From: William Parsons <williambparsons@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, January 9, 2019 4:10 PM

To: Patrick White; Wanda Parrish; Chris Yakabouski; Kevin Marshall; Timothy J. McLaughlin; David Ross; Gary Skinner; Thomas G. Benton; Paul D. Trampe; berkeleymaddox@gmail.com; grenewpc@gmail.com; Paulette Mann; 2012sheriffsmith@gmail.com; spotsyslem@gmail.com; Aimee Mann; travAAU@cox.net; Paulette Mann

Subject: Spotsylvania Solar Plant Issues and Concerns @ Decommissioning and Site Restoration Bond Amount

To the members of the Spotsylvania Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

I became aware of this mega project in April of last year…thanks to the group **Concerned Citizens of Spotsylvania County**. **CCSC** has been the Environmental Watchdog and Technical Resource trying to inform and protect this County and its Citizens from sPower who is trying to get a $600,000,000 project approved that has questionable specifications and bare minimum safeguards. If the project is approved and implemented as proposed, it will have a significant negative environmental and financial impact on Spotsylvania for years to come. It seems ironic that a project being implemented to produce environmentally friendly renewable energy could potentially be so damaging to the environment…is that the responsible thing to do, certainly not.

At the 1/2/19 PC meeting I was encouraged with your awareness and concern about the negative impacts of using well water, the burning of debris, building mulch berms vs earthen berms, only having 50’ setbacks, construction noise on Sundays, traffic volumes and patterns on roads that can not support it, etc.

sPower says they will be a Good Neighbor. I would ask you all to consider, would a Responsible Good Neighbor really have proposed the 5'th largest Solar Plant in the US with such minimum safeguards and specifications in a rural residential area? Not to mention that this project is owned by five (5) LLC's…Limited Liability Company's (part of sPower) for the purpose of spreading and limiting potential financial issues and costs.

There are many additional important issues that need to be addressed before being included in the SUP. One of those issues is the Decommissioning and Site Restoration Bond. If this Bond is not initially valued properly, it could have a significant long term financial impact on the County and its Residents when the solar plant is decommissioned. The County could face the financial burden of returning the 6,350 acres to an appropriate condition at time of decommissioning and the removal and recycling of the 1,800,000 solar panels.

It is obvious that sPower has been low balling and hedging on providing a realistic/fair Decommissioning and Site Restoration Bond amount…not what I would call the action of a Responsible Good Neighbor. Their initial plan was woefully low…showed that they would secure a $1,375,000 bond to cover all of the Decom/Site costs. They have since increased the bond amount twice with that amount now shown at $10,972,743. Their total Decommissioning and Site Restoration estimated cost is $36,705,64, from which they subtract $25,732,919, their estimated panel recycling value at EOL (end of life) leaving their bond amount at the $10,972,743.

Just because you recycle something doesn't mean you get paid for it…many items are recycled to prevent hazardous materials from going to a landfill. The reality is, solar panels do not have a recycling value. In fact, there is great concern over what to do with retired panels in the future…there is starting to be a glut of panels…particularly as we near 2050, which is approximately when this facility will reach EOL. Panels could also be retired sooner than EOL as panel technologies and efficiencies improve and current panels face early obsolescence.

Sean Fogerty, **CCSC**, has carefully researched solar panel recycling costs and provided you with documented accurate numbers from First Solar stating their charge is $6.50 to take back one (1) of their CdTe panels. He also provided recycling costs from Cleanlites Recycling and Dynamic Lifecycle who charge $.48/lb and $.40/ lb respectively to take back the Jinko CrSi panels. Based on the above charges, Sean calculated that at EOL, it would COST an estimated $32,943,600 to have all panels recycled…a very different number than the $25,732,919 recycling value sPower assigns to the panels...which they reduce from the bond! Would you trust an alleged Good Neighbor to manipulate the facts in this way…I would not. For a solar plant with this many panels on this much land, the Decommissioning and Site Restoration Bond would not be out of the question at $50,000,000.

From what I have seen through their misleading and divisive approach in trying to get this project approved, sPower can not be trusted to be a Responsible Good Neighbor to our County and residents.

Even with all conditions addressed there will still be significant adverse effects on our County from inserting a 10 sq mile 500 MW, 5'th largest solar plant in the US, into the heart of Historic Civil War countryside.

Thank You,

William B Parsons

11322 Fawn Lake Pkwy

Spotsylvania, VA 22551

- -

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