Energy Facility Permitting
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2198
ph 651.296.4026 | fax 651.297.7891
www.energyfacilities.puc.state.mn.us

Public Comments Received on Getty Wind Company, LLC's

LWECS Site Permit Application for the 40 MW Getty Wind Farm in Stearns County

PUC Docket No. IP6866/WS-11-831

Commenter	Date	Page
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	12/30/11	1-6
Retha Dooley	12/5/11	7
Cyril Felling	12/27/11	8
Dave & Barb Jennissen	12/21/11	9
Barb Jennissen	12/30/11	10
Lee Klisch	12/5/11	11
Colleen Mueller	12/30/11	12-13
Minnesota Department of Transportation	12/30/11	15-16
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	12/22/11	17
Stearns County	11/22/11	18-19
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	12/29/11	20-23
Janell Westerman	11/30/11	24
Scott & Janell Westerman	11/30/11	25-29

Page Intentionally Blank

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
500 Lafayette Road • St. Paul, MN • 55155-40_

December 30, 2011

Suzanne Steinhauer, State Permit Manager
Energy Facility Permitting
Department of Commerce
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

Re: Application for a Site Permit for the 40 MW Getty Wind Project in Stearns County
[PUC Docket Number: IP6866/WS-11-831]

Dear Ms. Steinhauer:

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has reviewed the Site Permit Application for the proposed Getty Wind Project in Stearns County. Please consider the following comments regarding the Site Permit Application. Please also consider the attached comment letter and memo assessing the Avian Use Report for the Getty and Black Oak Wind Projects.

Page 28 – This application states that the Trisko and Kenna Waterfowl Production Areas (WPA) are adjacent to the project area. However it is notable that the Getty Wind Project and Black Oak Wind Projects are combined in the Certificate of Need docket. If one considers the projects as combined, the Trisko WPA would be included within the boundaries of the overall project (See Figure 5). If these projects are combined, this type of information should be clarified and cross-referenced as much as possible between dockets.

Page 40 – The application discusses Central Region Regionally Ecological Significant Areas (CRRESA). The application states that CRRESAs were created to help make regional scale land use decisions. The second paragraph, last sentence, states that "it is not clear to the applicant why the areas being actively farmed have been identified as CRRESAs." The first statement most accurately describes the CRRESA located within the Getty Wind Project boundary as a designated based on a regional land use analysis. Please see the first comment on the second page of the attached DNR comment letter, dated December 8, 2011, which describes a DNR field observation of agricultural land use in the area of the CRRESA. The comment also describes how CRRESAs are designated.

Page 44 - The pre-construction avian survey report identified seven state-listed species, but the application states that only five state-listed species were identified. The application is missing the trumpeter swan and Wilson's phalarope. A short statement of clarification would be helpful.

Page 48 – The first paragraph on this page of the application quotes the DNR regarding an assessment of the surrounding landscape. The paragraph then continues with a final conclusion that due to similarities in landscape features between the Buffalo Ridge Site, Paynesville Wind Site and the Getty Wind Site, the application states that no additional studies are proposed. It may be possible to misunderstand this paragraph as linking a DNR statement on surrounding habitat to the conclusion and plan included. The DNR has previously considered the possibility of using Buffalo Ridge and Paynesville Wind Project data for the adjacent Black Oak Project and has recommended that surveys be completed in the Black Oak and Getty Wind Project area. Please see the attached comments regarding the Avian Use Report for a risk assessment and survey recommendations

www.dnr.state.mn.us
AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER CONTAINING A MINIMUM OF 10% POST-CONSUMER WASTE

for both the Black Oak and Getty Wind Farm area.

Page 48 – The application states that the project developer will continue to coordinate with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the DNR as the Project layout is developed. The DNR appreciates these efforts and coordination that has occurred. The DNR would appreciate the opportunity to provide comments regarding development of the Avian and Bat Protection Plan. Project representatives have indicated that a draft ABPP is available. The DNR plans to participate in a comment period or meeting as proposed by the Minnesota Department of Commerce Energy Facility Permitting Unit (EFP).

Page 52 – The section including a discussion of bat impacts does not discuss completing fatality studies for bats. The DNR recommends considering possible impacts to bats in the EFP decision regarding whether to require formal fatality surveys for birds and bats. The attached comment letter includes a risk assessment and survey recommendations partially based on the likelihood that a nearby river corridor and nearby wetlands may attract bats.

Page 54 - The Site Permit Application discusses non-bird and bat natural resources, including mammals, reptiles, amphibians, and insects. This is a thorough approach to a site analysis. We encourage this approach for other proposers.

Page 55 – The Site Permit Application states that the Powesheik skipper record is a historic record. The Powesheik skipper record is from 1997 which, though older, is not considered "historic" by DNR reviewers. The description of the record as historic may inaccurately imply that there is a lower possibility a skipper population is still present.

Page 56 – The correspondence table is a helpful addition to a Site Permit Application.

Page 63 – Access roads are discussed in the application. It may be useful for a variety of reasons (minimizing crop loss, property impacts, etc.), including natural resource concerns, for applications to include a discussion of minimizing the number, width, or length of access roads as much as possible.

The DNR appreciates the opportunity to provide comments for the Getty Wind Project. Please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Jamie Schrenzel

Jamie Schrenzel
Principal Planner
Environmental Review Unit
(651) 259-5115

Enclosures: 2

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
500 Lafayette Road • St. Paul, MN • 55155-40

December 8, 2011

Suzanne Steinhauer, State Permit Manager
Energy Facility Permitting
Department of Commerce
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

Re: Getty Wind Project and Black Oak Wind Project – Draft Avian Use Assessment Report

Dear Ms. Steinhauer:

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has reviewed the Draft Avian Use Assessment Report for the Black Oak and Getty Wind Projects, dated August 2011. During a meeting regarding the report on August 30, 2011, the DNR agreed to provide initial comments immediately to address some time-sensitive questions, then to follow with more detailed comments. The attached September 2, 2011 memo was sent after the meeting. This comment letter contains additional comments regarding the Draft Avian Use Assessment Report as planned. Please consider both comment letters in development of the Avian and Bat Protection Plan(s) (ABPP) for the Getty Wind Project and Black Oak Wind Project.

The Draft Avian Use Assessment Report is generally a detailed and well-documented description of avian use surveys conducted for the Black Oak and Getty Wind Projects. The DNR appreciates that this report was submitted early in the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) permitting process for the Getty Wind Project. The following comments identify some corrections to the report and include DNR input regarding how the information gained from pre-construction surveys could be used for development of the Avian and Bat Protection Plan(s) for the Getty and Black Oak Wind Projects. An estimated risk level is also provided in this letter.

