

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION BY SWEETLAND WIND FARM, LLC  
FOR FACILITY PERMITS OF A WIND ENERGY FACILITY AND A 230-KV  
TRANSMISSION FACILITY IN HAND COUNTY, SOUTH DAKOTA FOR THE  
SWEETLAND WIND FARM PROJECT**

**SD PUC DOCKET EL19-012**

**PRE-FILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ROBERT O'NEAL  
ON BEHALF OF SWEETLAND WIND FARM, LLC**

May 20, 2019

1 **I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS**

2

3 **Q. Please state your name, employer, and business address.**

4 A. My name is Robert O’Neal and I work for Epsilon Associates, Inc. (“Epsilon”),  
5 located at 3 Mill & Main Place, Suite 250, Maynard, Massachusetts 01754.

6

7 **Q. Did you provide Direct Testimony in this docket on March 6, 2019?**

8 A. Yes.

9

10 **Q. What is the purpose of your Supplemental Direct Testimony?**

11 A. The purpose of my Supplemental Direct Testimony is to provide the results of  
12 updated sound and shadow flicker analyses for the Project. I will also address  
13 comments made at the public input meeting regarding predicted shadow flicker  
14 levels and infrasound.

15

16 **Q. What exhibit is attached to your Supplemental Direct Testimony?**

17 A. The following exhibit is attached to my Supplemental Direct Testimony:

- 18 • Exhibit A10-1: Updated Sound and Shadow Flicker Analyses.

19 **II. SOUND AND SHADOW FLICKER ANALYSES UPDATE**

20

21 **Q. Please describe the updates reflected in the results of the updated sound  
22 and shadow flicker analyses.**

23 A. The results of the updated sound and shadow flicker analyses reflect the following  
24 changes: one wind turbine was removed from the layout (T43) and one wind  
25 turbine was changed to standard wind turbine blades as opposed to the low noise  
26 trailing edge (“LNTE”) blades (T42). This modified layout has been modeled to  
27 predict the sound levels and the annual expected durations of shadow flicker due  
28 to the operation of the proposed wind turbines at occupied residences in Hand  
29 County.

30

31 It should also be noted that on May 10, 2019, the Project team received  
32 confirmation from the Hand County Tax Assessor that the residence of Dale G.  
33 Christiansen (modeling receptor 34) is not an occupied residence. Receptor 34  
34 has therefore been excluded from the updated sound level and shadow flicker  
35 analyses.

36

37 **Q. What are the results of your updated sound analysis?**

38 A. Based on the modifications to the wind turbine layout, the sound levels at all 40  
39 modeling receptors showed no appreciable change (i.e. less than one A-weighted  
40 decibel (“dBA”) change). The predicted worst-case sound levels from the  
41 Sweetland Wind Project are still at or below the 50 dBA limit at participating  
42 residences and are still at or below 43 dBA at non-participating residences.

43

44 **Q. Based on the results of the updated sound analysis, will the Project comply**  
45 **with the requirements of the Development Agreement between the Applicant**  
46 **and Hand County?**

47 A. Yes.

48

49 **Q. What are the results of your updated shadow flicker analysis?**

50 A. Based on the modifications to the wind turbine layout, the shadow flicker durations  
51 at 38 of the 40 modeling receptors showed no change. Receptor 5 incurred an  
52 annual expected shadow flicker reduction to approximately 21.8 hours. Receptor 6  
53 also incurred an annual expected shadow flicker reduction to approximately 21.3  
54 hours. The predicted annual shadow flicker durations range from 0 hours to  
55 approximately 45.5 hours at the modeled receptors. The maximum modeled  
56 expected duration of shadow flicker (approximately 45.5 hours) is predicted at a  
57 participating residence. The maximum modeled expected duration of shadow  
58 flicker predicted at a non-participating residence is approximately 9.3 hours. The  
59 maximum modeled expected duration of shadow flicker predicted at a pending  
60 participating residence is approximately 21.3 hours.

61

62 **Q. Based on the results of the updated shadow flicker analysis, will the Project**  
63 **comply with the requirements of the Development Agreement between the**  
64 **Applicant and Hand County?**

65 A. Yes. While the modeling indicates that two residences in Hand County could  
66 experience annual shadow flicker levels above 30 hours per year, both residences  
67 are participants and Epsilon understands that Sweetland will obtain written waivers  
68 for these residences in accordance with the Hand County Development Agreement  
69 for the Project. Therefore, the Project meets the requirements with respect to  
70 shadow flicker in the Development Agreement.

71

### 72 **III. RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS**

73

74 **Q. Are you aware of a comment made at the public input hearing regarding the**  
75 **shadow flicker levels expected at residences within the Project Area?**

76 A. Yes. At the public input hearing, a member of the public stated shadow flicker will  
77 be 45+ and 55+ hours per year at two residences within the Project Area.  
78 However, as explained above, as a result of the changes to the layout reflected in  
79 the updated shadow flicker analysis, the annual expected shadow flicker at  
80 Receptor 6 (a participating residence) has been reduced from 55.4 hours to 21.3  
81 hours. Further, the receptor predicted to experience 45.5 hours of shadow flicker  
82 annually is a participating residence. Epsilon understands that Sweetland will  
83 obtain written waivers for this residence in accordance with the Hand County  
84 Development Agreement.

85

86 **Q. There were some comments at the public input hearing regarding**  
87 **infrasound. Could you please explain what infrasound is?**

88 A. The noise or sound emitted by any source contains energy at different frequencies.  
89 Humans can generally hear frequencies between 20 and 20,000 Hertz (“Hz”). Low  
90 frequency sound is generally defined as that between 20 and 200 Hz, while  
91 infrasound is defined as 0 to 20 Hz. Humans are most sensitive to sound at  
92 around 1,000 Hz, and least sensitive to low frequency sounds. Many sources

93 produce infrasound, such as the wind, ocean waves, airplanes, tractors, and wind  
94 turbines. The levels produced by all of these sources are below the human  
95 hearing threshold by orders of magnitude.

96

97 **Q. In your experience, is infrasound typically regulated or modeled?**

98 A. No. Infrasound is not typically modeled for wind projects and I am not aware of any  
99 regulations in the United States on infrasound produced by wind turbines.

100

101 **IV. CONCLUSION**

102

103 **Q. Does this conclude your Supplemental Direct Testimony?**

104 A. Yes.

105

106 Dated this 20th day of May, 2019.

107



108

---

109 Robert O'Neal

110

111

112

113 66778531