

From: Jim.Burg@state.sd.us [mailto:Jim.Burg@state.sd.us]
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2002 3:13 PM
To: Hadjy, Pandor
Subject: FW: Comments on Implementation of Section 9006 of Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002

-----Original Message-----

From: Burg, Jim
Sent: Wednesday, December 04, 2002 2:06 PM
To: pandor.hadgy@usda.gov
Subject: Comments on Implementation of Section 9006 of Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on implementation rules for section 9006. I participated in the development of and fully endorse the comments that were submitted and the oral testimony presented on December 4th by the Environmental and Law and Policy Center.

Additionally I would encourage giving preference to those projects which enhance or compliment other rural and agriculture projects. For example: Wind is rapidly developing into a source of rural energy as well as agriculture economic development. However wind is available on the average 30% of the time and is not considered a dispatchable resource. Other renewable energy sources which could firm wind generation or provide a more dispatch able energy source would greatly increase the value of wind development as well as the supplemental renewable resource. Resources like "biomass" energy, "anaerobic digester gas" for electric generation and solar and hydrogen as well as storage techniques could greatly enhance the wind resource and thus increase the value or agriculture energy production.

I would also add that I support a preference to loan guarantees over grants because the will make the limited resources support so many more projects.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Jim Burg, chair
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission