From: Glenn Marcus <ghmarcus@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 8, 2019 8:15 PM

To: Paul D. Trampe; Chris Yakabouski; Kevin Marshall; Timothy J. McLaughlin; David Ross; Gary Skinner; grenewpc@gmail.com; 2012sheriffsmith@gmail.com; TravAAU@cox.net; berkeleymaddox@gmail.com; spotsysalem@gmail.com; Wanda Parrish; Patrick White; Jay Cullinan

Subject: Fwd: Solar Farm Hazard

Attachments: article_849e117c-5de2-562a-839a-c3b553365720.html; CountyResponsesToFREMDocs.pdf; forklift-catches-fire-causes-2-million-in-damage; mantua.htm

Forwarding to you for consideration a copy of an email sent to Mr. Benton.

Glenn Marcus

Glenn Marcus

-------- Forwarded Message --------

Subject: Solar Farm Hazard
Date: Tue, 8 Jan 2019 12:12:21 -0500
From: Glenn Marcus <ghmarcus@yahoo.com>
To: GBenton@spotsylvania.va.us
CC: ConcernedCitizensFawnLake@gmail.com

Mr. Benton, a recent event raises a safety issue that has not yet been addressed, or at least publicly discussed. I want to ensure that the committee is aware of it.

sPower claims that the cadmium-based solar cells are completely safe due to the cadmium being encapsulated in the glass. It claims it would take a fire with temperatures far in excess of what the solar cells could ever be exposed to in order for the cadmium to be released. A recent editorial described it as being so safe that if a panel breaks, a workman only needs to wear gloves to protect his hands from glass cuts.

As part of the sPower submission to the county, you have on file an emergency response plan from Swinerton, which supposedly covers all of the risks and how these would be handled. I haven't read all 110 pages in detail, but I did not find any indication that the document deals with the solar panels themselves. All of the covered risks seem to relate to what would naturally be at the site, and incidental supplies that would be on-site.

Swinerton recently made the news due to a fire at a different solar farm it is constructing in Florida. The firefighters were merely in the presence of the smoke and required full decontamination because the smoke from the solar panels is carcinogenic.

This raises two concerns. One is the true nature of the risks to the environment and the public, which appear to be very different from what has been presented to date. Besides potential environmental contamination, imagine a fire at the site. People live within a few hundred feet and would be exposed to the same carcinogenic smoke as the firefighters. Do emergency response plans include decontaminating entire neighborhoods? Is it fair for nearby residents to live in fear of contracting cancer from a potential mishap at the site?

Even if such risks are minimal, they aren't nonexistent. Risk has two components, how bad the potential outcome is, and how likely it is to occur. A risk can have an infinitesimal probability of occurring, but can be horrendous if it does occur. Nobody wants to put his family at unnecessary risk, including a tiny chance of something terrible, if it can be avoided. What will happen to property values if people view the neighborhood as next to a hazardous waste site?

The second concern relates to decommissioning. If the solar cells are still producing power, nobody is going to abandon such a huge investment. If the site is decommissioned, it will almost certainly be because the solar cells have no value. So assuming any kind of resale value in the decommissioning bond makes no sense. But the concern should really be in the other direction. The panels can't simply be hauled away and dumped in a landfill. They will need to be handled as hazardous waste, and as such, the decommissioning costs could be astronomical. Ignoring the dubious resale value, the county needs to verify that the disposal cost, itself, estimated by sPower is adequate.

I moved to Spotsylvania from Northern Virginia, and can relate how an environmental problem destroyed an entire community. The neighborhood of Mantua is located not far from a petroleum tank farm. You can read the story here, but briefly, the tanks leaked, and 20 properties were affected. However, the entire neighborhood was stigmatized, and the value of all 1,500 homes plummeted. A large amount of money went into the environmental cleanup, buying up affected properties, renovating the neighborhood, and a marketing campaign. Years later, the community recovered. But even a decade later, some people still avoided moving there, impacting the real estate market.

A hazardous event, or the risk of one, at the solar farm could similarly affect the value of surrounding properties, which contribute significantly to the Spotsylvania tax base due to their high value. If an entire community like Fawn Lake is stigmatized by proximity to the solar farm, that Spotsylvania County revenue would be substantially affected. This is being scoffed at by sPower and its supporters (although nobody has yet put it in the context of a hazardous

event). However, various people have told me that real estate agents have described to them that this has already started to happen. While I can't substantiate this first hand, it would be irresponsible to dismiss the issue based on vague assurances.

The risks from the solar panels have not been honestly portrayed, so it seems likely that the county has not had the basis to properly evaluate them. Please give this consideration in your deliberations.

Thank you for your attention.

Glenn Marcus

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