

Public Input Meeting August 26, 2019 Watertown, SD

George L. Holborn Sioux Falls, SD

In March 2018 I presented what we found in the Codington County Ordinance 65 Industrial District Chapter 30.06.04

“A. 1 Noise.

All noise shall be muffled so as not to be objectionable due to intermittence, beat frequency or shrillness.”

We suggested this ordinance was in conflict with itself.

First District Government, Mr. Mueller, answered we have different standards for different settings.

We were not allowed follow-up so my question is:

Why is noise less /more objectionable at an industrial sight in Codington County than an industrial wind turbine sight in Codington County?

Are those non-participants living among the turbines of less importance than other county citizens?

Such inconsistencies are imposed upon those without choice by **every layer** of government dealing with industrial wind turbines.

Secondly, this past spring we attended an evidentiary hearing in Fort Pierre. We and others wrote follow-up letters to the PUC.

Commissioner Hanson responded in kind to [REDACTED] & me with very similar verbiage:

“By law, we must take several factors into account when considering whether or not to grant a wind siting permit.

The **primary duty** of the commission is to ensure the location, construction and operation of the facilities will produce minimal adverse effects to the health, safety and welfare of the environment and citizens.

The standards we must follow are defined in South Dakota Codified Laws and Administrative Rules.

Again, our decisions must be based upon evidence that is presented to the commission by parties of the docket.”

At Prevailing Wind Park LLC, the PUC granted the non-participants 40 dba. The applicant's expert was held in high regard; the applicant employees seemed to be held in higher regard than even the sound expert hired by the PUC.

At the Deuel Harvest Evidentiary Hearing independent expert testimony was ignored when the PUC determined everyone, those participating with the wind developer and those found to live in the Deuel County Sacrifice Zone could live with 45 dba.

Both the independent and PUC expert claimed an ambient noise level should be established and add 10 dba.

Please remember every 10 dba increase in noise loudness doubles at the receptor.

That number would determine the threshold limit for the non-participants.

Mr. Rand continues, if the PUC wishes to hold the Health, Safety and Welfare in preeminence above the profits of the wind developer, the threshold for the non-participants should begin at 35 dba.

Now these numbers may seem fatuous to a politician or an absentee participant, but in fact can be a life changing eventuality for those forced to live among the turbines.

So, you are aware, per Commissioner Hanson's letter, what "will produce minimal adverse effects to the Health, Safety and Welfare of the environment and citizens."

It appears to me you are obfuscating your "Primary Duty", your words not mine.

Please consider the words of D. M. Deutchlander:

"Good behavior best serves to keep order and preserve society;

Bad behavior undermines order and threatens society.

Government should be concerned with behavior that deprives another of life, or property without justice."

George L Holborn

Sioux Falls, SD 57110