

Janus Solar EIR Comment

Submitted to:

Greg Plucker, Senior Planner
County of Colusa Planning and Building Department

Colusa, CA 95667 - via email:

Submitted by:

Residents: Stephen Marsh, Karan Marsh

This letter is to document our opposition of the proposed Janus Solar Project at **Spring Valley Rd (SVR)** and Walnut Rd in Williams, CA, County of Colusa. Following are where we see this proposal conflicts with the existing Colusa County General Plan and general concerns:

Property Taxes

Please explain how/how often the following items will be taxable, i.e., one-time or for the life of the operation? If Appreciable?

- Ownership - Will the project be on leased land or owned land?
- BES
- On-site Sub Station
- Power Lines - To/from the road to the industrial complex. How will these lines be taxed?

Financing: Who pays for the construction and maintenance. The last Solar Panel proposal did not address who (or what fund) will be used for the development.

Water: How many gallons of water will be used for the construction and operation? What type of water, i.e., potable, grey, drinking? Where will water be sourced? What is water transport conditions (how) and schedule (how often)? Explain

Fire: The local fire department should have a fire plan for dealing with solar facilities and the BES prior to permit approval. This plan should include either a signed and enforceable mutual aid or automatic aid. What extinguishing systems will be available on day 1, on site?

BES Battery Energy Storage (BES): Will the BES be a taxable AND appreciable structure? Will the BES be sodium rather than lithium? Explain with evidence which is the safer element.

Power Lines: Will lines be on county property, or will they require an easement over private property?

Construction: Define the percentage of union project construction workers compared to verified residents (who have resided in Colusa County for over 12 consecutive months).

Road maintenance SPV and Walnut roads: Explain who pays for and who provides maintenance on primary roads. During construction and throughout operations.

GOAL 2.1: LAND USE Protection and conservation of existing communities and rural centers...
Will the land use permit grazing under the panels or not?

Policy 2.1.1.7 requires...as adequate roadways, utilities, and other public service infrastructure become available and wildfire hazards are mitigated as required by an approved Fire Safe Plan.

1. Should an emergency require evacuation from the proposed site, we anticipate increased bottlenecks at SVR exit and Walnut Rd with such a proposal which will impact our SPV neighbors negatively.
2. SPV is in the High Fire Hazard Severity Zone based on the CALFIRE maps. CALFIRE is in the middle of updating the zones. Should a proposal be approved and if CalFire's risk changes, impacts would likely be felt with canceled fire insurance policies, and or increased premiums.
3. The Williams fire station is not equipped to adequately respond to a major fire incident in such proposed facilities. What fees from the applicant are to be provided for emergency services training to respond to the site once needed?
4. How would a disaster at the facility impact its rural neighbors? There are no safeguards within the proposal to safeguard its residential rural and suburban neighbors from potential disasters.
5. The proposal includes solar power; it is not evident PGE has permitted, approved or confirmed their ability to absorb that generation of power?
6. The proposal recommends the use of a temporary in-ground septic system for their 150+ room transient facilities? We do not recall seeing such a "commercial" provision in the General Plan.
7. The Colusa County staff is not sufficiently staffed to accommodate the increased workload of inspections and reviews of elder care, community housing and hotels. We work with Colusa and understand they are understaffed without this proposal being approved.
8. The Proposal will likely increase traffic volume, speed and road rage incidents.

GOAL 2.3: NATURAL LANDSCAPE FEATURES Maintain the characteristic natural landscape features unique to each area of the County.

9.

GOAL 2.4: EXISTING COMMUNITY IDENTITY Maintain and enhance the character of existing rural and urban communities, emphasizing both the natural setting and built design elements which contribute to the quality of life, economic health, and community pride of County residents.

10. We see the Proposal going against keeping rural as rural as established by this General Plan goal.
11. Residents have moved to this rural suburb for its peace and quiet, as our family did back in the 1900s. Permitting such an industrial facility defeats the rural community identity.
12. We, and our neighbors will see an increase in light, dust and noise pollution and operation of night events.
13. How long is construction planned? How many days per week, hours? Dust suppression?

So many unanswered questions from this proposal. Many thanks for your consideration and review of our comments against this proposal.