no in-depth FAA radar impact study was requested or required by the FAA at this time due to the received Determinations of No Hazard.

h) What navigation means and radio navigation aids are accessible to aircraft operating in and around the Deuel Harvest Wind North project area at all altitudes below Class A airspace?

Kevin Justis: It is impossible to know with the data that is available, which NAVAIDs are accessible up to 18,000 feet AMSL within the project area. There are two VOR/DMEs (MVE, BKX), six NDBs (AQP, DXX, GB, WV, BK, AT), and one VORTAC (ATY) within a 40 nautical mile radius from the center point of the Project.

i) How many wind turbines in the Project may require assessments for Determinations of No Hazard prior to the start of construction?

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request to the extent that the word "assessments" is ambiguous.

Michael Svedeman: Subject to that objection, the Project has received a Determination of No Hazard for each proposed turbine location.

1-10) Regarding Appendix U – Decommissioning Cost Analysis:

a) Please provide a detailed accounting of how many decommissioning cost analyses for wind energy system projects Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. has completed in the last 5 years, including the name and location of the projects, the number of wind turbines included in each project, and the name of the project owner.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it is overbroad, unduly burdensome, and seeks information not in the custody or control of Deuel Harvest.

Jeff Kopp (Manager, Utility Consulting): Subject to the foregoing objection, Burns & McDonnell has performed dozens of wind energy system decommissioning cost analyses for a multitude of clients, including Invenergy, EDP Renewables, Calpine, OGE Energy, PacifiCorp, Nebraska Public Power District, ALLETE Clean Energy, Capital Power, Xcel Energy (PSCo), Tradewind, MidAmerican Energy, and Apex Clean Energy, for projects located in states including, but not limited to, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, Kentucky, Nebraska, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, New York, Oklahoma, Texas, and South Dakota.

b) Please provide a detailed accounting of how many wind energy system decommissioning or demolition projects Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. has managed or executed over the life of the firm, name and location of the projects, the number of wind turbines included in each project, and the name of the project owner.

Jeff Kopp: Burns & McDonnell has not managed or executed any wind energy system decommissioning or demolition projects to date. However, very few wind energy systems have actually been decommissioned or demolished to date.

c) Please provide a detailed list of all parts and materials included in the project that are not considered salvageable in the decommissioning analysis.

Jeff Kopp: Parts and materials not classified as salvageable include: blades; all concrete and reinforced concrete; portions of electrical equipment that are not steel, aluminum, or copper; fencing, building wood and sheetrock; stabilized soil; and portions of the nacelle, hub, and towers that are not steel, copper, or aluminum.

d) Please provide a detailed list of all materials, fluids, coatings, and chemicals used in or on non-salvageable parts or materials included in the project that are considered toxic, hazardous, or otherwise controlled waste.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request to the extent that it calls for legal analysis.

Jeff Kopp: Subject to and without waiving the objection, hazardous waste is defined by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act ("RCRA") of 1973. None of the material at the site meets the criteria listed in RCRA to be classified as hazardous material; therefore, no hazardous materials are present at the site. All materials are classified as either scrap or debris. All debris is accounted for in the disposal costs as the appropriate disposal site for each material. Costs for disposal of oils, fluids, and chemicals were based on previous Burns & McDonnell project experience as well as unit costs provided by contractors with which Burns & McDonnell works. Although it is not considered "hazardous" or "toxic", any soil that could be potentially contaminated through normal plant operations was assumed to be disposed of at a landfill permitted to accept petroleum-contaminated soil. All other materials were considered construction and demolition debris, which can be disposed of in a traditional solid waste landfill. All disposal methodologies are to be completed in compliance with RCRA.

e) Please provide the year used in this analysis for estimating the decommissioning costs in US dollars (i.e. 2019, 2039, or other).

Jeff Kopp: Burns & McDonnell performed this decommissioning analysis using 2018 US dollars.

f) Please provide the labor cost and cost year used in the decommissioning cost analysis.

Jeff Kopp: Burns & McDonnell used 2018 non-union labor costs from the RS Means database. Costs were determined on a per-unit basis in order to account for the correct labor types and crew; turbine decommissioning includes approximately $29,400 per turbine for equipment and labor.

g) Please provide the date used in the analysis for the project's end of useful life.

Jeff Kopp: Burns & McDonnell did not make a determination of when end of useful life would occur. All costs are calculated using current (2018 Q4 in this case) dollars.

h) Section 2.2 of the cost analysis report does not explicitly state that the wind turbine blades were considered elements of the project facilities included in the decommissioning and demolition. Please confirm that the wind turbine blades will be included in the decommissioning and demolition and that the cost analysis conducted accounts for those associated costs.

Jeff Kopp: Wind turbines are included in the decommissioning and demolition cost analysis and specifically called out in the report (Appendix U). As stated in Section 4.1 of the report "The wind turbine blades will be removed from the wind turbine rotors using a crane, cut into manageably-sized sections, loaded onto a trailer, and hauled to a local landfill for disposal." The total cost for removal and processing of blades is approximately $8,800 per turbine. From that point, blades were to be treated as general debris and hauled to a nearby landfill for disposal. Costs for hauling and disposal of the blades are also included in the estimates.

i) Please provide a detailed list and description of all materials used in the finished wind turbine blade assemblies, including primers, paints, or other coatings, proposed for use in the Project.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it is vague, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Jeff Kopp: Subject to the foregoing objections, the specific composition of rotor blades is highly dependent on the manufacturer, and manufacturer designs are considered highly confidential. However, the wind turbine blade materials generally include fiberglass, balsa wood, epoxy resins, carbon fiber, lightning receptors / conductor, and paint. The type of coating was not provided for the purposes of this study; however, landfills generally accept materials with coatings and paint on them, so an appropriate level of cost is included in the estimates.

j) Please provide the total combined volume of oils, lubricants, or other fluids required for proper operation of all equipment included in the project at any point in time.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it is vague, overbroad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Deuel Harvest further objects to this request to the extent it calls for legal analysis.

