

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

---

**IN THE MATTER OF THE  
APPLICATION BY TATANKA RIDGE  
WIND, LLC FOR A PERMIT OF A  
WIND ENERGY FACILITY IN DEUEL  
COUNTY, SOUTH DAKOTA**

---

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

**STAFF'S FIFTH SET OF DATA  
REQUESTS TO APPLICANT**

**EL19-026**

Below, please find Staff's Fifth Set of Data Requests to Applicant. Please specify the responder when answering each interrogatory. Should any response have subparts answered by more than one individual, identify the respondent by subpart. Consider each question ongoing and update answers as they evolve or change.

- 5-1) Will the Applicant agree to the following condition to mitigate potential impacts to whooping cranes:

*Applicant shall establish a procedure for preventing whooping crane collisions with turbines during operations by establishing and implementing formal plans for monitoring the project site and surrounding area for whooping cranes during spring and fall migration periods throughout the operational life of the project and shutting down turbines and/or construction activities within 2 miles of whooping crane sightings. The South Dakota Game, Fish, and Parks will be consulted on the procedure to minimize impacts to whooping cranes.*

If no, please explain why.

- 5-2) Please explain the whooping crane mitigation strategies implemented at the following adjacent wind facilities owned by Avangrid: Buffalo Ridge I, Buffalo Ridge II, Coyote Ridge, and MinnDakota.
- 5-3) Please refer to Condition 26 of the Settlement Stipulation in this docket that was not accepted by the commission (<https://puc.sd.gov/commission/dockets/electric/2019/el19-026/settlement.pdf>).
- a) How should cumulative impacts from adjacent wind facilities, such as Buffalo Ridge II, be considered when analyzing sound compliance with regulatory limits?
  - b) Does the Applicant have any proposed modifications to Condition 26 to address the concerns raised by Commissioner Fiegen during the October 15 commission meeting? Please explain.
  - c) How does the Applicant propose to analyze and measure cumulative sound impacts during post compliance testing? Should the condition be Project only, or consider all wind turbines within a reasonable proximity to the residence? Please explain.
  - d) Refer to the Applicant's response to Staff Data Request 2-33.
    - i. For Receptors H14 and H17, are the turbines associated with Buffalo Ridge II the primary source of sound when looking at the cumulative sound level for these residences?

- ii. What is the regulatory sound limit for Buffalo Ridge II? How should the Commission evaluate cumulative sound impacts when one wind facility has a higher regulatory limit than the adjacent wind farm being evaluated for cumulative impacts?
- 5-4) Refer to the Applicant's response to Commission Staff data requests 1-3 and 2-23(a). The Applicant stated "distance notwithstanding, one could not be simultaneously downwind from both projects simultaneously."
- a) Please explain the wind direction assumptions used in sound modeling software versus the downwind concept discussed in response Staff Data Request 1-3.
  - b) Is the sound modeling conservatively representing cumulative impacts based on wind direction assumptions included in software? Please explain.

Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of October 2019.



---

Amanda M. Reiss  
Staff Attorney  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
500 East Capitol Avenue  
Pierre, SD 57501  
Phone (605)773-3201  
[amanda.reiss@state.sd.us](mailto:amanda.reiss@state.sd.us)