RECEIVED

NOV 09 2026

SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Statement of Intent

Pursuant to SDCL 49-41B-22

Power On Midwest will negatively affect me in the following way(s):

X Health X Safety X Socio-economic X Environment

X Future development X Inhabitants X Future inhabitants

Name G & M McKeown Trust X Owner ☐ Renter

Location [redacted] Elkton SD 57026

Township and County Alton Brookings

Explanation: (add pages as appropriate)

See attached

Mary J Guthmiller

Signature Date 11-2-2026

Email [redacted]

Mailing Address [redacted] Bozeman MT 59718

Phone

November 2, 2026

RECEIVED
NOV 09 2026
SOUTH DAKOTA PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

Public Utilities Commission
Capitol Building 1st Floor
500 E Capitol Ave
Pierre SD 57501-5070

Subject: PowerOn Midwest Project

To the Public Utilities Commission:

As a landowner where the PowerOn Midwest Project is proposed, I am vehemently opposed to this and request denial on such a project. Recently, I attended a Brookings County Commission Zoning Committee meeting and listened to a recording of the PUC meeting held in Brookings where many people spoke out against this project.

My reasons:

1. The farm that some of the line is being proposed to go through (Why have they changed the line to now go through just our property - is it because one group has hired their own lawyers and we haven't?), has been in our family for 100 years and was granted the 100 year Farmstead award this September. It has seen much production of crops and livestock over the years and continues to produce crops to this day.
2. There will be no benefits for the people of South Dakota. Do the people of South Dakota need that much more power? No, it's mostly going to be used elsewhere, so why don't they have it go through their lands or even close to the power hungry data centers that are demanding this energy? Currently, there are many lines, wind turbines, and sub stations in this area. More will not only hamper existing inhabitants but will mar what is left of God's beautiful countryside. Additionally, the power companies themselves have as much admitted they target relatively less populated areas that are heavy agricultural corridors (which, by the way, feeds the very people that are trying to take away the land). Why is that? Do they think just because there are less people they aren't as important as more populated ones?
3. Despite "testimony" and "studies" (just who is funding their studies???) by PowerOn Midwest's paid doctors, there is greater risk of health issues, such as: cancers, electro-magnetic field impacts, thermal heating raising tissue temperatures, stabbing pains, infertility/miscarriages, and disruption of the body's own electrical system. The U.S. government does NOT have any uniformity in what constitutes safety limits for high voltage lines such as what is being proposed. Don't you think it would be prudent to have those in place first? Currently, we have family members living on land near where the power lines are being proposed. Who is going to pay for any health related costs? Certainly not these big companies! In contrast, there are organizations that are concerned with human and animal welfare as well as the environment that are conducting peer-reviewed research that are linking daily exposure to all the emissions of lines and sub-stations to significant problems.
4. There are also electrical hazards like downed wires posing risks of fires, electrocutions, and shock. Arc flashes through the air could interfere with machinery, people, and

animals. The noise that it creates 24/7 is very concerning, especially for needed sleep/rest! Additionally, there are many weather anomalies that occur in this area, which also pose greater risk of downed wires causing the above concerns.

5. Acreage can be taken by easements. Yes, a paltry **one-time** payment may take place to landowners, but will never replace taking the land out of production that provides a yearly income. If eminent domain is exercised, it is basically stealing what our relatives bought and have worked hard over the years to keep in our family. Oh, they may argue that the area can still be used, but would you and definitely not them want to do so?
6. Towers are around 175 feet tall, 150 feet wide with only a 250 foot right of way? Such towers disrupt wildlife such as deer, pheasant, and other birds. Hunting habitat is vital to this area!!! Additionally, what about the water in the area, such as aquifers and wetlands? What about the honeybee population that is vital to not only pollination, but honey production? A National Institute of Health Study listed at least 6 adverse issues that these lines cause the bees, which include queen bee loss and poor over winter survival rates and we all know how harsh South Dakota winters can be to them even without interference from these lines.
7. The argument of job creation is just a myth! Many South Dakotans will not be hired or if so, very temporarily or very few. Additionally, claiming that money will be generated to help South Dakota is also a myth (just like passage of allowing gambling several years ago was supposed to benefit education).
8. At a recent meeting, the power companies "promised" Brookings County that there will be a substantial million+ tax boost the first year of operation and any other subsequent years. That sounds like a bribe, please do not let this money be a carrot dangled in front of you. This so-called money will go to other residents and won't really benefit the landowners that have a huge stake in what happens to their land. In addition, if South Dakota continues to be fiscally responsible with its money (the current fiscal year ended with a surplus, however the agricultural sector, again, suffered quite a few burdens). Do not let them continue to shoulder the burden. Feeding people is imperative!!!!
9. The area is not equipped to handle large emergencies, such as uncontrolled prairie fires or the threat of cyber attacks (which are becoming more and more a reality).
10. The power companies investors are not concerned with any of the above concerns/risks that current and future landowners have, but only with their rate of monetary return. They don't live and work there.
11. In the 1970's, my mother was very active in the fight against putting a coal slurry line through South Dakota. Her efforts helped to get ETSI's project cancelled. Another recent grassroots effort in northern South Dakota is to not allow carbon dioxide lines to go through. As you can see, South Dakotans are and will continue to be passionate about **their** land and to be good stewards of it.
12. The majority of the people that live and farm there do NOT want or need this. They are the ones that will be shouldered with all the health risks, loss of property and income. Studies have shown that there is property devaluation where transmission lines are constructed. Some say it's an insignificant 2-10% - tell that to the landowners that it's not significant. Others indicate there is a much greater devaluation - who is going to cover that? Again, the actual landowners and not the land grabbing power companies.
13. What happens when the coal runs out? Will they then look into putting in a nuclear power station? Heaven forbid!

14. Finally, stand up for the residents of South Dakota and the little guy first. We don't have the lawyers and all the rest of the muscle the big power companies have armed themselves with.

Please check this website that the Environmental Health Sciences has. It has excellent information regarding all the arguments (and then some) landowners have presented. It includes many things to consider and questions to pose.
https://ehsciences.org/emf-insights/science-on-power-line-emf-health-effects/

Again, I adamantly oppose this project and am confident that you will weigh all the risks and cons of this project to protect not only this generation of South Dakotans, but future ones as well from such a project that poses more risks and issues than any possible benefits.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Mary McKeown Guthmiller

Mary McKeown Guthmiller