

Dear Planning and Zoning Board,

On August 28th Grant County Development Corporation and Lake Area Technical Institute sponsored an educational information tour of wind energy systems in Minnesota, for the Grant County Commissioners and Planning and Zoning Board and the public. Although the bus went into Toronto, SD we did not stop to meet South Dakotans living with a corporate wind project as we will have in Grant County. There, many residents who will invite you over for a cup of coffee in the backyard under the turbines if you can handle it, one talks about the walls of his house rattling, another about how noisy the turbines are downwind and in the dense heavy air. It would have been good for policymakers to hear from residents who won't drive on certain roads in the winter because of ice throw. Our tour turned out to be an aggressive sales pitch from Vestas employee who owns his own turbine. We heard about the "combine in the sky" that generates \$165K per year, without having to give up his property rights. Wonder if that figure includes production tax credits, p.i.l.o.t, carbon credits, and pipeline payments. WOW, that is 10x the check in the mail, contracted landowners will get from Dakota Range project.

The salesman was taken aback when he heard about the 4.2MW Vestas turbines in the Dakota Range project. He said the 2.0 MW Vestas is the most efficient and have the longest life. We learned the "clean and green" turbines use 80 gallons of fossil fuel per generator (4.2MW use 335 gallons) and that when the turbine isn't spinning, it is using electricity from the coal powered grid. He also talked about the natural gas fired power plant in Aurora, SD and how it will power turbines. Natural gas consists mostly of methane which is 84x more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide, not sure how that is environmentally friendly.

Unlike the Dakota Range project, his lonely turbine is not in a string of 3 or 4, the turbine is 4,000 feet from the closest neighbor and 2,000 feet from the closest turbine, which also is not in a string of 3. It is a 1.5 MW and 80-meter tower with 120-foot blades. The blade tips are 142 feet off the ground. The Dakota Range wind project (Grant and Codington Counties) will be 4.2 MW, 82-meter (269 feet) towers with 220-foot blades sweeping through the air around 50 feet off the ground. The salesman sited his half-pint size, hilltop turbine just over 1500 feet and a 324-foot drop in elevation from the nacelle to his tree surrounded home. In the Dakota Range project, non-participating residents, have no say in siting, and there is at least one home that will have a string of three 4.2MW turbines with the nacelle (noisy, school bus size 4 generator compartment) approximately 2,000 feet almost level with a bedroom window. Very doubtful that home will be livable or sellable if the proposed turbines are constructed.

Since he owns his turbine, he can go out and feather the blades (turning them to reduce surface area and noise) and he can control the speed. On that day, the salesman said the tip of the blades were going about 100 mph. The turbines in the Dakota Range Project are corporate owned and will be operating at full capacity to make the maximum dollar for the corporation, spinning at 120-170 mph, not for the comfort or safety of nearby residents.

If our county commissioners and the planning and zoning board thought the salesman's turbine was a great example, they should require the 1.5 to 2.0 MW turbine to be privately owned (keeps the \$\$ in the community) on owner occupied land. The turbine must be single and not in a set of three. The setback should require that the private turbine owner not trespass flicker or infrasound on the neighboring land unless there is a waiver signed by the neighbor. Like the example there should be a minimum setback of 4,000 feet to the nearest neighbor and 2,000 feet to the nearest single turbine. The setback requirements should also consider number of generators (increased noise and infrasound) total blade tip height (flicker) and blade size (increased noise, infrasound, and flicker). So for a 4.2 MW, a 12,000 foot setback? Just like the example shown, the board should require the turbine to be privately owned so the owner can control the speed, pitch, yaw and turn off when needed, because of, out of balance

blades or ice buildup. Although, not sure who would risk their life, against the manufacturers advice and go near an out of control industrial wind turbine.

The informational packet from First District and Lake Area Tech was full of outdated and incorrect information as was our host. When pressed about the \$15 billion Minnesota taxpayers have paid in subsidies to the wind and supporting transmission lines he passed it off as a million and no subsidies have been given. Minnesota Blows YouTube video clearly contradicts what we were led to believe about subsidies, taxes and electric rates. The truth for South Dakota lies somewhere in the middle. Where is the net tax benefit study to Grant County? Will South Dakotans electric rates continue to climb because MN has a mandate on renewable energy? For better economic development, why isn't our county and the state promoting private ownership of industrial turbines? Why is the state of South Dakota taking the lion's share of income from the turbines and only giving a little back to the communities, especially the townships most impacted by industrial turbines?

The tour of a single small turbine, on a warm clear day, is a huge gross misrepresentation of what will happen if the Dakota Range project is constructed. Even if the turbines are half the size proposed for Dakota Range, it would have been nice to visit a South Dakota wind project, owned by out of state multinational corporations, and been able to visit with people forced to live with industrial power plants in their backyards.

Vince and Pat Meyer, Dan and Teresa Kaaz, Al and Shirley Robish, Wayne Borgheiinck, Amber Christensen and Kristi Mogen