

From: eera.admin_no_reply@state.mn.us
To: [Steinhauer, Suzanne \(COMM\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment re: Walleye Wind Project
Date: Thursday, January 21, 2021 11:06:32 AM

Walleye Wind Project

Submitter Name: Kay Ames

Submitter Email: ameskm8@gmail.com

Submitter Telephone: (605) 757-6663

Comment:

I have notified the TV stations in South Dakota of your project along the South Dakota State line. That potentially concerns of South Dakotans along the Minnesota an S.D. border so they can address their concerns. We border the South Dakota State line we've lived here over 40 years and enjoy wildlife and beautiful view of our countryside. Your proposal of these 585 foot wind turbines will be deportment to wildlife and an eyesore to the landscape. The noise levels both audible and inaudible vibrations will impact the well-being of everything living. I suggest you put in the middle of Minnesota where I can?t see it!

Submit Date: 01/21/2021 11:06 AM

Austin Carlson
48763 256th St.
Garretson, SD 57030

1/20/2021

Suzanne Steinhauer, Environmental Review Manager
Minnesota Department of Commerce
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101

Public Comment to address Docket Numbers (20-269 & 20-384) Large Wind Energy Conversion Project

I have numerous concerns with the proposed Walleye Wind Project planned for southwest Minnesota. My family has actively lived and farmed along the SD/MN border since 1886. I am the 4th generation of the Carlson family to live on the home farm place and continue farming operations. The last 2.5 years my wife and I have rented the home we live in, on my family's historic home place (recognized as a century farm) and were blessed with the opportunity to purchase the acreage this fall. A couple weeks after we closed our home, we learned of the Walleye Wind Project and realized we live less than 1,500' from the proposed project boundary, 3,500' and 3,700' respectively from two turbines. A huge frustration of mine is the lack of notice regarding this project from the project developers and MN PUC. I do not feel like this has been a transparent process. Below are summaries of my concerns for the proposed project. Though the project boundary lies within MN, impacts from the project will carry over and affect land owners and residents of SD.

1. Potential human and environmental impacts of the proposed project should be considered in the environmental report and the draft site permit

- a. Personal use and enjoyment of property is a right that is upheld in our state and federal constitutions. This right allows free use and enjoyment of property as long as the enjoyment does not disturb or unreasonably interfere with neighboring property owners. Large wind turbines on neighboring properties causes several concerns to our community and does hinder the current use and enjoyment of property:
 - i. Shadow flicker—My wife and her entire family enjoy riding horses and occasionally train young horses. The shadows will pose additional risk for young horses (or family member's horses that are not used to the shadow flicker) to spook, increasing the chance for dangerous situations. This is an unreasonable obstacle that my family should not have to consider when using our property.
 - ii. Audible noise—We specifically enjoy our property because of the peace and quiet. Our driveway is relatively long, we live on a rarely traveled road, and we sincerely appreciate our property as a place to enjoy the sounds of pheasants, and many other wild birds. Though most of the time our property is quiet, we do live close to a busy railroad tracks. The trains frequently wake me up in the night, I don't need any additional sustained sounds to listen to.
 - iii. Scenic views of the area—Our house has a deck that faces east. I estimate when the weather is suitable, we enjoy eating 90% of our meals outside, on the deck. Countless morning sunrises have been viewed. I am genuinely sad that this simple joy of my life is proposed to be taken by placing an incredibly tall, industrialized object directly in the center of the natural horizon we currently cherish.
 - iv. Wind developers often describe turbines fitting seamlessly in the rural landscape; I do not find this true at all. The tallest agriculture structure in the area is at the Valley Springs Farmer's Coop where the grain leg stands 115' tall and is stationary. The proposed 114m tower climbs to a

height of 375' to the generator plus 127' blades rotating around. These wind turbines do NOT fit with the surrounding natural landscapes and do NOT fit with the rural facilities of the farming community. 40 structures towering 580+ feet scattered around the country side is not natural to rural landscapes, not to mention the sweeping motion of the blades casting moving shadows in addition to nuisance noise.

