



Sean Gaston <sean.p.gaston@gmail.com>

to Sean ▾

Fri, Jun 19, 4:50 PM



Mr. **Lawler**,

I was writing to discuss the location of turbines 38 and 39. As you know, my wife and I have expressed our concerns about the impact of the six turbines that are within or around 1 mile from our home. We have pointed out that our property will be subjected to noise and shadow flicker that either exceeds or falls right at the thresholds of those two impacts as set by ordinance or the permit.

Most of the potential impact on our home comes from turbines 38 and 39. We raised this issue with Dan Litchfield at the outset of this project. However, he never attempted to discuss with us, in any serious manner, how the plan could have been minimally altered to eliminate almost all of the impact on our home. We were hoping that you may be more willing to consider the re-siting of turbines 38 and 39 away from our house. By removing/re-siting them to a different location, the vast majority of the noise and shadow impacts on our home would go with them. The reduction of these impacts could significantly improve the quality of life for my family and me and would go a long way to showing the commitment Xcel has towards working with individually-affected landowners.

I look forward to your response.

Have a good weekend,

Sean Gaston

—

Sean Gaston



Lawler, Sean W

to me ▾

Mon, Jun 22, 12:02 PM



Hi Sean,

Thank you for again reaching out regarding the Freeborn Wind Project.

Significant work goes into the siting of each wind turbine. Siting wind turbines requires years of land acquisition activities, engineering activities, environmental studies and more. The proposed location of each wind turbine was reviewed in great detail throughout the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission's permitting process. After multiple years of review, the MPUC issued an order approving the construction of the Freeborn Wind Project. This approval included the locations of both wind turbine 38 and 39. The Freeborn Wind Project, including wind turbines 38 and 39, will meet required noise and shadow flicker levels as approved by the MPUC. Re-siting turbines 38 and 39 would require significant time. Construction of turbines 38 and 39 is scheduled to begin within the coming weeks and so there is insufficient time to re-site either turbine 38 and 39 prior to commencement of construction.

Thank you,

Sean Lawler, SR/WA

Xcel Energy | Responsible By Nature

Land Rights Agent

414 Nicollet Mall 6A

Minneapolis, MN 55401



Sean Gaston <sean.p.gaston@gmail.com>

to Sean ▾

Fri, Jul 10, 3:42 PM



Mr. **Lawler**,

I am writing to revisit our discussion on Turbines 38 and 39 in light of new changes to the project. I just finished reviewing your amended project design and I am curious if this new design would allow for the removal of Turbines 38 and 39 now. Those turbines appear to be isolated and represent two of the three remaining turbines in London Township. By removing those turbines, you would reduce shadow flicker at my residence to a near negligible amount as well as significantly reduce noise impacts. Doing so would relieve almost all of the personal concern I have for this project. Furthermore, your amended site design shows the presence of multiple alternate sites in Iowa that could readily house those turbines. The re-siting of those turbines would go a long way towards eliminating remaining "antagonistic", to borrow your phrasing, aspects of this project. I ask that you and your project team consider this adjustment. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Sean Gaston

...

—

Sean Gaston



Lawler, Sean W

to me ▾

Tue, Jul 21, 11:57 AM (3 days ago)



Hi Sean,

Thanks for reaching out. Sorry for my delayed response, I was away from work on paternity leave.

Xcel Energy fully intends to construct turbines 38 and 39. These turbines are not isolated, in fact they are two of the most centrally located turbines in the project. The alternate sites in Iowa are reserved for unforeseen circumstances that could arise during the construction of the project. Use of the alternate sites would require significant engineering work and physical changes to the designed and partially installed underground collection system. Xcel Energy does not plan to change the alternate sites to primary sites.

As I stated previously, the proposed location of each wind turbine was reviewed in great detail throughout the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission's permitting process. The MPUC issued an order approving the construction of the Freeborn Wind Project. The Freeborn Wind Project, including wind turbines 38 and 39, will meet required noise and shadow flicker levels as approved by the MPUC. I understand your concerns and do appreciate your willingness to reach out to discuss but Xcel Energy is not considering the re-siting of either turbine 38 or 39.

Thank you,

Sean Lawler, SR/WA

Xcel Energy

Land Rights Agent

414 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, MN 55401

P: 612.330.1956

E: sean.w.lawler@xcelenergy.com



Sean Gaston <sean.p.gaston@gmail.com>

to Sean ▾

Tue, Jul 21, 1:08 PM (3 days ago)



Mr. **Lawler**,

Thank you for your response. No apology necessary for the delay. As a father of three, I appreciate those who put family first. Congratulations on the birth of your child. I hope your family and your new addition are doing well.

I understand the position of your company, though I find it interesting. The recent decision to move 17 turbines seems to illustrate the ability of the project to re-site. Additionally, expediency was the cited reason for re-siting. Therefore, the re-siting of one or two turbines does not seem to present an issue that would alter the viability of the project or slow it down. Furthermore, I doubt that companies like Xcel or Invenenergy, with hundreds of projects under their belts, would designate alternative sites without completing the necessary engineering and design elements to ensure a timely transfer to an alternative site if the situation arose.

I assume that you and your company are carrying out your fiduciary duty to make this project as profitable as possible. As a non-participant, it is clear that my family and I and the impacts we will endure mean nothing in the decision-making of this project. I remain disappointed that no compromise can be reached between your company and non-participants. At this time, it seems that I am simply wasting your time and mine by attempting to discuss this issue anymore.

Again, best wishes to your family and your new child.

Sincerely,

Sean Gaston

Sent from my iPhone

...