Though the pre-construction survey methods used for this joint report were based on previous DNR recommendations, the project developer did not submit survey plans prior to conducting surveys for these projects. We caution that every site has unique features and encourage project developers in the future to submit survey plans to DNR reviewers prior to spending considerable resources and sometimes limited timeframes to conduct surveys. This could help avoid the risk of conducting inadequate analyses than what the Department of Commerce Energy Facility Permitting (EFP) unit or DNR recommend, and could help avoid any project delays that might occur as a result.

It would be helpful to clarify whether Black Oak and Getty Wind Projects will be submitting a joint ABPP. Submitting a joint ABPP may help address the possible cumulative effects of two projects sited adjacent to each other. Also, this would likely utilize information in the Draft Avian Use Assessment Report in the most efficient way.

If the ABPP is submitted jointly for both projects, we request that a preliminary site layout map(s), including any exclusion areas based on information from the Avian Use Assessment Report, be provided that depict turbine layouts for both projects so that turbine layout can be viewed in relation to avian use for the entire area.

www.dnr.state.mn.us
AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER CONTAINING A MINIMUM OF 10% POST-CONSUMER WASTE

DNR reviewers visited the project area on October 5, 2011. Using the preliminary turbine layout maps, we visited the estimated location of a turbine located in a Central Region Regionally Ecological Significant Area (CRRESA) that was discussed during previous meetings with the company. It appears that the area where the turbine is located is within a field used for agricultural purposes and is not located in an area of concern considering the ranking of CRRESA. Modeling for identification of regionally ecological significant areas was completed at a landscape level and has not been fully field verified in outstate counties. The field observation could be verified if the company was to submit a map with turbine locations and CRRESAs layered together or were to provide the DNR with a shapefile with turbine locations.

The preliminary site layout maps do not include turbine numbers. Turbine numbers would be helpful for future discussions of individual turbines. Please note that turbine numbering can become confusing as project changes occur. It is helpful for turbine numbering to remain consistent and for turbine numbers not to be re-used if locations change. It may be worthwhile to consider consistent numbering between projects if the two projects combine.

Preliminary site layout figures layered with proposed exclusion areas in yellow (Fig. 1,2 and 3 provided August 30, 2011) were reviewed. These generally show exclusion areas correlated roughly with identified flight paths. This seems to be a particularly effective approach between the Trisko WPA and Padua WMA. There is some concern that for turbine layouts other than the Vesta 112 turbine layout, there may not be adequate spacing near the flight path area identified near Sections 32, Township 126, Range 34 and Section 5, Township 125, Range 34. If these exclusion areas are used as an avoidance and minimization measure, please further discuss proposed exclusion areas that do not overlap directly with flight paths in this area.

The Vesta 112 layout appears to better avoid flightpaths and has less of a footprint. The DNR generally encourages use of larger turbines for the same overall megawatt plan to reduce the footprint of turbines and associated infrastructure and reduce possible flyway impacts. Maps showing various turbine types, exclusion areas, and flight paths are helpful and should also be included and discussed in the same manner for the Black Oak Wind Project in the ABPP, preferably combined with the Getty Wind Project maps.

Page 13 of the Draft Avian Use Assessment states that the trumpeter swan "will be" downgraded. All of the proposed changes to the state list are draft and are subject to change.

Getty Wind and Black Oak Wind Combined Risk Analysis

Based on the Tier 1, 2 and 3 assessments of the Getty and Black Oak Wind Projects, the DNR considers the cumulative impact of these sites to have an estimated high risk of avian fatalities without avoidance and minimization measures and a moderate risk of avian fatalities with the proper use of avoidance and minimization measures. This assessment is due to the verified presence in the Draft Avian Use Assessment of 7 state-listed species and 22 Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN), in the project vicinity, as well as project locations in a surrounding area containing eighteen WMAs, thirty-four Waterfowl Production Areas (WPA) and one Scientific and Natural Area (SNA) within approximately ten miles. The projects also surround the Trisko WPA and the Getty Wind Farm is adjacent to the Kenna WPA and near the Padua WMA. The Getty Wind Farm is also near a known flyway associated with the Sauk River and Sauk River WMA. A river corridor and nearby wetlands may also attract bats, which are known to be at risk to colliding with turbines. Considering the location of these sites geographically, post-construction fatality monitoring is appropriate. Draft fatality survey

protocols recommended by the DNR are enclosed and include information specific to high risk and moderate risk sites.

It is very important to note, however, that both projects have made substantial efforts avoid avian and bat habitat during their preliminary project development. The Getty Wind project has demonstrated avoidance of most survey-identified flyways within their project boundary based on preliminary maps of turbine layouts. If final turbine layouts for both projects are designed in similar manners to preliminary turbine layouts presented by Getty Wind during the August 30, 2011 meeting and are based on information gathered from the Draft Avian Use Assessment considering above comments, the resulting avoidance of possible impacts would likely result in an estimated risk level of moderate. It would also be important for the PUC Site Permit to clearly require all proposed avoidance measures.

If adequate avoidance measures were included in finalized project plans and required by the PUC Site Permit, then the DNR would recommend that the project developer conduct fatality surveys according to the moderate level of effort included in DNR fatality survey protocols. The DNR recommends that post construction fatality monitoring protocols are included in the ABPP. The ABPP should also include steps that the proposers will be taking if a state-listed species is injured or killed.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments regarding the Draft Avian Use Assessment for both the Black Oak and Getty Wind Projects. Please note that the DNR is currently conducting a review of the Application for a Site Permit by Getty Wind and will provide separate comments within the public comment period.

Sincerely,

Jamie Schrenzel
Planner Principal
Environmental Review Unit
(651) 259-5115

Enclosures: 2

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
Division of Ecological Resources

STATE OF MINNESOTA
Memorandum

DATE: September 2, 2011 **PHONE:** (651) 259-5115

TO: Suzanne Steinhauer
Department of Commerce, Office of Energy Security

FROM: Jamie Schrenzel
MDNR, Division of Ecological and Water Resources

SUBJECT: Black Oak/Getty Wind Draft Avian Report Initial Review

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has reviewed the Draft Avian Report for the Black Oak and Getty Wind Projects, dated August 2011. During a meeting regarding the report on August 30, 2011, the DNR agreed to provide initial comments this week and to follow with more detailed comments in the coming weeks. This memo provides initial comments for the purpose of identifying any additional survey needs in a timely manner and, as discussed, more comments will follow.