- b. Nuisances of living near a wind farm certainly decrease residential property values as the sights and sounds of the turbines are negative externalities and impact the future value of a residential property. This is fundamentally wrong to decrease other's property value for the gain of MN, and a few land owners.
- c. Another human impact I would urge the commission to consider is the socioeconomic results of approving this project and how it will change the character of the community. The wind developer offers lucrative lease payments to land owners; this in turn is supposed to help farmers—just some farmers. Please consider another angle. These lease payments can negatively impact our community as it widens the economic gap between farmers who receive a payment and those who do not. No one in Rock Co. purchased land with the expectation of “producing wind”. If approved, I personally believe this community will accelerate the trend to fewer farmers covering more acres. Fewer farmers lead to fewer businesses, and fewer students in schools. Another real challenge in rural America is increasing age of current farmers with fewer beginning farmers entering the profession. Lucrative wind payments have potential to inflate ag land prices in this area, further hindering opportunities for beginning farmers.
- d. How many absentee landowners have lease agreements? Those living out of this area will not be spending their dollars locally.
- e. Animal impact in the form of livestock is of importance to me. My family raises livestock and frequently grazes pasture and crop ground that will be near several turbines. I'm concerned conception rates and weight gain may be impacted.
- f. Animal impacts to wildlife are important to me as well. My family has adopted farming practices that enhance wildlife habitat we've seen an increase in wildlife in the fields. After harvesting small grains, geese and other birds flock to these fields to find food. Pheasants, deer, owls, ducks, and many other animals seek refuge on our farm throughout various periods of the year. We even have noticed a pair of bald eagles the past two summers. This summer I spotted them in the section I live on, directly adjacent to the proposed site. My family and friends enjoy watching the abundant wildlife and enjoy good hunting opportunities on our property and in this area. This wind development further hinders some traditions we've come to love.
- g. Environmental concerns I have is when the turbines reach the end of their useful life and the blades are unable to be recycled. When the blades are replaced, the old ones will likely be cut up and/or buried whole in a landfill. 127' long composite blades take a lot of space, and certainly are not good for the soil or the disturbed land they are placed in.

2. What are possible methods to minimize, mitigate, or avoid potential impacts of the proposed project that should be considered in the Environmental Report and the draft site permit?

- a. I believe if this project is welcomed by the citizens of Rock County, all the benefits AND negatives of this project should remain in Rock Co. At this time, benefits stay in MN, and negatives are carried over to SD residents.
- b. Increased turbine setbacks specifically for non-participating receptors (in MN and SD residents along the border)
 - i. SD residents will not benefit by county tax dollars by this project. Please consider moving the 6 turbines close to the state border further into MN.

3. Are there any unique characteristics of the proposed site or the project that should be considered?

- a. The proposed site is situated so close to the SD/MN border. Many SD residents along the border still are unaware of this project.
- b. The western portion of the proposed project area is very close to a busy railroad track. Please consider reassessing the ambient sound levels closer to the railroad tracks as the current ambient sound levels were not taken near railroad tracks.
- c. This area has rich cultural heritage to many families in the area including mine. Our ancestors have lived and enjoyed the resources, sights, and sounds of this area and have shaped who we are today. Enjoyment of peaceful scenery and nature on my family's land over my entire life has helped develop my thought process and creativity. A radical change to this environment of erecting many turbines close by will end, or at least dampen this desired environment I'd like to offer for my future children
- d. Utilize the existing infrastructure of the 7 existing turbines—the concrete is already there, the towers are erected; replace worn out components with new. Removing 7 turbines just to put up 44 seems like an inefficient use of resources.

4. Are there other ways to meet the stated need for the project, for example, a different size project or a different type of facility? If so, what alternatives to the project should be considered in the Environmental Report?

- a. I propose the project be built closer to the recipients of the needed energy. Larger diameter transmission lines and longer lines are needed when transporting the energy long miles. Please reevaluate a smaller project, closer to the energy demand. Positioning the project closer to demanded energy would reduce infrastructure and minimize voltage loss.
- b. Wind energy is stated 40-50% efficient. Less than half of the time, the facility is generating power, and matching the energy supply to the demand needs is rarely achieved.
- c. Under MN Statutes 216B.243, the Certificate of Need must enhance or protect the environmental quality and to increase reliability of energy. Wind energy is not very reliable. Consumers demand energy at all times of the day, wind energy is not always available to meet the energy demanded.
- d. As the energy this facility is expected to generate is used in large population areas of MN, please determine some cost alternatives to other energy sources where the facility would be located to the demanded energy:
 - i. Geothermal
 - ii. Methane digester from waste materials
 - iii. Horizontal wind turbines (urban areas) to minimize shadow flicker and noise
 - iv. Solar panels on rooftops in the cities
 - v. I am trying to stress more localized energy production, smaller, less asthenic altering wind generators that provide power to hundreds of homes rather than thousands would be more acceptable around here and would consist of far less infrastructure and would be much less cost, producing a return faster than these giant ones.

I will end by sighting comment by conservationist and philosopher Aldo Leopold and ask you ponder his thoughts wisdom. *"To sum up: a system of conservation based solely on economic self-interest is hopelessly lopsided. It tends to ignore, and thus eventually to eliminate, many elements in the land community but are essential to its healthy functioning."*

Thank you for your consideration.

-Austin

Suzanne Steinhauer
Environmental Review Manager
Minnesota Department of Commerce
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul MN 55101

Public Comment for Docket Numbers: 20-269 & 20-384

My husband and I live on the South Dakota border, just over ¼ mile from the proposed Walleye Wind project boundary.

