

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

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION BY DEUEL HARVEST WIND ENERGY
SOUTH LLC FOR ENERGY FACILITY PERMITS OF A WIND ENERGY FACILITY
AND A 345 KV TRANSMISSION FACILITY IN DEUEL COUNTY, SOUTH DAKOTA
FOR THE SOUTH DEUEL WIND PROJECT**

SD PUC DOCKET EL24-____

**PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL HANKARD
ON BEHALF OF DEUEL HARVEST WIND ENERGY SOUTH LLC**

June 28, 2024

1 **I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS**

2

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

4 **A.** My name is Michael Hankard. I am the president and principal of Hankard
5 Environmental, Inc. (“Hankard Environmental”). My business address is 211 East
6 Verona Avenue, Verona, Wisconsin 53593.

7

8 **Q. On whose behalf are you providing this testimony?**

9 **A.** I am providing this testimony on behalf of Deuel Harvest Wind Energy South LLC
10 (“South Deuel Wind”) in support of its Facility Permit Application (“Application”) to
11 the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission. The Application is for a permit to
12 construct and operate a wind energy facility which will have a nameplate capacity
13 of up to 260 megawatts (“MW”) and deliver up to 250 MW to the point of
14 interconnection (“Wind Energy Facility”), and a transmission facility which will
15 operate at 345 kilovolts (“kV”) and be approximately 6 miles in length
16 (“Transmission Facility”). The Wind Energy Facility and the Transmission Facility
17 are collectively referred to as the Project.

18

19 **Q. Briefly describe your educational background and professional experience.**

20 **A.** I have been measuring, analyzing, researching, and reporting on environmental
21 noise levels for more than 30 years. My focus over the last 15 years has been
22 noise from utility-scale wind turbines, but I also have extensive experience with
23 noise from mining operations, industrial plants, roadways, rail lines, commercial
24 developments, and a host of other sources. I have worked on projects across the
25 United States, as well as internationally, and have been principally responsible for
26 noise measurements, analysis, and control on over 500 projects. I have interacted
27 with a wide cross-section of project participants, including the public, local and
28 state agencies, owners, operators, designers, and planners. I have a B.S. in
29 electrical engineering from the University of Maine with a specialization in
30 acoustics. I am a full member of the Institute of Noise Control Engineering and the
31 Acoustical Society of America, and a member of the ANSI/ACP 111-1 Wind

32 Turbine Sound Modeling Standard Subcommittee. My statement of qualifications
33 is attached as **Exhibit 1**.

34

35 **Q. Expand on your professional expertise regarding sound from wind turbines,**
36 **and how it is relevant to these proceedings.**

37 **A.** I have conducted some of the most in-depth noise measurement studies of
38 operating wind turbines in the United States. This experience includes spending
39 many days and nights at residences located within wind farms listening to and
40 measuring turbine noise and has given me a first-hand understanding of the
41 characteristics of wind turbine noise emissions. In addition, I have spent hundreds
42 of hours reviewing measured noise levels, listening to audio recordings, and have
43 developed time- and frequency-based methods for separating wind turbine noise
44 from that of the wind blowing through vegetation, traffic, insects/frogs, etc. I used
45 the results of these real-world studies to validate the accuracy of the noise model
46 I employed to predict noise emissions from the Project. Thus, the model of wind
47 turbine noise emissions I use is accurate and is calibrated to predict the maximum
48 wind turbine noise level over a one-hour period that is expected to occur at each
49 residence. Finally, I have participated in public and agency hearings regarding
50 wind turbines at which the full spectrum of wind turbine noise issues was debated.
51 This includes audible noise, low frequency noise, and infrasound. In preparation
52 for these proceedings, I have read the relevant and significant research papers on
53 these subjects published by acoustical consultants, government agencies,
54 university researchers, and health professionals.

55

56 **II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

57

58 **Q. What is your role with respect to the Project?**

59 **A.** Hankard Environmental was retained to conduct noise modeling for the Project.
60 The firm conducted acoustic modeling of the Project's proposed layout and
61 prepared an associated report entitled Noise Analysis, which is provided in
62 Appendix M of the Application.

63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93

Q. What is the purpose of your Direct Testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to discuss the methodology and results of the acoustic modeling Hankard Environmental conducted for the Project. In addition, I will discuss how the modeling demonstrates that the Project will comply with applicable acoustic regulations.

Q. Identify the sections of the Application that you are sponsoring for the record.

A. I am sponsoring the following portions of the Application:

- Section 11.3: Sound
- Appendix M: Noise Analysis

Q. What exhibits are attached to your Direct Testimony?

A. I am sponsoring the following exhibit:

- **Exhibit 1:** Michael Hankard Statement of Qualifications

III. ACOUSTIC ANALYSIS

Q. What was the purpose of the acoustic modeling and analysis discussed in the Noise Analysis?

A. The purpose of the Noise Analysis was to model the sound level to be produced by the Project and determine through analysis whether the noise generated by the Project will comply with the applicable noise standard in Deuel County, which establishes a maximum dBA level at non-participating residences. To ensure compliance with that requirement, my modeling was designed to assess the maximum sound level that could be generated by each turbine in any given hour (one-hour L_{eq}). Consistent with these goals, the Noise Analysis describes the results of the acoustic modeling we conducted, which demonstrates that Project sound levels will meet Deuel County’s 45 dBA noise standard at the perimeter of existing, non-participating residences.