Generally, the Draft Avian Report for Black Oak and Getty Wind Projects provides enough avian information for the purpose of continuing development of the Avian and Bat Protection Plan without further avian surveys during the fall 2011 migration survey season. The DNR plans to follow up with more information regarding recommendations for the Avian and Bat Protection Plan based on the results of this report. Considering possible risk to bats in the area, there are numerous wetlands in the vicinity of the project areas and a river located northeast of the Getty Wind project boundary. The DNR has some concern regarding risk to bats, particularly in the vicinity of the Getty Wind project area and has previously commented (see attached letter) regarding bats in this area. However, as the project proposers noted in the August 30, 2011 meeting regarding this report, the preliminary turbine layout includes avoidance of wetlands and the nearby river habitat, which are considered probable bat habitat. Due to the location of the project in the vicinity of features that may attract bats, pre-construction acoustic bat data would ideally be included in the record prior to permit issuance. However, because the primary purposes of collecting pre-construction data is for impact avoidance and the preliminary site layout avoids areas of probable higher risk to bats, the DNR recommends that these efforts be considered voluntary by the Department of Commerce. If data is collected during the 2011 fall migration period for bats, the DNR recommends following the attached draft protocols for the remainder of the season.

Also, when considering data collection and bat risk for these sites, it is important to note that post-construction fatality surveys would also provide bat fatality data in addition to avian fatality data. Initial review of survey results for the Black Oak and Getty Wind project areas indicates that risk level would be estimated at a minimum of moderate risk, and possibly high risk. This assessment will be further developed in the next set of comments. For purposes of this discussion, either a moderate or high risk level would correspond with DNR recommended draft protocols for post-construction fatality surveys. Therefore, the DNR plans to recommend post-construction fatality surveys, which would assess fatality of both birds and bats.

Please note that this assessment is based on a preliminary turbine layout and current avoidance efforts. Additional pre-construction surveys may be warranted if the turbine layout changes substantially.

Thank you for your coordination regarding the Black Oak and Getty Wind Draft Avian Report.

From: apache@web.lmic.state.mn.us
To: Steinhauer, Suzanne (COMM)
Subject: Dooley Mon Dec 5 07:42:13 2011 IP6866/WS-11-831
Date: Monday, December 05, 2011 7:42:18 AM

This public comment has been sent via the form at:
www.energyfacilities.puc.state.mn.us/publicComments.html

You are receiving it because you are listed as the contact for this project.

Project Name: Getty Wind Project

Docket number: IP6866/WS-11-831

User Name: Retha Dooley

County:

City: Sauk Centre

Email: retha.dooley@gmail.com

Phone: 320 352-9927

Impact: I just want to make a congratulatory comment and to say that I hope this project moves forward as quickly and seamlessly as possible.

Mitigation:

Submission date: Mon Dec 5 07:42:13 2011

This information has also been entered into a centralized database for
future analysis.

For questions about the database or the functioning of this tool, contact:

Andrew Koebrick
andrew.koebrick@state.mn.us

From: The Fellings
To: Steinhauer, Suzanne (COMM)
Subject: PUC Docket No. IP6866/WS-11-831 Wind Project, Getty township; Stearns County MN
Date: Tuesday, December 27, 2011 10:41:28 AM
Importance: High

I would like to add my comments to this proposed project: I have never been contacted regarding this project; nor did I give any permission for any "wind" rights for this project. How can our land be put into the proposal without having contacting us: our Sections in Getty township are: 16, 21. And also Sauk Township 29.? We are in a livestock area and great concern on how they are grounded and stray voltage is a big concern in the livestock industry. Once again, how can our land be included in a wind project such as this without our permission? Contact information: Cyril Felling, Felling Dairy LLC, Sauk Centre, Mn Cell # 320 248-7171. p.s. Please respond so I have acknowledgment of this email.

From: apache@web.lmic.state.mn.us
To: Steinhauer, Suzanne (COMM)
Subject: Jennissen Wed Dec 21 11:58:03 2011 IP6866/WS-11-831
Date: Wednesday, December 21, 2011 11:58:06 AM

This public comment has been sent via the form at:
www.energyfacilities.puc.state.mn.us/publicComments.html

You are receiving it because you are listed as the contact for this project.

Project Name: Getty Wind Project

Docket number: IP6866/WS-11-831

User Name: Dave and Barb Jennissen

County: Stearns County

City: Sauk Centre

Email:

Phone:

Impact: After seeing the site permit book, we noticed a letter from Michael North, Regional Environmental Assessment Ecologist. According to his observations, this area abounds with permanent and migratory birds of all sorts. His summary includes this statement and we quote, "this does not seem like a viable location for a windfarm". This wind farm is located in the middle of the Padua WMA, the Kenna WPA, and the Trisko WPA. We especially are concerned about the turbine in Section 7. We continually observe loons, geese, ducks and trumpeter swans flying between the above mentioned wildlife areas. We thought the PUC took these things into consideration when approving a site.

We also have a nesting bald eagle on our property. According to the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service, a turbine should not be located within two miles of nesting eagles. Is this recommendation being followed? We think not. We have spoken with wildlife organzations who will be watching the outcome.

Mitigation: How do you mitigate impacts? This is a C-BED project. Local investors will be making the money. The route should be changed to place as many turbines on their properties as possible. Only one investor will have turbines and they are not near his residence. He has a alot of property and has more area to put towers near his residence. He has said he wants as many towers as he can get. Then route it so he gets what he wants. Sixteen of the towers are not near any investors. This is their investment, they want to earn the return, then place the towers on their property.

Submission date: Wed Dec 21 11:58:03 2011

This information has also been entered into a centralized database for
future analysis.

For questions about the database or the functioning of this tool, contact:

Andrew Koebrick

From: apache@web.lmic.state.mn.us
To: Steinhauer, Suzanne (COMM)
Subject: Jennissen Fri Dec 30 14:18:02 2011 IP6866/WS-11-831
Date: Friday, December 30, 2011 2:18:05 PM

This public comment has been sent via the form at:
www.energyfacilities.puc.state.mn.us/publicComments.html

You are receiving it because you are listed as the contact for this project.

Project Name: Getty Wind Project

Docket number: IP6866/WS-11-831

User Name: Barb Jennissen

County: Stearns County

City: Sauk Centre

Email:

Phone:

Impact: I will take this last opportunity to share concerns I have with placing an Industrial Wind Farm in a heavily populated area. No where in Minnesota have I seen this happen. Why are we allowing it now? With so many residents, it will be impossible to guarantee that noise, shadow flicker and a host of other problems will go unreported. I do not believe we have fully addressed the impact on human life when these turbines end up in populated areas. We have families whose children want to remain part of the family farm. This will restrict them from allowing their children to remain in our area. There is a very good chance that these turbines will not run at maximum speed or even around the clock. Too many homes will be too near the turbines and noise restrictions will apply and rest assured most of us will be monitoring the noise levels.

Mitigation:

Submission date: Fri Dec 30 14:18:02 2011

This information has also been entered into a centralized database for
future analysis.

For questions about the database or the functioning of this tool, contact:

Andrew Koebrick
andrew.koebrick@state.mn.us

From: apache@web.lmic.state.mn.us
To: Steinhauer, Suzanne (COMM)
Subject: klisch Mon Dec 5 12:16:15 2011 IP6866/WS-11-831
Date: Monday, December 05, 2011 12:16:23 PM

This public comment has been sent via the form at:
www.energyfacilities.puc.state.mn.us/publicComments.html

You are receiving it because you are listed as the contact for this project.