I am concerned about the quality of life of people within and surrounding the project area. Our household enjoys nature and the outdoors. We appreciate the natural beauty and rolling hills in this area. We spend most of our time outside and value our view. Turbines will alter the viewshed for miles surrounding this project. I am also very concerned about the noise impacts we will face. This is a very quiet area, and the constant noise of surrounding turbines will have a noticeable impact on our daily life. Part of the reason we live in a rural area is because it is peaceful.

Health impacts are a serious concern. I have been disappointed with the limited information presented with this project on potential health impacts caused by living near turbines. There are many peer reviewed studies showing wind turbines can cause vertigo, headaches, sleep disruption, and heart issues for some people. With conflicting research on this topic, all perspectives should be considered. When questioned about health concerns at the public meeting 1/5/2021, the answer was vague “There are occasional problems, just as you would expect.” I would like to know what is expected, and what happens if health issues result from living in close proximity to this project?

We have livestock and horses that I’m concerned about too. As much as we will be impacted by the turbine noise, infrasound, and shadow flicker, they will have no escape from this. The increase in traffic and noise during construction, along with shadow flicker coming onto my property has strong potential to create a risk of accidents while horseback riding.

We enjoy seeing wildlife daily in the area and look for ways to improve habitat. Palisades State Park is also very close to the proposed project, and many wildlife species including bald eagles are seen commonly there. This is a large attraction for recreation in the Garretson area. I fear this project will push wildlife from our area.

Living within the noise, view, and shadow flicker zones of these turbines presents a concern for property values of many homes, and interferes with the quiet enjoyment of our property. Non participating land owners will have to live with the negative impacts of this project without receiving financial benefit. Many would not choose to move into a wind farm area, and feel like they have no say over one moving in around them. When a project affects so many lives, everyone should be invited to participate and be part of the decision making.

Next Era stated they operate with transparency. South Dakota landowners adjacent to the project area along with many people living within ¾ mile from proposed turbines, that will be directly affected by both noise and shadow flicker, have not been informed of this project. Public transparency and working together would help minimize the negative impacts. The fact that many have not been informed causes distrust and division in the community and amongst neighbors.

Some potential methods to minimize, mitigate, or avoid potential impacts of the proposed project to consider:

- Increase setbacks to from concerned households to protect health and quality of life.
- Add noise reduced operations technology to turbines near concerned households.
- Work with affected landowners and residents on turbine placement.
- Relocate turbines that are directly on the state border. South Dakota residents living near the border will receive the negative impacts of this project in our daily lives, while not receiving the financial benefits Rock County gains from this project.
- Turbines 29 and 30 are very close to West Palisades Cemetery. Larger setbacks should be considered to respect areas with cultural importance.
- Locate this project closer to where the energy will be used. This project will add massive infrastructure that will change this area for years to come. Transporting the produced power many miles to urban areas does not seem like the most efficient use of resources.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Baylee Carlson
48763 256th St
Garretson, SD 57030
(605) 351-7340

From: [Brian Carlson](#)
To: [Steinhauer, Suzanne \(COMM\)](#)
Subject: Walleye Wind LLC
Date: Monday, January 25, 2021 9:19:11 PM

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.

Docket number 20-269 or 20-384

My name is Brian Carlson. My wife Wendy & I live @ 48770 257th St Garretson, SD 57030. We understand the possibilities of a wind farm is being considered in our area. I also see we have been left out as being recognized as residing in the affected area. I understand we should have received a sound level modeling result as it affects our residence.

I am not impressed how this wind farm is conveniently placed @ a neighboring state border taking away the voice from the adjoining state property owners. A project such as this should have all neighboring land owners having equal voice.

I do expect to hear back from someone.

Brian & Wendy Carlson

January 25, 2021

Bruce Carlson – 605-360-2058

Email: CarlsBru4020@alliancecom.net

Proposed Project Docket # 20-269 and # 20-384

I have listed below concerns I have regarding the proposed wind project in Rock County, Minnesota.

I am a South Dakota property owner & resident, a livestock and crop producer adjacent to the Minnesota line. I question why the South Dakota property owners were not informed of such a project?

It affects us South Dakota residents who will have the visual effect. I understand these towers are to be 292 feet & 374 feet tall and a blade height of 127 feet equaling around 500 feet tall with a red blinking light at night. Other concerns I have are:

- inaudible noise**
- turbine noise**
- health issues such as dizziness, vertigo, migraines and sleep deprivation**
- loss of productivity in livestock**
- property values**
- GPS interruptions**
- Television & phone interruptions**

If Minnesota is to benefit from this then I believe it should be placed further into Minnesota than riding on the South Dakota line where residents living there will have nothing to gain from the project but the possible bad health effects.

