TO: David Birkholz

FROM: CD Tarasek DVM

RE: CN-10-429

I am writing in response to some of the issues raised at the April 19th meeting in Parkers Prairie and some of the points that have been made since in the press.

First I consider a wind farm to be much like any other farm. My neighbors/farmers have never asked me if I approved of their crop or their farming practices. That includes aerial applicators flying low over my home at 6:30 am (especially irritating on Sundays). I don't particularly like a steel shed popping out of every grove but, drive the countryside and that's what's happening - again people doing as they wish on their own property.

Secondly, one man at the Parkers meeting spoke about his retirement home. He was opposed to towers intruding on his solitude. He lives in a modern world but doesn't want progress "in his backyard". Well, progress has to be measured in terms of benefit out weighing risk or detriment. The benefit to the community as a whole certainly out weighs his detriment. The school, township, and city of Parkers Prairie will all benefit. The short term boom associated with construction will be seen in terms of food, lodging, and entertainment locally. Workers will bring big money to town for awhile. Also, the benefit of electricity from a renewable source within Minnesota is great. Our state has mandated that we need to produce 10% of our electricity from wind and this is one place to do it..Our world isn't big enough for "not in my backyard".

My third point is the health concerns. I remember years back when a high voltage transmission line was being discussed for western Minnesota. The opponents stated there would be terrible effects -- birth defects, stray voltage, cattle would suffer etc. None of these were ever documented. The Administrative Law Judge in the Goodhue Wind Farm case stated she found no scientific evidence for adverse health effects in people. She mentioned peer - reviewed literature - the gold standard in scientific research. There may be lots of reports of health concerns but none are backed by hard science. You need control groups, limited variables, and statistical data that stands the judgment of other scientists to make a peer - reviewed journal. My other thought in this area is the building if the Missouri River dams - a great source of cheap, non-polluting electricity. Was there some health effects to building those dams? Yes, people were killed and maimed on those projects. People lost homes, farm land, historic sites but the greater good was served by building those dams.

Another point I want to make has to do with the aerial application of farm chemicals. My understanding is that an aerial applicator is supposed to do a visual inspection of the area (s)he is to treat prior to starting the process. If that is done the turbines shouldn't be any more of a problem than a silo, communications towers, or water tower. You learn to deal with it. I've personally seen these aerial applicators go underneath power lines. That could be a health hazard! People have farmed here for years and will continue to

farm they just need to embrace technology. We all want electricity and demand more and more of it.

My last point has to do with the discussion of the federal subsidy for wind energy. The man at the April meeting who brought this point up is a row crop farmer who "lives" on federal crop subsidies. I'm amazed he has the gall to be opposed to a different federal subsidy What's good for the goose is good for the gander! Federal payments cost every tax payer but they keep business going, make jobs, keep our food supply "cheap" and help multitudes of people.

Lets drop the stonewalling and support this project. We all want a steady supply of electricity and wind turbines are preferable to coal and/or nuclear plants!

Sincerely,

CD Tarasek, DVM