Project Name: Getty Wind Project

Docket number: IP6866/WS-11-831

User Name: lee klisch

County: Stearns County

City: saint Joseph

Email: klischridge@gmail.com

Phone: 320 292 6257

Impact: The main positive impact is less coal power on the capx2020 line. Also more local jobs rather than sending them to North Dakota. More direct local access to wind power.Local tax base increase.

There are no negative impacts.

Mitigation: Nothing to mitigate.

Submission date: Mon Dec 5 12:16:15 2011

This information has also been entered into a centralized database for future analysis.

For questions about the database or the functioning of this tool, contact:

Andrew Koebrick
andrew.koebrick@state.mn.us

PC 11-831

Rice, Robin (PUC)

From: COLLEEN MUELLER <cmueller@wildblue.net>
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2011 12:16 PM
To: staff, cao (PUC)
Subject: IP 6866 CN-11-471;WS-10-1240(Black Oak) ;WS-11-831 (Getty) or CN-11-831

To:MN.Public Utility Commission and Commissioners: Black Oak filed site application 1/6/2011 (WS-10-1240), Getty filed application 10/13/2011(WS-11-831). Now both are applying for a certificate of need. Both projects have been in the making for over 2 years. Both have been working together for over 2 years. To now determine a request for a certificate of need be applied for is putting the " cart before the horse." Under 216F.011 (a)(1),(3)-MUST be combined nameplate capacity of any other wind energy conversion system:(1) is located within 5 miles of the wind energy conversion system;(3)exhibits characteristics of being a single development, including, but not limited ,ownership structure,an umbrella sales arrangement,shared interconnection,revenue sharing arrangements, and common debt or equity financing. Black Oak Wind LLC and Getty Wind LLC fall under this criteria. In addition under 216B-243 Subd.2. No energy facility shall be sited or constructed in MN. without an issuance of a certificate of need by the commission pursuant to sections 216C.05-216C.30 and this section and consistant with the criteria for assessment of need.The applicant fails to satisfy 216B.243 Subd. 3a. -Minnesota hydro and geothermal energy technology considering total overall expenses would be more prudent and cost effective. Both these projects are located in or near a environmental concern area -neither should be allowed to go forward. WS-10-1240 site permit was granted before a certificate of need -Permit revocation is required-it was issued without proper criteria being met. WS-11-831 Application denied-not site permit granted-application accepted with out proper criteria being met. CN-11-471-Certificate of need denied due to inability of developers to meet proper criteria. MN. Rules 7854.0500 (Subp.2.) THE COMMISSION SHALL NOT ISSUE A SITE PERMIT FOR AN LWECS FOR WHICH A CERTIFICATE OF NEED IS REQUIRED UNTIL THE APPLICANT OBTAINS THE CERTIFICATE, ALTHOUGH THE COMMISSION MAY PROCESS THE APPLICATION WHILE THE CERTIFICATE OF NEED REQUEST IS PENDING BEFORE THE COMMISSION. Under MN. Rules 7854.1100 Subp.3.POWER PURCHASE AGREEMENT(PPA). The permittee has obtained a power purchase agreement or some other enforceable mechanism at the time a permit issued. (No permit should be granted without first assessing the need). Applicants do not have any PPA(purchase power agreements) in place-no NEED! Taking into account energy conservancy efforts are just now beginning to produce results and long range demand and forecast had not surged as predicted-"put the cart after the horse."- Consumers need-RELIABLE, AFFORDABLE ELECTRICITY-Wind will provide neither-it isn't reliable, base load, or inexpensive.Deny a certificate of need-revocation of WS-10-1240-;refuse WS11-831 as neither PPA is in place, nor is application considered complete without following the required criteria. Neither is recommending not following rules and laws acceptable by either the DOE or OES, or the MN. PUC. Respectfully submitted as public record. Dec. 30,2011 @12:10P Sincerely, Colleen Mueller 22186 Hwy 4, Paynesville, MN. 56362

PC-11-831

Rice, Robin (PUC)

From: COLLEEN MUELLER <cmueller@wildblue.net>
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2011 2:09 PM
To: staff, cao (PUC)
Subject: WS-10-1240;WS-11-831/.CN11-831:CN-11-471

MN Public Utilities: The National Weather Service and Weather Underground have wind estimates at an average of 9 mph for the entire year for Sauk Centre, MN. (1) Industrial wind turbines require proposed here have a rated wind speed of 25 mph or 11 m/s-(2) Without access to the wind resources data it would be impossible to verify or check if there is enough wind to guarantee any economic value to property owners or the community as a whole. There are almost 10,000 acres of wildlife within or a 10 mi radius of both the Getty and Black Oak wind farms. At the April meeting is Sauk Centre when objections were raised to allow the developers to use Paynesville Wind Avian studies Ms. Steinhauer specifically said no-that would not be allowed. It appears as though it is being allowed-and that is unacceptable! While there are many similarities, there are also many differences. There are no two places on this earth that are exactly alike. NO MITIGATION can be achieved AFTER the wildlife and humans are impacted, including habitat. All studies MUST be mandatory and pre-construction. These studies must be done bu UNBIASED wildlife specialists who don't have any vested interest-and include the DNR and USFW, NOT done by wildlife companies hired by the developers.(3) In May 2009 the MN. DEPT of HEALTH issued the white paper on health effects of wind turbines. The MN. PUC has taken no action to priotect the health and welfare of the citizens of this state from ill effectslinked to industrial wind. Not only are basic human rights ignored, so are the rights to enjoy the tranquil and scenic beauty without industrial instrusions in our landscape. Over the previous 3-5 years energy consumption is down-it is projected to level off or remain much as it is now. MN. is "Land of 10,000" lakes. Water resources are valuable, but when questionable wind resources pushed by political agenda to destroy our resources. This is neither environmentally friendly or a prudent use of those resources. Many of the utility companies are ahead of the mandate for wind energy. Not only is wind energy expensive-it also contributing to more economic failure. So few jobs are created and sustained-except for a brief construction period. There is no real socio-economical benefit to the area except to those who host a turbine-even they can't speak due to confidentiality and secrecy surrounding wind farms. Transmission costs for poorly producing electricity are too expensive to justify the cost. MN citizens can't afford any more financial burdens to supply electricity to far away cities, not to mention the losses when transmission is further away. It is estimated a mere 10% will be the final number when all factors are considered into wind energy. This is not acceptable in this millenium. Rural communities are targeted because there are less people and financial resources to fight it. Developers have big money and teams of lawyers. What do the citizens have? Lawyer bills and bankruptcy. Corporation sand developers apply BIG MONEY to get stimulus dollars-our money-citizens don't get money from the feds. It was intended that if a wind farm were to be developed-only American products were to be purchased and used under ARRA-seems that's been forgotten. The MN. PUC. has denied ONLY one permit for wind energy development. All others have been approved. There are HUGE environmental problems associated with "wind farms"-some of those, but not all include 1. noise pollution (2) visual pollution (3) water contamination -1000 ton concrete per footing) (4) wildlife and habitat destruction or displacement (5)rural infrastructure destroyed(5) public health and safety (6) citizens right to encumber (7) devaluating private property ersulting in nigration out of rural communities . ONLY a complete and unbiased accoustical study of noise at 80m and 100m or whatever size is suggested and what associated noise produced by industrial wind turbines. Without doing the studies it is forcing citizens to endure and suffer adverse health affects. These studies must include shadow flicker, inaudible and audible modulation include sitings with multiple turbines. In addition to an accoustical study a complete environmental worksheet is the ONLY method to properly assess the positive and negative issues surrounding wind and all energy developments. Minnesota water and mineral resoiurces could be negatively affected by run off and burying 1000's of ton of concrete. Our waters are already