Thank you for your time in listening to my concerns.

Bruce Carlson

Public Comment

Proposed project docket numbers
(20-269 & 20-384)
Walleye Wind Project Proposal

Rhonda Drewes
605-351-2355
Sherman, SD, 57030
rhonda.drewes@gmail.com

My concerns are for my Daughter
and Son in law and future grandchildren
The proposed project will place a
turbine less than a mile from
their home.

- Noise levels - both audible and inaudible vibrations (infrasound) could have negative impact on their health not to mention quality of life. This could also include livestock
- Shadow Flicker - is another health concern!
- Property value will go down.

Public Comment to be considered from

Jordan Dumke

48794 259th st

Valley Springs SD 57068

jordan.dumke@yahoo.com

605-237-0896

Project docket number (920-269 & 20-384)

Thank you for taking the time to review my comment. I'm going to start by saying I recently moved here from Deuel County SD. Before I moved, they were in the process of starting a wind farm that ran the entire width of the county.

A few of my concerns include the one-sided education of the public, the greed you will witness from your neighbors, the absolute destruction of the infrastructure during construction, the type of people that will be in the immediate area during the construction, the destruction of wildlife habitat. Some health, both physical and psychological, concerns that stem from the blade flicker from when the blades shadow casts over the landscape and often times the windows of your house. The constant woosh woosh woosh that is unavoidable and has been proven to literally drive people crazy. Then to top it off there are studies that suggest a drastic property value decrease for acreages nearby.

so lets begin

1) One sided education of the public

- a. All the studies that you will hear are conducted and paid for by the wind companies and any outside studies will quickly be disregarded, you will hear arguments from people that sound like "well the wind company has showed us the data on that why would I not trust them". At the risk of sounding like a kook. Its because the wind companies have an agenda, and that is to get the towers built and move on to the next one. So clearly the studies that they conducted and paid for will be displayed in a way that favors their argument.
 - i. Just one example is the decibel rating map. I am right on the edge of the 35-decibel line. What kind of protections are in place if the decibel rating exceeds that?

2) The greed that you will witness

- a. The biggest argument I hear from the participating land owners is "well its my land, you can't tell me what to do on it." So, with that logic If I owned that land directly downstream, I could dam it up causing the water to flood his property? Or I could

plant trees with no regard to how it affects everyone else, my point in this is that yes the towers are on their land, but it affects the non-participating landowners and that should be considered in the decision.

- b. The participating landowners reap the benefits of the towers, the schools are promised money for the towers. Those are good things, but in Deuel county's case there is a portion of their k-12 school that is falling into deep disrepair, there needs to be some intervention. So after the claims of how much money the farmers will be making off the towers and how good the schools will have it, it turns out that the schools budget gets offset by state funding so the money that the wind turbines bring in basically ends back in the state pool. It went to a vote for the tax payers to add a penny to the city sales tax to pay for it. That also failed miserably. The take away is the promise for more money to the school transfers to more money to the participants and everyone else gets nothing.
- 3) One thing that the commission did right when they were negotiating the contracts with the wind companies was make sure the wind companies were responsible for repairing the roads when they were done with construction. We will see how that plays out when the construction is finished. As of now the roads are a nightmare. They have to widen roads to make the corners, the equipment coming in and out of the fields coats the roads with mud and dirt clumps that make some roads nearly un-drivable in a car. The gravel roads have large ruts in them, and most of the time its up to the county to maintain and fix them, also it may be a good time to add, in the case of the eventual need to remove the towers it will be up to the county to pay the bill on that. They have to be hauled to the landfill and buried, that takes up a lot of space because they can't be crushed. From what I've seen at the landfill they cut them in to thirds and stack them beside each other, just imagine how much space that takes up. What happens to the concrete foundations in the event they get removed? Farm around them?
- 4) Now the people that come to town in droves during construction process aren't all bad, but they aren't all good either, as I was in my friend's driveway, we witnessed one of the not great ones literally punching his girlfriend/wife in the face. I guess to each their own but when they do it in broad day light right in front of 2 families and their kids leaving a 10-year-old girl crying hysterically what else are they bold enough to do. Is my house safe will I have to install security systems and cameras around my properties, what kind of added policing will there be to help combat this issue?
- 5) I believe the destruction of wildlife habitat is self-explanatory
- 6) The fear with light flicker only gets worse as the towers get larger. Light flicker is significant up to 10 rotor diameter (127m for these towers), 1270meters = 4166 ft. or ¾ mile. There are 2 towers within that range of my house. that doesn't mean its non-existent at a much farther distance. Recommended set backs are 2km from non-participants to alleviate the health risks caused by light flicker.
- 7) Property values decrease around wind towers, studies conducted by Forensic Appraisal Group LTD. suggest at minimum property values decrease by 10% and can even deem a property unsellable. Is there any compensation for non-participants to accommodate the drop in value in their property?

