

Emails Regarding Ordinance Amendments

1. Gene and Denise Stehly-2-27-17-Proposed wind ordinance for Davison County.
 - a. Propose setback 1 mile, 1000' damage quality of life and decrease property value.
 - b. Require property value guarantees for non-participating within 2 mile.
 - c. Clarify decommission statement to include decommission/reclamation bond administrated by the county.
 - d. In favor of recent ordinances passed by Lincoln County and Letcher Township.
2. Lance Koth-2-28-17-Proposed wind ordinance for Davison County.
 - a. Questions need for wind ordinance.
 - b. 1000' set back not enough, suggests 1 mile to help protect real estate values.
 - c. Decommission of tower should be of all tower components, not just down 3' below ground and provide assurance that it will be paid for.
 - d. Does not live in country, understands perceived value of wind turbines in regards to tax revenue but that shouldn't be the only focus.
3. Jade Stehly-3-1-17-Proposed Wind Ordinance.
 - a. 24 year old buying acreage in county.
 - b. Feels in system would change way she feels about living in country.
4. Glen Lowrie-3-2-17-March 8, 2017 Ordinance Meeting.
 - a. Agrees with Letcher Township and Lincoln County ordinances.
 - b. 1 mile setbacks for non-participating buildings.
 - c. Concerned with requirements, run 100% of the time unlike traffic or machinery.
 - d. Thinks property values will decrease.
 - e. Create an eyesore in the county.
 - f. Should be placed in lower populated areas in the state.
 - g. Decommissioning of the tower should have a guaranteed bond for each tower to cover cost.
 - h. Agree with Letcher Township and Lincoln County ordinances, please consider their parameters.
5. Doug Hansen-3-4-17-Proposed wind ordinance for Davison County.
 - a. Ordinance snuck up on public, little awareness to public.
 - b. Will be unable to attend meeting.
 - c. Proposed ordinance is built on ancient wind energy information, 1.1 x tower height, 1000' setbacks, dBA ratings, etc.
 - d. Other areas of the state face the same concerns, Walworth County, Lincoln County, Avon region and Letcher Township.
 - e. Impact the welfare of life style and economy.
 - f. Feel we are rushing into something that we have not done due diligence on.
 - g. Need to implement an adequate set back of minimum of 1 mile but preferably 2 mile from a residence.
 - h. Wind is not agriculture commodity, should require unique controllers and zoning.
 - i. Place wind farms in less populated regions of the state.
 - j. Create new rules that aren't antiquated and encompass feedback.

- k. Nothing in proposed ordinance regarding protection of other industries: hunting farms, wineries, tourism, agriculture and its associated industries, agricultural applications.
 - l. Agrees with Letcher Township ordinance.
- 6. Mike and Mavis Anderson-3-5-17-Wind Energy.
 - a. Strongly support Lincoln County and Letcher Township ordinances.
- 7. Harvey Kelley-3-6-17-Sec 2:11 Wind Energy Systems.
 - a. More research needs to be done before final adoption
 - b. 45 dBA is too high
 - c. 30 hours of shadow flicker is too much.
 - d. 1000' setback from non-participating residences is too close, should be 5280'.
 - e. 1.1 times height is too close to property lines and can create safety issues when next to roadways if they collapse.
 - f. Thorndike, Maine voted for 1 mile setbacks.
 - g. Frankfort, Maine ordinance would create a setback of one mile to each property line of non-participating landowner.
 - h. US Dept of Energy Wind Exchange website states 430 wind ordinances in the US, should look at Trempealeau County Wisconsin Ordinance, agrees with that one.
 - i. Ordinance needs to cover liability insurance decommission bonding, etc.
- 8. Jerry Scott-3-6-17-Planning and Zoning Board Meeting Mar 8, 2017.
 - a. If the application from Juhl Energy failed with the same recommendations, changes are needed to the ordinance.
 - b. No provisions for enforcement.
 - c. Best and least expensive action is to place a 2 mile setback from non-participating owners property lines.
 - d. Attached a 22 page pdf with the current proposed ordinance and his recommendations and research.
- 9. Adrian Laurendeau-3-6-2017-Wind Energy Message.
 - a. Opposed to the 1,000' setback, Referenced Letcher Township and Lincoln County Ordinances.
- 10. Dan Koupal-3-7-17-Wind Ordinance for Davison County.
 - a. Gave an opinion on the financial impact that wind towers have in relationship to the distance to residential locations.
 - i. Tower within 500' 40 to 45% negative financial impact
 - ii. Tower within 1000' 35 to 40% negative financial impact
 - iii. Tower within ½ mile 30 to 35% negative financial impact
 - iv. Tower within 1 mile 10 to 15% negative financial impact
 - b. Currently licensed by the South Dakota Real Estate Commission as a Broker.
- 11. Harvey Kelley 3-8-17-Wind Energy Ordinance.
 - a. Mr. Kelley shared his concerns (as he did in the open public hearing) that the Davison County Website was not clear that this was a "proposal". He also offered to help further the research on wind energy ordinances.
- 12. Planning & Zoning Administrator Bathke-3-9-2017-Response to Mr. Kelley

- a. Administrator Bathke explained to Mr. Kelley how this has been a lengthy process and the department has not tried to hide anything. He also accepted Mr. Kelley's offer to help further research wind energy ordinances.
13. Denise Stehly-3-11-17-Davison County Wind Energy.
 - a. Forwarded information referenced at the open public hearing, provided by Ken Stach.
14. John O'Connell-3-13-17-Wind Towers in Davison County
 - a. Feels wind towers should not be allowed in his air space.
15. Lance Koth-3-14-17-Proposed Wind Ordinance for Davison County
 - a. Submitted a cost estimation of removal of a wind tower.
16. Harvey Kelley 3-8-17-Wind Energy Ordinance.
 - a. Mr. Kelley again shared his concerns (as he did in the open public hearing) that the Proposed Davison County Ordinance was not properly researched.
 - b. Mr. Kelley also feels Administrator Bathke deserves to receive criticism regarding the ordinance.
 - c. Mr. Kelley also cited SDCL 8-2-1 (4), which allows a township to pass an ordinance.
17. Planning & Zoning Administrator Bathke-3-15-2017-Response to Mr. Kelley
 - a. Administrator Bathke responded to Mr. Kelley, explaining the past Juhl Energy votes, the number of projects and/or ordinances we have researched (24 plus the PUC SDCL and ARSD), and explained the Supreme Court case explaining townships do not have the inherent power to zone.
18. Peter Licht-3-17-17-Wind Turbines.
 - a. Mr. Licht explained the noise level and blade flash from the Prairie Winds towers, which are 2,200 feet from his residence, is terrible. Also, the roads were damaged.