under stress-to further this negative situation without environmental studies is not acceptable. References: (1) www.weatherunderground.com/history.html (2)http://www.aweo.org/windmodels.html(3)Minnesota Dept of Health 2009 White paper. Respectfully submitted as part of the public record. Sincerely, Colleen Mueller 22186 Hwy 4, Paynesville,MN. 56362

Minnesota Department of Transportation
Office of Land Management
395 John Ireland Boulevard
Saint Paul, MN 55155

Mailstop 678

Phone: 651-366-4635
Fax: 651-366-3450
stacy.kotch@state.mn.us

December 30th, 2011

Suzanne Steinhauer, State Permit Manager
Minnesota Office of Energy Security
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101

RE: In the Matter of the Getty Wind Project
PUC Docket Number: IP6866/WS-11-831

Dear Ms. Steinhauer,

On November 22nd, 2011, the Minnesota Office of Energy Security (OES) issued a Notice of Application Acceptance, which includes a public comment period regarding the scope of the environmental report (ER) and the draft site permit that is under consideration with respect to Getty Wind Company, LLC's Getty Wind Project 30 Megawatt Large Wind Energy Conversion System (LWECS) in Stearns County. The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) has reviewed the application regarding the proposed project and submits the following comments in response to the Notice.

MnDOT appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft site permit. MnDOT notes that there are several provisions that may have impacts on the state transportation system.

The draft site permit should include language specifying that the Permittee shall obtain all relevant permits or authorizations from road authorities relating to any electric cables and/or feeder lines that may be proposed to be placed in a public road right-of-way. MnDOT has adopted a formal policy and procedures for accommodation of utilities on the highway rights-of-way ("Utility Accommodation Policy"). A copy of MnDOT's policy can be found at http://www.dot.state.mn.us/utility/files/pdf/appendix-b.pdf . MnDOT's policy seeks to permit utilities to occupy portions of the trunk highway rights-of-way where such occupation does not put the safety of the traveling public or highway workers at risk or unduly impair the public's investment in the transportation system. Compliance with MnDOT's Utility Accommodation Policy, and similar policies of other road authorities, should be included as a condition of the site permit.

Based on the information provided in the Site Permit Application, it appears that the project area directly abuts state trunk highway (TH) 71. Although MnDOT has no scheduled projects in the immediate area, there may be highway-related considerations related to oversize/overweight hauling of wind turbines and equipment. Specifically, these large loads of freight are often transported along nearby interregional corridors such as I-94. Because MnDOT's highway construction activities could impact the Applicant's plans to haul oversize loads to the proposed

site, the Applicant will need to coordinate with MnDOT when planning such loads. If the Getty Wind Project or its associated facilities should happen to intersect with the trunk highway system, the Applicant will need to apply for and obtain permits for those locations.

Any wind farm construction work, including delivery or storage of structures, materials or equipment that may affect MnDOT right-of-way is of concern such that MnDOT should be involved in planning and coordinating such activities. The site permit should include language specifying that the Permittee shall obtain all relevant permits from road authorities relating to the transport of oversize materials and equipment related to the project over public roads, as well as installation of facilities that may be proposed to occupy portions of public road rights-of-way. Please note that if work is required within MnDOT right of way for temporary or permanent access, such work should be coordinated with Mark Renn in District 3B Permits Office at 320-223-6522 or Mark.Renn@state.mn.us.

Sincerely,

Stacy Kotch

Utility Transmission Route Coordinator

Minnesota Department of Transportation

cc: Mark Renn – MnDOT District 3B Permits
Roland Jurgens – Getty Wind Company, LLC

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

520 Lafayette Road North | St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-4194 | 651-296-6300

800-657-3864 | 651-282-5332 TTY | www.pca.state.mn.us | Equal Opportunity Employer

December 22, 2011

Ms. Suzanne Steinhauer
State Permit Manager
Energy Facility Permitting
Department of Commerce
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

Re: Getty Wind Project
PUC Docket Number: IP6866/WS-11-831

Dear Ms. Steinhauer:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Getty Wind project (Project), a 40-megawatt wind farm located in Stearns County, Minnesota. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) staff has reviewed the route permit application and has no comments at this time.

Please be aware that this letter does not constitute approval by the MPCA of any or all elements of the Project for the purpose of pending or future permit action(s) by the MPCA. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the Project proposer to secure any required permits and to comply with any requisite permit conditions. If you have any questions concerning our review of this project please contact Karen Kromar of my staff by e-mail at karen.kromar@state.mn.us or by telephone at 651-757-2508.

Sincerely,

Craig Affeldt

Craig Affeldt
Supervisor
Environmental Review Unit
Resource Management and Assistance Division

CA:mbo

cc: Keith Thorstad, Getty Wind Company, LLC, Chokio
Karen Kromar, MPCA, St. Paul
Reed Larson, MPCA, Brainerd

COUNTY OF STEARNS

Administration Center Rm 121 • 705 Courthouse Square • St. Cloud, MN 56303
320-656-3600 • Fax 320-656-6393 • www.co.stearns.mn.us

November 22, 2011

Suzanne Steinhauer
Minnesota Department of Commerce
State Permit Manager
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St Paul, MN 55101-2198

Re: Getty Wind Company, LLC Application for LWECS Site Permit

Dear Ms. Steinhauer:

The Stearns County Board of Commissioners respectfully submits comments based on Site Permit Application, Docket No. IP-6866/WS-11-831, for Getty Wind Company, LLC. The Board reviewed the site permit application and wishes to submit the following comments.

Page 13: 6.4 Permitting Associated Facilities
The application states that "the project will apply to Stearns County for a conditional use permit for the 69 kV overhead transmission line, permanent meteorological tower(s), utility road crossings, and O&M facility." Stearns County zoning ordinance does require permits for the overhead transmission line and the O&M facility, but not for the utility road crossings. It has also been our practice to not require an additional permit for the permanent meteorological tower if it is an associated facility in the site permit. Additionally, Stearns County does not enforce the Uniform Building Code; therefore we will not issue *building permits* for each turbine, substation and permanent meteorological tower(s) and O&M facility.