In conclusion my experience in living near a developing wind farm have been, not so great. I know that my voice may very well fall on deaf ears, but I also know that there are many more people that agree with me and don't speak up. Thank you for your time and I hope you all have a wonderful day.

Docket Number 20-369 and 20-384

As a property owner located near the South Dakota, Minnesota border who rents residential property near the proposed site, I do not support the Walleye Wind Project. My concern with the project is that the negative impacts of noise and destroyed view to the property I rent will make finding tenants more challenging as the turbines will deter interest for prospective tenants of my property. The project boundary is simply too close to the border and creates a nuisance to my property. This nuisance will cause me reduced income potential from my rental business. I don't believe its right to exclude South Dakota property owners from a project that is practically in our front yard and will extend negative effects onto us, while not providing any compensation to property owners, our county, or even our state. I ask consideration to move the turbines further from the South Dakota border and keep all the effects from the project within the bounds of Minnesota.

Mark Ericksen

From: jackieb@alliancecom.net
To: [Steinhauer, Suzanne \(COMM\)](#)
Subject: Walleye Wind Project
Date: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 9:30:51 AM

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.

We were never advised of this project even though it impacts our landscape, property values, communications interruptions and livestock health along with wildlife concerns.

These issues are real, in addition to South Dakota doesn't receive any value from this project but it negatively impacts our way of life without any permission or compensation.

For that matter, all power produced and carried on transport lines LEAVES THE STATE with no value to the residents who are impacted by this in Minnesota as well as those in South Dakota who live within viewing distance of these proposed wind towers.

We are opposed to this addition of towers in an already over farmed tower area.

From: [Eric Kientopf](#)
To: [Steinhauer, Suzanne \(COMM\)](#)
Subject: rock county wind generator project 20-96
Date: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 9:42:35 PM

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.

as some one living close to the boarder i feel this project should be postponed until there is a public meeting the impact to our country neighbor hood will include unsightly wind turbines noise what is the impact on wild life ,liestock and human beings in the area those who benefit from these un profitable heaps should have one in there back yard i dont think we should have this crap pushed off on our neighborhoods lowering property values and ruining our country views , also pretty smooth advertising this on the 24th of December when people are focused on our family's ,not cool please consider the people in the area before this non profit junk is built for us to look at the rest of our lives ,

Kientopf

cell 605-201-5612

Concerned Eric

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS

LOCAL NO. 49, 49A, 49B, 49C, 49D, 49E, 49L
MINNESOTA • NORTH DAKOTA • SOUTH DAKOTA

CLAYTON J. JOHNSON, President
RYAN P. DAVIES, Vice President
STEVE R. PIPER, Recording-Corresponding Secretary
OSCAR J. SLETTEN, Treasurer



JASON A. GEORGE
Business Manager/Financial Secretary

2829 Anthony Lane South, Minneapolis, MN 55418-3285
Phone (612) 788-9441 • Toll Free (866) 788-9441 • Fax (612) 788-1936

To: Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (MN PUC)
From: Jason George-Business Manager, Int'l Union of Operating Engineers, Local 49
Date: January 22, 2021
RE: Docket Number. **IP7026/CN-20-269 & IP7026/GS-20-384**

In the Matter of the Application of Walleye Wind, LLC for a Certificate of Need and a Site Permit for the up to 110.8 MW Walleye Wind Project in Rock County, Minnesota.

To Whom It May Concern,

On behalf of the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 49 ("Local 49") which represents over 14,000 heavy equipment operating engineers across Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, I am submitting a formal comment related to the Walleye Wind Project certificate of need and site permit.

Specifically, Local 49 would like to applaud Walleye Wind, LLC for its commitment to using local labor to complete the project. This commitment ensures the economic benefits of this project will go back into our communities and the local region.

The economic benefits of this project combined with its ability to increase our region's renewable energy production capacity drive Local 49's strong support for this project.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Jason A. George
Business Manager — Financial Secretary
International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 49

From: eera.admin_no_reply@state.mn.us
To: [Steinhauer, Suzanne \(COMM\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment re: Walleye Wind Project
Date: Thursday, January 21, 2021 8:33:30 AM

Walleye Wind Project

Submitter Name: Jeff Maassen

Submitter Email:

Submitter Telephone:

Comment:

I am not in favor of having these wind turbines so close to the state line. First of all no one on the South Dakota side was made aware of this project. With our property only 2,500 ft away from a proposed wind turbine I would think I should receive some type of wind right to this tower. With farm ground so close to a turbine I would be concerned of damage to the ground if a storm would come through and destroy the turbine sending turbine debris onto my ground.

