Speak Up!

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Applications of Flat Hill Windpark I, LLC for a Certificate of Need, Large Wind Energy Conversion Site Permit and High Voltage Transmission Line Route Permit for the 201 MW Flat Hill Windpark in Clay County |WS-08-1134 | TL-08-988 | CN-08-951

Closed Mar 04, 2016 · Discussion · 1 Participants · 4 Topics · 1 Answers · 0 Replies · 0 Votes

1	4	1	0	0
PARTICIPANTS	TOPICS	ANSWERS	REPLIES	VOTES

SUMMARY OF TOPICS

Topic: Do the compliance filings submitted by Flat Hill Wind comply with the Commission's October 6, 2015 Order Postponing Decision on Permit Amendment and Requiring Filings?

0 Responses

View Topic

Topic: Should the Commission authorize the requested permit modifications to allow a different turbine type, the Acciona AW 3000, and the modified project layout, a reduced project footprint, and a reduced number of turbines?

0 Responses

View Topic

Topic: Should the Commission amend or revoke the site permit pursuant to Minn. Rule 7854.1200 and .1300?

0 Responses

View Topic

Topic: Are there other need or project-related issues or concerns?

1 Responses

1 Responses

Kathleen Stradley at March 04, 2016 at 3:05pm CST

This project is not needed. Please see MN Dept of Commerce's latest report indicating Minnesota could beat its goal for electricity generated by renewable energy. ,,,,The Minnesota Department of Commerce says the state generated 21 percent of its electricity from solar, wind, hydro and biomass power in 2015, up from 6 percent a decade ago..... So why is this project being considered? Also, our comments were sent to PUC via Fed Ex signed for by staff @ PUC with delivery date of 11 am on 2/26/16 yet those comments do not show up on any of Flat Hill's dockets as PUBLIC COMMENTS.

0 Reads

SCOT A. STRADLEY, Ph.D.
3116 HWY 9 S
GLYNDON, MN 56547

PC 08-1134
08-988
08-951

PUC DOCKET NUMBER: IP-6687/WS-08-1134, TL-08-988, CN-08-951

This project has allowed me to see how Minnesota's machine politics work. The entire experience, from the scramble of local officials (township officers standing to gain from the powerline) to financially benefit from the project, to this latest attempt by Flat Hill to submit an entirely new project, is frustrating because it is unconstitutional. This new submission must be submitted to public review. The public had the chance to comment on the original project design. Most of the project's opponents have given up and some may not be aware of the changes in the project. The new project intends to use bigger turbines. This fact might have profound implications for near-by residents, but this process leaves the public out, again. This process ignores public input on what is a new project.

The State has issued what seems like a perpetuity to Flat Hill. They do not have to do anything within any time period, just return when they are ready. This is not fair to the public adjacent to and impacted by the process. The State has issued a perpetual right to Flat Hill to seize my property without compensation. This perpetual process is unfair and violates my property rights. This process has resulted in a liability on my property that is equally perpetual. This is an unconstitutional invasion of my property rights. The new project has not passed muster with the MN Health Department. If turbine height, tower height, or blade diameter change, then there should be a period where the general public can comment. The same is true of project layout. I believe that since our rights were not respected when there was only a couple of days of notice for the meeting in Glyndon. This hasty beginning excluded impacted residents from participation. Now the company comes with a completely new turbine manufacturer proposing a 3 mw turbine compared to 1.5 mw turbines. This is a completely new project. The company advertises in a video on their homepage that they provide operation and maintenance service to their turbines. This changes the economic impact statement and could lower the ratio of benefits to costs, even below one.

This technology has proven harmful to birds. I do not see how letting them use fewer bigger turbines is better for birds. There should be a complete environmental impact study for the "NEW" project. There should be a reasonable time given to the public to read and evaluate the new studies before they exercise their right to comment. If this was a mine in the Range and the developer proposed a new method of production after the initial review process the impacted general public should have the right to comment. It is no different here.

SCOT A. STRADLEY, Ph.D.
3116 HWY 9 S
GLYNDON, MN 56547

The capacity of the transmission line is proportional to the electricity generated. If production capacity is reduced, then the capacity of the transmission line should be reduced. Due to the potential for this transmission line to interfere with prairie chicken feeding in the winter it should be buried and it should be a part of the environmental impact process that should be done for this NEW project. There is an abandoned railroad right-of-way that was available to this project from the beginning. This alternate route should be considered in the new environmental impact statement. All of the social science in the original is way off in the new project proposal.

Sincerely

Scot Stradley

3116 Hwy 9 S

Glyndon, MN 56547