Recommendation: The site permit should not include an O&M building as an associated facility and should be subject to development and building siting standards set forth in Stearns County Land Use and Zoning Ordinance #439. The site permit should include the utility road crossings, permanent meteorological tower(s) and project substation as associated facilities.

Page 16: Local Zoning.
The application states that Stearns County has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Getty and Sauk Centre Townships making Stearns County the permitting authority for wind energy conversion systems (WECS) within the Townships. Pursuant to the MOU between Stearns County and Sauk Centre Township, the *Township* acts on conditional use permits for WECS outside the shoreland or floodplain overlay district. However it is correct that neither Getty nor Sauk Centre Township have more restrictive WECS zoning ordinances.

"Affirmative Action / Equal Opportunity Employer"

Page 18: Impacts and Mitigation
The application indicates that Getty intends to meet the more stringent setback requirements of the Stearns County Land Use and Zoning Ordinance #439 where it is feasible and reasonable. It goes on to state that the information provided in Section 9 demonstrates the total energy loss resulting from wake interference in the non-prevailing wind direction will be significantly less than the energy loss in the prevailing wind direction. This reduced interference warrants the commission implementing the 3 rotor diameter setback in the non-prevailing direction. **Table 9.5 – Wind Power Rose (page 61)** depicts this as well.

Recommendation: Require a setback of 5 rotor diameters (RD) on the prevailing wind directions and allow a setback of 3 rotor diameters (RD) on the non-prevailing wind directions. According to Section 6.60.5 of Stearns County Land Use and Zoning Ordinance 439, the Board may authorize a setback of less than 5 times the rotor diameter if the applicant demonstrates that due to the wind direction, the wake interference is less than 5 RD. Based on wind data collected onsite and provided to the County from the applicant, the wake interference is less than 5RD on the non-prevailing wind directions.

Stearns County Environmental Services is responsible for administering the Wetland Conservation Act and should be contacted once final turbine siting is completed in order to properly assess potential wetland impacts.

Stearns County and the State of Minnesota have invested a significant amount of resources on developing the 800mh 911 emergency network systems and have mapped the towers and microwave beam paths. To ensure protection of the network, the Board requests that the applicant submit a plan to the Commission for conducting an assessment of television signal reception and microwave signal patterns in the project area prior to beginning construction.

If you should have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Angie Berg, Interim Environmental Services Director, at 320-656-3613.

Sincerely,

Donald R. Otte, Chair
Stearns County Board of Commissioners

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Twin Cities Field Office
4101 American Blvd E.
Bloomington, Minnesota 55425-1665

December 29, 2011

Suzanne Steinhauer
State Permit Manager
Minnesota Department of Commerce
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

Re: Getty Wind Project Site Permit Application Review, Stearns County, Minnesota
PUC Docket No. IP6866/WS-11-831
FWS TAILS #32410-2010-FA-0068

Dear Ms. Steinhauer:

This is in response to the Department of Commerce (DOC) request for comments on the Site Permit Application for the proposed Getty Wind Project in Stearns County, Minnesota. The proposed project includes the installation of wind turbines, and associated infrastructure including roads, transmission lines, and staging areas. Representatives from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) and HDR have met on site during the summer and winter of 2011. The Service provided a letter regarding recommendations for the proposed Getty Wind Project to Bruce Jennings, P.E. with Dewild Grant Reckert, and Associates Company on May 11, 2010.

This letter is not intended to replace previous comments and recommendations the Service has provided regarding the Getty Wind Project. Our recommendations in this letter are intended to assist DOC staff in making informed decisions regarding recommendations they will carry forward to the Public Utility Commission (PUC).

Federally-listed Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species

Because of the potential for wind power projects to impact federally-listed species, they are subject to the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531-1544) section 9 provisions governing "take," similar to any other development project. "Take" incidental to a lawful activity may be authorized through the initiation of formal consultation, if a Federal agency is involved. If a federal agency, federal funding, or a federal permit are not involved in the project, an incidental take permit pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA may be obtained upon completion of a satisfactory habitat conservation plan for the listed species.

Since our May 2010 correspondence with the project proponent the Poweshiek skipperling has been determined to be a candidate for listing under ESA, and is found within Stearns County, Minnesota. The Poweshiek skipperling has been identified within the Trisko Waterfowl

Production Area (WPA), adjacent to the Getty Wind Project boundary. The Poweshiek skipper has experienced rapid population decline in the State of Minnesota. To minimize any potential impacts to the species or its habitat, placement of turbines within grassland habitats should be avoided.

Migratory Birds

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703-712; MBTA) implements four treaties that provide for international protection of migratory birds. The MBTA prohibits taking, killing, possession, transportation, and importation of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests, except when specifically authorized by the Department of the Interior. Bald and golden eagles are afforded additional legal protection under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668d). Unlike the Endangered Species Act, neither the MBTA nor its implementing regulations at 50 CFR Part 21, provide for permitting of "incidental take" of migratory birds.

The Service recommended observational bird surveys for the Getty Wind, LLC Project site to document species, direction of flight, and height of flight. To date, avian surveys have been completed within the proposed project site, and winter surveys specific to bald eagle movement are currently on-going. The Service is currently working with the project proponent as they develop an Avian and Bat Protection Plan (ABPP) to address migratory bird impact avoidance and minimization.

The Service recommends that proposed transmission lines be placed underground to the greatest extent possible. Transmission lines that must be placed above ground should be constructed in a location and fashion that will minimize impacts to migratory bird species. Due to the high waterfowl and shore bird use within the project area the Service recommends that bird diverters be placed on overhead transmission lines when they are adjacent to and/or bisect wetland and open water habitats.

Conservation Lands

We recommend that no turbines be located within ¼ mile of Conservation Reserve Program, Wetland Reserve Program, or other similar federally- or state-funded restoration projects.

Service Owned Lands

The Trisko and Kenna WPAs are adjacent to the proposed project site. The Service recommends that no turbines be placed within a ½ mile of any WPAs. If feasible a one mile setback from WPAs is preferred, which will reduce the potential for striking migratory birds utilizing the open water wetland and grassland habitats associated with these areas. If turbine locations are selected within 1 mile of any WPA, the Service recommends post construction mortality surveys be completed at these turbine locations.