Submit Date: 01/21/2021 08:33 AM

Re: MN PUC Docket Number: IP7026/WS-20-384

We would like to share our concerns regarding the Walleye Wind Project. We live in rural Garretson, SD, close to the Minnesota border. Our home is located less than 1 mile from proposed turbines 29, 30 and 31. Even though our home appears on several of your maps, we are not in the project "zone". We find it very troubling that Minnesota does not have any regulation/requirement for developers to notify neighbors in close proximity to this type of project. Even though it is our understanding this wind farm has been in the planning stages for over a year, we just found out about it from a neighbor within the last month. It has not left a lot of time for those of us who live in such close proximity to these turbines to do effective research as to the concerns of having a wind farm so close to our property.

One of the primary reasons we purchased our property was for the beautiful, unobstructed views. The height of these turbines can go upwards approximately 585 feet. They will be highly visible from great distances and extremely unsightly for those living close to them.

Of greater concern is the noise output from these turbines. Several studies have shown that the low frequency noise generated by wind turbines can cause stress, headaches, insomnia, tinnitus and nausea, as referenced in the attached article:

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/search/all/?term=adverse%20health%20effects%20of%20industrial%20wind%20turbines>. This is just an example of the myriad articles and research that exist. Will NextEra Energy Resources be responsible if someone in our family or our neighbors develop these symptoms? If several people develop these types of health concerns what would be our recourse? Our family spends a great deal of time outdoors enjoying our acreage and we think the sound from these turbines will greatly reduce the quality of life we currently enjoy.

We have an abundance of wildlife in our area. There is not a day that goes by that we do not see deer, turkeys, rabbits, and pheasants pass through our property. If noise is a concern to humans, how can it not be of concern to the animals that roam free here? Over the past several years, we have had the privilege of watching bald eagles nest and pass through our property, as well as many other predatory and migratory birds. What will become of them if they are displaced because of the sounds and sight of these turbines? What about livestock? We have a lot of livestock in this area. Can wind turbines have an impact on their health as well?

Has there been any studies done directly in this area as to what the wind farm will do to our property values? A quick Google search shows that having a wind farm near your property can negatively affect its value anywhere from 3-75%! It seems reasonable to ask that a third party be asked to objectively provide this kind of research and information to local homeowners prior to any approval on the project.

Lastly, it seems as if several of your community leaders who are pushing for this project to move forward will be personally financially benefitting from the wind farm by hosting turbines on their own properties.

For many of us, this is seen as a conflict of interest, and undermines their support for the project.

As property owners in South Dakota, we see no direct benefit to our state in building this wind farm. All taxes, jobs and power are for the benefit of Minnesota and its residents. We respectfully ask that you consider not allowing the construction of the Walleye Wind Project. If the project is given approval, we ask that you reconsider the proximity of the turbines to the South Dakota border. It is unreasonable for

South Dakota and its residents to endure all the negative aspects of the turbines, while Minnesota reaps all the benefits of this wind farm.

Regards,
Randall & Amy Pullman

From: [Cathy Schroeder](#)
To: [Steinhauer, Suzanne \(COMM\)](#)
Cc: [Kaluzniak, Mike \(PUC\)](#); [Bruce, Charley \(PUC\)](#)
Subject: Re: walleye 2021 meeting
Date: Tuesday, January 05, 2021 7:20:15 PM

LeRoy and Cathy Schroeder, from Rock County (Beaver Creek, Mn) are looking forward to having a wind turbine on our farm' and the impact it will have on Rock County and surrounding areas.

On Tuesday, January 5, 2021, 01:50:59 PM CST, Steinhauer, Suzanne (COMM) <suzanne.steinhauer@state.mn.us> wrote:

Ms. Schroeder –

I'm attaching the slides for tonight's meeting, together with a sample site permit and draft scoping document. You can also review this material at the Department of Commerce's website for the Walleye Wind Project <https://mn.gov/eera/web/project/13893/>

Someone else is printing the material and I'll let you know when that is mailed.

The meeting tonight will start out with the background material included in the slides, then we'll open it up to comments and questions. The sample permit and draft scope is provided for context to see what is usually in a typical permit for a large wind project and what is typically included in an Environmental Report.

As long as you are connected by phone you can ask questions or make a comment tonight. Written comments will be accepted through January 26.

Please let me know if you have questions or if there's anything else I can help you with.

Regards,

Suzanne

From: Steinhauer, Suzanne (COMM)
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2021 11:21 AM
To: Cathy Schroeder <sun_shine.1854@yahoo.com>
Subject: RE: walleye 2021 meeting

Ms. Schroeder –

Thank you for your email and interest in the project.

I'm still waiting on one piece of the material for tonight's meeting before I have a package sent. I'll let you know when I receive confirmation that it's been sent, but it probably won't go out in the mail until tomorrow.

I'll follow up later today with all the material attached and a link to the website for the project.

