

From: [Patricia Johnson](#)
To: [Bruce, Charley \(PUC\)](#)
Cc: pands@nobleswildblue.com
Subject: RE: PUC docket number IP-6646/WS-09-584
Date: Monday, April 26, 2021 1:34:06 PM

The tower immediately north of the NW corner of section five, is sited too close to the Graber Trust property, such that the upward blade would be past the middle of 220th st, toward the south. If I am not correct on this matter, please let me know what the setback requirements are.

Neither Graber Trust (Sherman Graber) nor I (Patricia Johnson, wife of Sherman Graber) agree to any waiver or easement agreement for our properties in Section 5 Dewald township.

Thank you for your response and additional information.
-Patricia Johnson

--- charley.bruce@state.mn.us wrote:

From: "Bruce, Charley (PUC)" <charley.bruce@state.mn.us>
To: Patricia Johnson <pands@nobleswildblue.com>
CC: "Kaluzniak, Mike (PUC)" <mike.kaluzniak@state.mn.us>, "Birkholz, David (COMM)" <david.birkholz@state.mn.us>
Subject: RE: PUC docket number IP-6646/WS-09-584
Date: Mon, 26 Apr 2021 15:09:51 +0000

Hello Ms. Patricia Johnson,

Thank you for reaching out. You are correct with your question. Xcel Energy stated in its application that it is "working with landowners to secure sufficient land lease and wind easements/setback easement agreements necessary to repower, operate, and maintain the Project." The application goes on to state that, "where Xcel Energy is unable to reach agreement or obtain a no-objection declaration, Xcel Energy will seek a waiver from the Commission from the wind access buffer setback, consistent with the Commission's actions in other repower dockets."

If you have any other information or could expand on what you mean when you say a tower appears to be "noncompliant" as it was originally built that would be helpful.

Also, I will file your email as a comment in the docket in order to ensure it is part of the record the Commissioner's will review prior to making a final decision on the matter.

Thank you,

Charley

Charley Bruce

Energy Facilities Planner | Energy Facilities Permitting

Pronouns: He, him, his

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

121 7th Place E, Suite 350
Saint Paul, MN 55101-2147

O: 651-201-2251

C: 651-587-8603

F: 651-297-7073

mn.gov/puc



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is only for the use of the individual(s) named above. Information in this email or any attachment may be confidential or may be protected by state or federal law. Any unauthorized disclosure, use, dissemination, or copying of this message is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, do not read this email or any attachments and notify the sender immediately. Please delete all copies of this communication.

From: Patricia Johnson <pands@nobleswildblue.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 24, 2021 11:51 PM
To: MN_PUC_PublicAdvisor <publicadvisor.puc@state.mn.us>; Kaluzniak, Mike (PUC) <mike.kaluzniak@state.mn.us>; Bruce, Charley (PUC) <charley.bruce@state.mn.us>; Birkholz, David (COMM) <david.birkholz@state.mn.us>
Cc: pands@nobleswildblue.com
Subject: PUC docket number IP-6646/WS-09-584

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Regarding the requested permit amendments for upgrades to the Nobles Wind Farm:

Is the request asking PUC to grant waivers for wind access buffer setbacks for turbines where landowners have not and will not sign a waiver?

We are located in the west half of section 5 Dewald township, Nobles county.

We are against being forced to tolerate upgraded wind turbines which would be noncompliant, create more noise and shadow, denigrate a peaceful environment, and continue diminishing migrating birds and waterfowl.

Additionally the wind turbine immediately north of the northwest corner of Section 5 Dewald township appears to be noncompliant, as it was originally constructed.

Unfortunately, it was poor planning at the time of construction, that results in the current request for permit amendments. I believe longer blades were available at the time of original construction.

Rather than force individuals to tolerate the proposed upgrades, if no waiver is given by the landowner(s), the turbines should be decommissioned and moved to bring into compliance for any upgrade.

Thank you for the courtesy of your reply.

Sherman Graber and
-Patricia Johnson