Bat Acoustic Survey Recommendations

The Service recommends that the Getty Wind Project proponents and their consultants conduct rigorous assessments to determine bat use within the proposed Getty Wind Project site. We recommend installation of two AnaBat SDI detectors per meterological tower to be used within the project area, and data should be collected from April 15 - November 15, 2012, and extending into the operational phase of the proposed project. One AnaBat detector should be mounted at 5 meters above ground, and the other should be mounted as close to the rotor-swept area as possible. The AnaBat's sensitivity should be adjusted to detect a calibration tone at 20 meters. AnaBat units must monitor from 0.5 hour before sunset until 0.5 hour after sunrise. This will help to gauge bat activity and to some degree, to determine bat species/guild composition within the project area during spring and fall migration and the maternity season.

Pre- and Post- Construction Survey Recommendations

Due to the presence of an active bald eagle nest site in close proximity to the proposed turbine locations, and the presence of potential foraging habitat within the proposed project the Service recommends that the project proponent complete annual raptor nest surveys within the proposed project area and out two miles from the final turbine locations selected for construction. Raptor nest surveys should be completed prior to leaf-out in the spring of each year during construction and operation of the project. Monitoring should be conducted to assess the daily movement patterns of any raptors actively nesting within the proposed project site or within two miles of the proposed project site.

All bald or golden eagle use areas, including but not limited to; nesting areas, winter roost areas, and foraging areas, identified within or in close proximity to the proposed project should be reported to our office immediately. The information on bald or golden eagles and data gathered through these survey efforts will be utilized by our office to provide recommendations to assist the project proponent in reducing potential impacts to bald and golden eagles.

The Service recommends the project be monitored post-construction to determine impacts to migratory birds and bats. A specific post-construction monitoring plan should be prepared and reviewed by the Service and should include a scientifically robust, peer reviewed methodology of mortality surveys. The duration of post construction surveys is project specific, generally the Service recommends that post-construction surveys be conducted for a minimum of three years following construction to assess impacts to birds and bats. We also recommend that the post-construction mortality studies be conducted by an independent third party contractor with expertise in bird/bat mortality monitoring. Results of mortality surveys and other forms of monitoring should be used to adjust operations to reduce mortality if necessary and feasible, as well as improve design and siting of future wind generation facilities. **The Developer or its contractor should provide to this office each year, no later than December 31, copies of annual bird/bat mortality monitoring reports.**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this proposed project. Please contact Rich Davis, Fish and Wildlife Biologist, at (612) 725-3548, ext. 2214 if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Tony Sullins
Field Supervisor

cc: Jamie Schrenzel, MN DNR
Scott Glup, USFWS Litchfield WMD

From: Westerman Dairy
To: Kirsch, Raymond (COMM)
Subject: Getty Wind Farm, PUC Docket number: IP6866/WS-11-831
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2011 10:01:17 PM

Getty Wind Farm, PUC Docket number: IP6866/WS-11-831

Have environmental studies been done as to the impact on the wildlife in the Getty Township area? If so, has the Getty Wind Farm paid for an independent study or has the study been done by someone who works for the wind developer?

Has any long-range plan been developed by Getty Wind Farm for 10-20-50 years down the road to dismantle outdated/non-working turbines and excavation of tons of cement left behind?

Are any kind of guarantees being made to land owners who live in the area, who have not signed contracts for "wind rights", whose land will decrease in value due to the wind turbines. When we want to retire some day and sell our farm, will the wind developers make up the price difference lost in the sale of our land?

What kind of compensation will be given to us for not being able to use our cell phones and our internet due to interference from the wind turbines?

Will the investors of Getty Wind Farm also be having wind turbines put up on their property? Where will the exact placement of these wind turbines be?
"We haven't determined that yet" from the investors is NOT acceptable. Exact placement should be known before ANY kind of a permit is issued.

Janell Westerman
43035 County Road 28
Sauk Centre, MN 56378

From: Westerman Dairy
To: Steinhauer, Suzanne (COMM)
Subject: Getty Wind Farm-PUC Docket #IP6866/WS-11-831
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2011 9:34:35 PM

Comments concerning the application for site permit for Getty Wind Farm
PUC Docket Number: IP6866/WS-11-831

To Suzanne Steinhauer, State Permit Manager:

We, the family of Scott and Janell Westerman, are very much AGAINST the Getty Wind Farm coming into our area. We are angry that this would even be considered in highly productive agricultural land. We live in section 18 of Getty Township and will be directly affected by the Getty Wind Farm.

The reasons are as follows:

1. The devaluation of our property. If we should decide to sell our farm in the next 5-10 years, we feel we would not be able to receive fair market value for our property - who wants to live next to these huge wind turbines? We attended the meeting Black Oak Wind Farm hosted, of which many of the investors of Getty Wind Farm were there. Black Oak Wind Farm is also planning on erecting wind turbines just to the northwest, west and south of us. They could not give us any guarantees that our property would be worth what others are getting in the area. IT IS A FACT THAT PROPERTIES AROUND WIND FARMS REDUCE IN VALUE WHEN THE WIND TURBINES GO UP!!!

2. Interference to our cell phones/internet service from the wind turbines. Also at the meeting Black Oak Wind Farm hosted we were told by Black Oak representatives that the wind turbines do in fact cause interference to cell phone usage and internet service. This is of great concern to us since we depend greatly on internet usage for market and weather reports, use for homeschooling our daughters, and cell phone usage related to our farm.

3. Concern for health effects. Since no long-term studies have been made regarding these large-scale wind turbines, we are concerned about health effects they may have. Others who live by them often complain about the screeching noise they make, migraine headaches, stress related problems, dizziness. This would not only affect us, but also our animals on the farm. We make our living here, if our cows are affected and milk production is reduced, we can't run a business that way. There is a scientific health study from UK-stating 6.5 mi is what the setback should be to protect human health- the link: http://www.express.co.uk/posts/view/286414.

4. Shattering of wind turbines. Lighting strikes, malfunctions, etc., yes - it will happen! Who will be there to pick up the pieces out of our fields, our cows' feed. Who will be helping to pay our veterinary bills from "hardware" in our cows' stomachs. I'm sure it won't be the Getty Wind Farm!

5. IMPACT ON THE WILDLIFE IN OUR AREA. We have over 6,000 acres of wildlife area out here. You can't tell me this wind farm will NOT impact the wildlife. We have large volumes of migratory birds flying over all the time, everything from Trumpeter Swans, to ducks and geese, to Bald Eagles. (And yes, we do have bald eagles nesting close by) And guess where the large blades of the wind turbines are -

right in their flight path. Where's Environmental Services? Why are they not doing their job? We have a natural environment lake at our back door - much too close for these wind turbines. Had Getty Wind Farm done studies to investigate the impact on the wildlife? Studies from other areas DO NOT COUNT - we want studies done for THIS area, until then, permits shouldn't even be considered!!

6. Electric rates WILL increase. The electric companies are forced to buy back the little electricity that the wind turbines produce. They in turn pass the cost on to us (and you). When's it going to end? We are a small dairy farm and we can't afford it.