Regards,

Suzanne

From: Cathy Schroeder <sun_shine.1854@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 05, 2021 11:14 AM
To: Steinhauer, Suzanne (COMM) <suzanne.steinhauer@state.mn.us>
Subject: walleye 2021 meeting

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.

I would like to receive printed copies of this meeting tonight because that way my husband can read what was said since he has to work. I will listen by phone.

Our address is: LeRoy & Cathy Schroeder

P.O. Box 108

Beaver Creek, Mn. 56116

507-673-2470

Any questions, please feel free to give me a call or drop me an email

From: eera.admin_no_reply@state.mn.us
To: [Steinhauer, Suzanne \(COMM\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment re: Walleye Wind Project
Date: Friday, January 08, 2021 11:57:28 AM

Walleye Wind Project

Submitter Name: William K Thomssen

Submitter Email: willthomssen@gmail.com

Submitter Telephone: (507) 215-7064

Comment:

Dear PUC commissioners: Hello, I am Will Thomssen from Lake Benton MN. I would like to express my support for the Walleye Wind project in Rock County MN. This project brings many opportunities for residents in the area. One major opportunity comes in the project's creation of heavy equipment industry jobs. This project will use equipment ranging from skid loaders to very large cranes. I am a member of the IUOE Local 49 and had a great career in the wind industry as a crane operator. I am excited that projects like this one will give others the opportunity to start a career with Local 49 like I did. I had no prior experience in the crane industry, but I gained it through the Local 49's apprenticeship and training center. Their earn while you learn program is self-funded and provides a tremendous opportunity for someone that is interested in the heavy equipment field. Thanks, Will Thomssen Lake Benton MN

Submit Date: 01/08/2021 11:56 AM

From: eera.admin_no_reply@state.mn.us
To: [Steinhauer, Suzanne \(COMM\)](#)
Subject: Public Comment re: Walleye Wind Project
Date: Saturday, January 23, 2021 3:00:33 PM

Walleye Wind Project

Submitter Name: Bryan K Vielmette

Submitter Email: velveeta@hotmail.com

Submitter Telephone: (605) 360-8264

Comment:

My address is 25769 487th Avenue Garretson, SD 57030, and I like to state that I am against this project moving forward because it would ruin my view of the horizon to the east. I am also concerned with the payback of energy, how much coal energy is used to create 1 wind turbine and how long does it take to recoup that cost, and also what about the disposal of these massive structures, they are filling up our landfills. I think it is a waste of time, energy and money. Thank you, Bryan Vielmette

Submit Date: 01/23/2021 03:00 PM

From: [Waysman, Bethany](#)
To: [Steinhauer, Suzanne \(COMM\)](#)
Subject: Docket No IP7026/WS-20-384
Date: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 10:52:24 PM

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.

Project Name: Walleye Wind Project
Docket No IP7026/WS-20-384

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing regarding the Walleye Wind Project Proposal. I would like to formally provide my concerns and why I would ask for Turbines 29, 30 and 31 along the South Dakota border be moved further east or preferably removed entirely from this project.

While I realize that a South Dakotan has no say in what a property owner in Minnesota does, I would have, at a minimum, expected to have been contacted by the principal people/organizations behind this project. It would have just been the decent and neighborly thing to do. While all landowners affected in Minnesota were notified, none of the South Dakota people living on the border were notified. To us, it almost feels a bit sneaky.

I currently live West of the Minnesota border on 257th St (SD). My family of 5 moved here after living for 12 years in Brandon. We wanted to get away from the urban life and see nothing but nature when looking out our windows. We were fortunate to find this home and put in an offer within hours of seeing this house. When we look out our Dining Room windows, Living Room windows, Basement bay windows, Patio door, Basement TV Room windows, Basement Bedroom window, and Master bedroom windows, we currently have a very picturesque view of the fields and trees as we look out to the East. Now, after roughly 6 years, that view is threatened. The proposed turbines will obstruct our view as the proposed turbines are slated to be roughly 500 feet high.

Also concerning, is that highly visible wind turbines and frequent noise sources will negatively affect South Dakota property values. A piece of property is just what someone is willing to pay for it. All things equal, why would someone choose to buy a home within view or noise range of wind turbines. Michael McCann, of McCann Appraisal, LLC concludes that "Residential property values are adversely and measurably impacted by close proximity of industrial-scale wind energy turbine projects to the residential properties," up to 2 miles and a range of 25% -40% of value loss (www.windaction.org). To my knowledge, a Property Value Guarantee has not been extended to South Dakota residents within a 2-mile radius of this wind project. Would NextEra Energy Resources, LLC be willing to provide compensation for relocation of homeowners within 2 miles of wind turbines if they elect to relocate away from the wind turbine project and cannot sell the property for the pre-project market value?