Jeff Kopp: Subject to the foregoing objections, for purposes of the estimates Burns & McDonnell included all oils, lubricants, and other fluids in the turbines. The total amount of oil in wind turbine generators included in the estimates is 22,400 gallons. As noted, none of oils, lubricants or other fluids is a hazardous material under RCRA.

k) Please provide the total combined volume of oils, lubricants, or other fluids requiring disposal at the end of life of the project.

Jeff Kopp: The total volume of oils, lubricants, and other fluids requiring disposal at the Project was estimated to be approximately 29,000 gallons.

l) Please provide a detailed description of the current disposal requirements imposed by State or Federal laws or industry best practices for all oils, lubricants, or other fluids included in the project.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it seeks legal analysis and is overbroad and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

m) Please provide a detailed description of the current disposal requirements imposed by State or Federal laws or industry best practices for the wind turbine blades.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it seeks legal analysis and is overbroad and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

n) Section 4.1 states "The wind turbine blades will be removed from the wind turbine rotors using a crane, cut into manageably- sized sections, loaded onto a trailer, and hauled to a local landfill for disposal."

i) Please provide the Project's total combined volume of wind turbine blades that will require disposal in a landfill.

Jeff Kopp: Though the total volume of blades was not analyzed, the total combined weight of the wind turbine blades was approximately 1,700 tons.

ii) Please provide a list of potential local landfills that may be used or considered for disposal of the Project's wind turbine blades. Of those landfills, which have confirmed they will be able and willing to accept the waste planned?

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it is premature and not known at this time. It is also not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

iii) Of the total combined volume of wind turbine blade materials that will require disposal in a landfill, how much is considered toxic, hazardous, or otherwise controlled waste?

Jeff Kopp None of the wind turbine blade materials would need to be handled as anything other than construction and demolition debris. Therefore, the costs for disposing of this material in a municipal solid waste landfill that is capable of receiving construction and demolition debris are appropriate.

o) Please provide a list of all materials used in the electrical generator assemblies included in the Project's proposed turbine models that would be considered toxic, hazardous, or otherwise controlled waste upon decommissioning.

Jeff Kopp: See response to Request 1-10(d), noting that none of the material at the site is hazardous under RCRA. In addition, the specific composition of a wind turbine generator is highly dependent on the manufacturer, and manufacturer designs are considered highly confidential. However, the materials generally include copper, steel, wiring, and oil. All oil is drained and disposed of separately from general debris as part of the decommissioning process.

i) Please provide the total combined volume of those materials included in the Project.

Jeff Kopp: Each turbine was assumed to contain approximately 200 gallons of oil, for a total of 22,400 gallons among all 112 turbines. The padmount transformers accounted for approximately 550 gallons of oil combined across all 112 turbines. Costs for properly disposing of those oils are included in the estimates. All other materials in the electric generators is appropriately classified as scrap or general debris and handled accordingly.

ii) Please provide a detailed description of the current disposal requirements for those materials imposed by State or Federal laws or industry best practices.

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it seeks legal analysis and is overbroad and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

iii) If any of those materials may be disposed of in landfills, please provide a list of potential local landfills (within the state of South Dakota) that may be used or considered for disposal. Of those landfills, which have confirmed they will be able and willing to accept the waste planned?

Lisa Agrimonti: Deuel Harvest objects to this request because it is premature and not known at this time. The question is also not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Dated this 25th day of March, 2019.

By /s/ *Lisa M. Agrimonti*

Mollie M. Smith
Lisa M. Agrimonti
FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.
Attorneys for Applicant
200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: (612) 492-7000
Fax: (612) 492-7077

66183561.1

Kevin Justis

From: DC Zoning <dczoning@itctel.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2019 9:27 AM
To: Kevin Justis
Subject: RE: Permitting and Zoning in South Dakota around Private Airports/Airstrips or Private Heliports

Kevin

Our County does not have any runway protection zones or zoning setbacks from airports written into our County Zoning Ordinance.

Sincerely
Jodi Theisen
Deuel County Zoning Officer

From: Kevin Justis [mailto:kevin@aviationsystems.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 12:28 PM
To: DCzoning@itctel.com
Subject: Permitting and Zoning in South Dakota around Private Airports/Airstrips or Private Heliports

Hi Jodi,

I am sending this email concerning local zoning and permitting for structure near a private airports/airstrips or private heliports. The FAA or State does not protect around these facilities. I am wondering if there are any county zoning regulations protecting areas around private airports/airstrip or private heliports. If so, what is the distances for the areas that would be protected? Thank you in advance for your help!

Best Regards,

AVIATION SYSTEMS INC
Kevin Justis
CEO / President
Office: (310) 530-3188
Cell: (714) 612-5123
Fax: (310)530-3850
Kevin@aviationsystems.com