WE are the ones who have to live next to these wind turbines, not you, not the commissioners, not the wind developers, WE DO! Your decision impacts the rest of our life and the lives of future generations. These wind turbines are being erected and called "green" energy. There is nothing "green" about them. In all reality, wind farms produce very little electricity. One of the Black Oak representatives said that it would take a 22 mph wind 100% of the time to make a wind turbine run at full efficiency. DO YOUR HOMEWORK ON THESE THINGS. If it wasn't for huge tax credits and government subsidies on wind turbines, they would not be popping up like daisies.

Who is going to dismantle these wind turbines 20 years down the road when they're no longer operating? Who is going to excavate the tons of cement they leave in the ground? Will it be those same investors and wind developers that are so eager to get them in? Most likely it will be the landowners left to deal with their garbage, and the costs will be so astronomical, that we'll not be able to do anything with them. So they'll stand like gravestones in a cemetery, allowed to become unsightly reminders of the mistakes of a few "select" money hungry people.

SAY "NO" TO THE PERMITS. The wind developers are promising a lot of things and they don't stand behind it their empty promises. They don't give back to the community, it does nothing to provide local jobs, there simply are no benefits to these wind turbines. Stearns County is the largest dairy county in the state of Minnesota. There is a farm at least every 1/2 mile and many times less. Set back laws are not strict enough. Wind turbines have no place here. Keep Stearns County the beautiful family-friendly, farmer-friendly place that it is. **KEEP THE WIND TURBINES OUT!**

Sincerely,
the Westerman family

From: apache@web.lmic.state.mn.us
To: Steinhauer, Suzanne (COMM)
Subject: Westerman Wed Nov 30 21:40:23 2011 IP6866/WS-11-831
Date: Wednesday, November 30, 2011 9:40:28 PM

This public comment has been sent via the form at:
www.energyfacilities.puc.state.mn.us/publicComments.html

You are receiving it because you are listed as the contact for this project.

Project Name: Getty Wind Project

Docket number: IP6866/WS-11-831

User Name: Janell Westerman

County: Stearns County

City: Sauk Centre

Email: janellw@wisper-wireless.com

Phone: 320-352-0103

Impact: Comments concerning the application for site permit for Getty Wind Farm

PUC Docket Number: IP6866/WS-11-831

We, the family of Scott and Janell Westerman, are very much AGAINST the Getty Wind Farm coming into our area. We are angry that this would even be considered in highly productive agricultural land. We live in section 18 of Getty Township and will be directly affected by the Getty Wind Farm.

The reasons are as follows:

1. The devaluation of our property. If we should decide to sell our farm in the next 5-10 years, we feel we would not be able to receive fair market value for our property - who wants to live next to these huge wind turbines? We attended the meeting Black Oak Wind Farm hosted, of which many of the investors of Getty Wind Farm were there. Black Oak Wind Farm is also planning on erecting wind turbines just to the northwest, west and south of us. They could not give us any guarantees that our property would be worth what others are getting in the area. IT IS A FACT THAT PROPERTIES AROUND WIND FARMS REDUCE IN VALUE WHEN THE WIND TURBINES GO UP!!!

2. Interference to our cell phones/internet service from the wind turbines. Also at the meeting Black Oak Wind Farm hosted we were told by Black Oak representatives that the wind turbines do in fact cause interference to cell phone usage and internet service. This is of great concern to us since we depend greatly on internet usage for market and weather reports, use for homeschooling our daughters, and cell phone usage related to our farm.

3. Concern for health effects. Since no long-term studies have been made regarding these large-scale wind turbines, we are concerned about health effects they may have. Others who live by them often complain about the screeching noise they make, migraine headaches, stress related problems, dizziness. This would not only affect us, but also our animals on the farm. We make our living here, if our cows are affected and milk production is reduced, we can't run a business that way. There is a scientific health study from UK-stating 6.5 mi is what the setback should be to protect human health- the link: http://www.express.co.uk/posts/view/286414.

4. Shattering of wind turbines. Lighting strikes, malfunctions, etc., yes - it will happen! Who will be there to pick up the pieces out of our fields, our cows' feed. Who will be helping to pay our veterinary bills from "hardware" in our cows' stomachs. I'm sure it won't be the Getty Wind Farm!

5. IMPACT ON THE WILDLIFE IN OUR AREA. We have over 6,000 acres of wildlife area out here. You can't tell me this wind farm will NOT impact the wildlife. We have large volumes of migratory birds flying over all the time, everything from Trumpeter Swans, to ducks and geese, to Bald Eagles. (And yes, we do have bald eagles nesting close by) And guess where the large blades of the wind turbines are - right in their flight path. Where's Environmental Services? Why are they not doing their job? We have a natural environment lake at our back door - much too close for these wind turbines. Had Getty Wind Farm done studies to investigate the impact on the wildlife? Studies from other areas DO NOT COUNT - we want studies done for THIS area, until then, permits shouldn't even be considered!!

6. Electric rates WILL increase. The electric companies are forced to buy back the little electricity that the wind turbines produce. They in turn pass the cost on to us (and you). When's it going to end? We are a small dairy farm and we can't afford it.

WE are the ones who have to live next to these wind turbines, not you, not the commissioners, not the wind developers, WE DO! Your decision impacts the rest of our life and the lives of future generations. These wind turbines are being erected and called "green" energy. There is nothing "green" about them. In all reality, wind farms produce very little electricity. One of the Black Oak representatives said that it would take a 22 mph wind 100% of the time to make a wind turbine run at full efficiency. DO YOUR HOMEWORK ON THESE THINGS. If it wasn't for huge tax credits and government subsidies on wind turbines, they would not be popping up like daisies.

Who is going to dismantle these wind turbines 20 years down the road when they're no longer operating? Who is going to excavate the tons of cement they leave in the ground? Will it be those same investors and wind developers that are so eager to get them in? Most likely it will be the landowners left to deal with their garbage, and the costs will be so astronomical, that we'll not be able to do anything with them. So they'll stand like gravestones in a cemetery, allowed to become unsightly reminders of the mistakes of a few "select" money hungry people.

SAY "NO" TO THE PERMITS. The wind developers are promising a lot of things and they don't stand behind it their empty promises. They don't give back to the community, it does nothing to provide local jobs, there simply are no benefits to these wind turbines. Stearns County is the largest dairy county in

the state of Minnesota. There is a farm at least every 1/2 mile and many times less. Set back laws are not strict enough. Wind turbines have no place here. Keep Stearns County the beautiful family-friendly, farmer-friendly place that it is. KEEP THE WIND TURBINES OUT!

Sincerely,

the Westerman family

Mitigation: Set-back rules need to be more stringent - at least 2 miles

The only mitigation here is to keep them out.

Submission date: Wed Nov 30 21:40:23 2011

This information has also been entered into a centralized database for future analysis.

For questions about the database or the functioning of this tool, contact:

Andrew Koebrick
andrew.koebrick@state.mn.us