The Pre-Construction Ambient Noise Study states that there is no scientific proof that low frequency sounds affect people in any way ([Pre- Construction Ambient Noise Study](#)). However, documents from the State of Minnesota show that there are tests proving that the low frequencies do in fact amplify within the homes versus the sound impact outside. There was no testing in homes by this project. (www.edockets.state.mn)

Part of the proposed project was the necessary sound testing to make sure that the noise levels don't exceed 50dB. I call into question the process that is used to take those measurements. The instruments that are placed in certain locations simply can't mimic the expected sounds from a 500-foot wind turbine when the device that is used to measure sound isn't placed more than 1.5 meters above the ground. There are so many natural and man-made obstructions between the transmitter and receiver devices that can obstruct the sounds at that height. A more realistic test would be to have sound transmitted from an object 500 feet above ground. This way there are no obstructions to the sounds transmitted to all areas and the data gathered would be more accurate and reliable.

The health of the residents within a 2-mile radius of a wind turbine are a huge concern. The noise from wind turbine use has been linked to additional stress, headaches, and insomnia. Will NextEra Energy Resources, LLC provide compensation to South Dakota families if symptoms occur? Will South Dakota residents have any recourse if symptoms develop after turbines are installed? Will residents within a 2-mile radius of the turbines have input into when the turbines are running? For example, turbines shut off during normal sleeping hours (10pm-7am).

If noise is a concern for humans, it would follow that wildlife and livestock would be affected as well. I am concerned for the birds and bats. Both have a direct connection to crop yield and a balanced ecosystem. Has this organization considered the direct impact on the wildlife, migration patterns and balance of the ecosystem in relation to the installation of wind turbines?

Then there is the matter of the gravel roads we live on. Can we be assured that our gravel road will not be used to transport heavy machinery to these locations near our homes? Has the township been notified about the use and repair of our roads? Will NextEra Energy Resources, LLC be responsible for repair costs and completion or will South Dakota be saddled with this cost?

As a South Dakota resident, there is no perceptible benefit to our state. The project proposal claims positive economic benefits as a result of the project. South Dakota will not receive temporary or permanent jobs, taxes collected, or energy produced by the turbines.

I ask that the project consider using the Alternate locations on the map as new locations for turbines 29, 30 and 31 located next to the South Dakota border. If these locations are not relocated, I ask that the project move the turbines to the east so that they are not closer than 1 mile from the border and that they also change those turbines to the smaller 300' sized turbines.

Regards,
Brent & Bethany Waysman

From: carmckwill@alliancecom.net
To: [Steinhauer, Suzanne \(COMM\)](#)
Subject: Re: project 20-269, 20-384
Date: Sunday, January 24, 2021 7:09:59 PM

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.

Dear Ms. Steinhauer:

As South Dakotans living in close proximity to the Walleye Wind Project, docket numbers 20-268 and 20-384, we would like to voice the following concerns:

a) A major concern is the lack of communication across the state line about this very impactful project. We had no idea that this project was being considered until mid January. No major news outlets or newspapers covered this issue until late December, and then we only saw it in a Minnesota paper that most South Dakotans don't see regularly. This lack of transparency appears unprofessional at best and suspicious at worst.

b) We are concerned about our property values. Having beautiful views now, we are concerned about the aesthetics. Proposed is a line of towers starting less than one mile away, these being in direct alignment with our house.

c) Much of the area close to us is used by migratory birds, and the height of the towers may be a danger to them. We also worry about the noise of the towers affecting a rich variety of wildlife in the area. It would be helpful to see the latest research addressing these issues.

d) We have learned that 7 turbines to the southeast of us are to be decommissioned. It seems the most logical and environmentally sound to include these in the current project. Use the sites, the access roads, the towers if possible. Replace only what is needed. It should be shared why this is not being done. If the companies behind this project are truly in the business of protecting our planet, this needs to be explained.

e) Please also explain what will happen at the "end" of this project. How will materials be recycled? Among other things, what will the company do about the immense cement base built in the ground for each tower?

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Williamson
Garretson, South Dakota (rural)

Dear Mn. PUC Commissioners,

We have lived at our residence for 53 years and have some very important concerns about having a huge wind turbine right next door.

We have concerns that our great natural landscape will be changed and the wildlife that come through here will be interrupted such as deer, pheasants, great horned owls, snowy owls, bald eagles, ducks, geese and a one time mountain lion.

Another concern is the decrease in our property value. It certainly can't help your property value with a huge wind turbine right next to it.

Another concern is the noise it will make? We have heard of others that it interrupts sleep and just the tranquility of country life.

We thank you for taking these concerns under consideration.

Sincerely,

Richard Zoeller
Donna Zoeller

119 91st

Beaver Creek Mn. 56116

Docket #20-269
20-384