

**From:** Sheila Monnier [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 7, 2026 11:29 AM  
**To:** PUC-PUC <[PUC@state.sd.us](mailto:PUC@state.sd.us)>  
**Subject:** [EXT] Re: EL25-028 – Opposition to Motion to Extend Decision Deadline

July 7, 2026

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

**Re: EL25-028 – Opposition to Motion to Extend Decision Deadline**

Dear Commissioners,

I respectfully ask the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission to deny the Applicants' Motion to Extend the Decision Deadline for an additional six months regarding EL25-028.

On June 2, 2026, the citizens of Deuel County clearly expressed their position regarding this proposed power plant. By a vote of **901 to 438**, county voters rejected the rezoning ordinance that was necessary for this project to proceed at the proposed location. That referendum restored the property's agricultural zoning and represented the direct voice of the people. The Applicants acknowledge this fact in their motion.

The basis of the current permit application has fundamentally changed. The proposed site no longer has the zoning necessary to support construction of the facility. Furthermore, South Dakota law prevents the rezoning question from being brought back before the voters for one year, and Deuel County has enacted a moratorium on power plant construction while it studies future zoning regulations. These are not temporary administrative delays but lawful actions taken by local government and affirmed by the voters.

The Applicants argue that additional time should be granted because they are evaluating alternative sites and considering their options. However, the uncertainty surrounding a future location is not a sufficient reason to keep the current application pending. If the Applicants determine another site is appropriate, they have acknowledged they may withdraw this application and submit a new one or seek to amend it. Those future possibilities should not justify extending an application that is based upon a site that currently cannot be developed under existing county zoning.

The Applicants also cite the time and financial resources they have invested in the project. While those investments are understandable, they do not outweigh the legal actions already taken by Deuel County or the clear decision made by its citizens through the referendum process. Granting an extension would effectively disregard the outcome of a

lawful election and prolong uncertainty for the residents and landowners who have already participated extensively in this process.

The people of Deuel County have spoken through the democratic process. The proposed site is no longer consistent with local zoning, and the application should be evaluated based on the facts as they exist today—not on the possibility that circumstances may someday change.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Commission deny the Applicants' request for a six-month extension and proceed with a decision based on the current record.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and for your service to the citizens of South Dakota.

Respectfully,

Sheila and Bryon Monnier

[REDACTED]

Brandt, SD 57218