94

95 **Q. Are you aware of any federal or state sound level regulations for wind energy**
96 **conversion facilities located in South Dakota?**

97 **A.** No. There are no federal noise regulations that apply to this Project. One noise-
98 related requirement at the state level is South Dakota Administrative Rule
99 20:10:22:33.02(5), which requires that an application for an Energy Facility Permit
100 include “Anticipated noise levels at the exterior of all occupied residences located
101 within the affected area during construction and operation.” The Noise Analysis
102 satisfies this requirement.

103

104 **Q. Has Deuel County established sound level requirements for wind energy**
105 **facilities?**

106 **A.** Yes. Section 1215.03(13)(a) of the Deuel County Zoning Ordinance provides that
107 the “Noise level for non-participating residences shall not exceed 45 DBA, average
108 A-Weighted Sound pressure. The noise level is to be measured at the perimeter
109 of existing non-participating residences.” This is the only numerical noise limit
110 applicable to wind energy systems in Deuel County, South Dakota.

111

112 **Q. Could you provide an overview of the methodology used in conducting the**
113 **acoustic modeling analysis for the Project?**

114 **A.** Noise levels from the Project were predicted using the modeling method set forth
115 in the International Organization for Standardization (“ISO”) Standard 9613-
116 2:2024: Attenuation of Sound During Propagation Outdoors. The method was
117 implemented using the SoundPLAN (v8.2) acoustical modeling program.

118

119 Three different turbine models were included in the analysis: Siemens Gamesa
120 (“SG”) model 4.4-164 wind turbines, utilizing 71 turbine locations, and all turbines
121 to be equipped with low-noise blades; Vestas model V163-4.5 wind turbines,
122 utilizing 71 turbine locations, and all turbines to be equipped with serrated trailing
123 edge (“STE”) blades; and General Electric (“GE”) Sierra model 3.8-154 wind
124 turbines, utilizing 73 turbine locations, and all turbines to be equipped with low

125 noise trailing edge (“LNTE”) blades.¹ For each analysis, two 150 mVA main power
126 transformers for the collector substation were also modeled.

127
128 In the SoundPLAN model, each turbine was represented as an acoustical point
129 source located at its hub height, which is 98 meters above the ground for the GE
130 3.8-154 and V163-4.5 units, 97.5 meters for the SG 4.4-164 units, and three
131 meters for the main power transformers. No directivity was applied to any noise
132 source, thus assuming maximum acoustic output in all directions. All turbines were
133 assumed to be operating in full, normal, and continuous operation and the main
134 power transformers (two 150 MVA) were assumed to be operating fully. The
135 locations of the turbines and main power transformers were provided by South
136 Deuel Wind. Also, in the SoundPLAN model, 132 receptors (residences) were
137 located within approximately 1.25 miles of any turbine or the substation. The
138 geographic locations of the residences were provided by South Deuel Wind and
139 reviewed by Hankard Environmental.

140

141 **Q. Please summarize the results of the analysis.**

142 **A.** Noise levels from the Project are predicted to not exceed 45 dBA at all non-
143 participating residences within 1.25 miles of the Project turbines and main power
144 transformers. At non-participating residences within the study area, predicted
145 noise levels are as follows:

- 146 • SG 4.4-164 Low Noise: range of 31 to 42 dBA with an average of 37 dBA.
- 147 • V163-4.5 STE: range of 35 to 44 dBA with an average of 40 dBA.
- 148 • GE Sierra 3.8-154 LNTE: range of 36 to 45 dBA with an average of 41 dBA.

149 The modeling approach employed in the Noise Analysis consistently overpredicts
150 measured levels. That is, actual noise levels from the Project are expected to be
151 less than those listed in the Noise Analysis and lower than the Deuel County limits.
152 Moreover, a majority of the time, noise levels will be lower than predicted when the

¹ The SG and Vestas turbine models do not include proposed turbine locations 69 and 76 to match the corresponding Shadow Flicker Analysis prepared for the Project. All turbine models at all proposed turbine locations can be constructed in compliance with Deuel County’s 45 dBA limit at all non-participating residences.

153 turbines are not producing full acoustic output due to low winds, and/or
154 atmospheric conditions are not as conducive to sound propagation as assumed in
155 this analysis.

156

157 **Q. Are you aware of any post-construction noise studies for other wind farms**
158 **that support the accuracy and conservativeness of the pre-construction**
159 **noise modeling you conducted for the Project?**

160 **A.** Yes. The noise level modeling method employed on this Project has been
161 validated by many acoustical consultants, including Hankard Environmental.
162 Hankard Environmental has conducted numerous wind turbine noise level
163 compliance surveys, and routinely compares the results of these measurements
164 with corresponding predicted levels using the same methods employed on this
165 Project. The noise modeling method used in the Noise Analysis has been
166 demonstrated by Hankard Environmental and other acoustical consultants to over-
167 predict actual maximum one-hour L_{eq} levels by at least 1 dBA.

168

169 **IV. CONCLUSION**

170

171 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

172 **A.** Yes.

173

174

175 Dated this 28th day of June, 2024

176 

177

178 _____
Michael Hankard