From: Michael <edwardsmt54@msn.com>

Sent: Monday, January 7, 2019 1:50 PM

To: berkeleymaddox@gmail.com; grenewpc@gmail.com; Paulette Mann; 2012sheriffsmith@gmail.com; spotsysalem@gmail.com; TravAAU@cox.net

Cc: Thomas G. Benton; Chris Yakabouski; Kevin Marshall; Timothy J. McLaughlin; David Ross; Paul D. Trampe; Gary Skinner; Aimee Mann; Wanda Parrish; Paulette Mann; Patrick White; concernedcitizensspotsylvania@gmail.com

Subject: sPower Solar Facility Initiative

Dear Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,

We have been residents of Fawn Lake since Fall of 2014. As a retired Marine Corps family, we have lived in many places but believe that Fawn Lake may be the nicest, most family friendly community in which we have ever lived--due to its pristine lake, abundant green space and opportunity for a variety of recreational activities.

We are not opposed to alternative energy sources, particularly solar, but we are opposed to a "mega" solar facility in Spotsylvania county as currently proposed by sPOWER. No, we are not, "not in my backyard" people by any stretch and we would never be confused with elitism. The solar facility initiative simply does not pass the common sense sniff test for several reasons:

- **Financial Accuracy**: We have heard and seen financial analyses that support the construction of the solar facility and an analysis that indicated a zero, if not negative return for Spotsylvania county. How do you know which one is correct? Has the commission done an independent and objective financial analysis? We have attended some of the meetings and heard a few residents express support for the facility. However, we discovered that those individual/families have a personal and significant financial stake/interest in the facility being built in Spotsylvania county. From what we have seen and studied, *the financial gain for our county and the state is negligible at best*.
- **Location**: Why locate the solar facility in Spotsylvania county, directly adjacent to a major residential community? It is not in dispute that there are solar facilities of a similar size/scope but they are all in isolated areas, nowhere near residential communities. So why does that seem appropriate now? There is currently no other comparably sized facility located so near a large residential community that can provide a model for the success or failure of a project of this depth and breadth placed so close to homes and neighborhoods. Is Spotsylvania county going to act as a "test case"? We understand that the Spotsylvania location will allow sPower to connect to the grid easier but that is the

only rational reason we have heard for that location and that reason is flawed. How are the other mega solar facilities connected to the grid? They did not have ready access so why must this facility? It is *NOT believable that sPower could not find an alternate more isolated location in Virginia to build their facility* and connect to the grid using other methods that apparently have proven effective.

- **Comprehensive Plan**: We have read the Comprehensive Plan and believe strongly that the solar facility initiative is not in compliance. However, that Plan is written in broad terms and it appears that somebody with a conflict of interest could come to the conclusion that the plan does support the construction of a mega solar facility. If that is what happens, it would beg the question; *what would the commission NOT approve if the money was right?* How important is maintaining the character of Spotsylvania county and the historic "flavor" of this area?
- **sPower Integrity and Reliability**: At one of the recent meetings with the Commission, a citizen presented a litany of legal entanglements and litigation surrounding sPower. We are not so naïve to not know that large corporations have legal challenges at multiple levels but what was presented to the Board provides what should be considered a *significant "red flag" in regards to sPower's willingness and capability of living up to their promises and the community's expectations*.
- **Special Use Permit (SUP)**: I have significant experience with large and highly complex government contracts from my time with Northrop Grumman after my Marine Corps career. Looking over the current provisions and restrictions in the SUP, I believe that *sPower will be extremely hard pressed to follow the requirements with an "acceptable" degree of success*. Many, if not most, of the additional or enhanced restrictions, proposed by multiple factions and which should be added to the SUP will only compound sPower's difficulty to execute their plan. This situation should not be considered merely a tactic to force sPower to withdraw their plans or for the Board to vote no. However, how will the Board enforce the SUP? Do you have or will you have an aggressive "Enforcement Plan" vs. simply saying that you will ensure compliance – that is NOT enough for such an extensive and complex construction job. Much discussion has centered around the emplacement of "berms".
    - If the solar facility is going to happen, why the heck can't there be a berm that circles the entire solar facility with at least a 350-400 foot setback? *This will not only simplify part of the SUP complexity, it will also subdue legitimate concerns of many citizens*. We suppose that cost is a concern but that hardly seems like a "showstopper". My understanding is that the closest any berm put up by sPower to date is at least 2,000 feet or more from any residential home. Why now is 350 feet deemed okay? Something just does not smell right!

The Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors have more than enough factual and common sense data/input to say no to sPower and we hope you will.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mike Edwards

edwardsmt54@msn.com

540-388-1610

--
This email was Malware checked by UTM 9. http://www.sophos.com