
From: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 28, 2023 4:48 PM
To: Camilla Brom
Cc: Kaye Cooper Mead; Debora Willford
Subject: RE: Question about BCC meeting Tomorrow

Camilla, after checking with the County Managers office, unfortunately minutes cannot be transferred. If anyone from the group is wanting to speak, please be sure to register using the link below.

<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScGCVmNef0n1z2tXZCR9OBHmbsJI6DmTcPEBkMfwKTcax1Ww/viewform>

From: Camilla Brom [mailto:br.camilla@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, August 28, 2023 1:02 PM
To: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>
Cc: Kaye Cooper Mead <kaye@coopmead.com>; Debora Willford <debora@wiresolnm.com>
Subject: Question about BCC meeting Tomorrow

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Mr. Bustos,

I have a question about the BCC meeting tomorrow (8/29/23), in regards to the time we are allowed to speak. I want to know, if we are allowed additional minutes, if another constituent is participating in the meeting, and has opted to give us "their minutes".

Meaning could we have additional minutes to speak, if someone else gives permission for us to use them.

If we can, what is the process for doing this?

Thank you,

Camilla Brom

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Hank Hughes
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2024 10:05 AM
To: Emma Felt; Dominic J. Sisneros; Greg Shaffer; Gabriel C. Bustos
Subject: FW: Proposed AES Battery Energy Storage in Santa Fe

Hank Hughes
Santa Fe County Commissioner, District 5



SANTA FE COUNTY

From: Charles M. Kittredge [mailto:cmkittredge@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2024 5:58 PM
To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Proposed AES Battery Energy Storage in Santa Fe

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

AES proposed

Battery Energy Storage System

With Lithium ion Batteries

In the middle of Santa Fe Residential areas

20 May 2024

Dear Commissioner Hughes,

A recent New York Times article pointed out that Battery storage is critical to the US meeting it's renewable energy goals.

With that given, It is becoming evidently clear that Lithium batteries are too dangerous and too expensive to meet the needs.

On a "tech" website (SlashDot) I recently saw the following:

[Lithium-Free Sodium Batteries Exit the Lab, Enter US Production \(newatlas.com\) 135](#)

Natron Energy, a pioneer in sodium-ion battery technology, has officially [commenced mass production of its lithium-free sodium batteries in its Holland, Michigan facility](#), offering an alternative energy storage solution with benefits such as faster cycling, longer lifespan, and safer usage compared to lithium-ion batteries. New Atlas reports: *Not only is sodium somewhere between 500 to 1,000 times more abundant than lithium on the planet we call Earth, sourcing it doesn't necessitate the same type of earth-scarring extraction. Even moving beyond the sodium vs lithium surname comparison, Natron says its sodium-ion batteries are made entirely from abundantly available commodity materials that also include aluminum, iron and manganese. Furthermore, the materials for Natron's sodium-ion chemistry can be procured through a reliable US-based domestic supply chain free from geopolitical disruption. The same cannot be said for common lithium-ion materials like cobalt and nickel.*

Sodium-ion tech has received heightened interest in recent years as a more reliable, potentially cheaper energy storage medium. While its energy density lags behind lithium-ion, advantages such as faster cycling, longer lifespan and safer, non-flammable end use have made sodium-ion an attractive alternative, especially for stationary uses like data center and EV charger backup storage. [...] Natron says its batteries charge and discharge at rates 10 times faster than lithium-ion, a level of immediate charge/discharge capability that makes the batteries a prime contender for the ups and downs of backup power storage. Also helping in that use case is an estimated lifespan of

*50,000 cycles.*_

With this kind of technology entering the market it is obvious that continued use of Lithium-ion batteries unsafe and environmentally unfriendly.

We need to move toward renewable energy, but we need to do it in a safe and responsible way.

Charles Kittredge

Eldorado at Santa Fe

From: [Hank Hughes](#)
To: [Emma Felt](#); [Greg Shaffer](#); [Gabriel C. Bustos](#); [Dominic J. Sisneros](#)
Subject: Fw: AES Rancho Viejo Solar Conditional Use Permit application
Date: Monday, June 17, 2024 8:34:56 AM

Hank Hughes
Santa Fe County Commissioner
District 5

From: Dana Killen <danakillen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2024 6:03 PM
To: Hank Hughes; Gabriel C. Bustos; Anna C. Hansen; Justin S. Greene; Camilla M. Bustamante; Anna T. Hamilton
Subject: AES Rancho Viejo Solar Conditional Use Permit application

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

To: The Santa Fe County Board of County Commissioners

I am a resident of Eldorado at Santa Fe and I'm asking this board to please enact a moratorium on the review process for the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Conditional Use Permit application until the correct codes, guidelines and regulations are in place and to allow the necessary time to explore other existing safer alternatives.

I believe the only reason the fires attributed to similar smaller installations in Arizona and California were not catastrophic is that they were not in populated areas. The proposed AES site is right in the middle of three residential communities affecting thousands of people, their homes and their very lives. The land itself is dry grassland plagued by drought, hot temperatures, high winds and low humidity making it already subject to risk of fire. The proposed lithium-ion battery energy storage system has the highest potential for sparking fires of all the available energy storage systems. There are safer solutions that need to be considered.

The idea of utilizing solar power is great, but the certainties of more costly home owner insurance coverage (if available at all), declining property values and strain on our water supply incurred as a result of this proposed installation added to the noise pollution created and the threats of air and water contamination and potential fire risk make this a very questionable plan. There are better sites and safer energy storage systems. Please protect your neighbors in these areas by taking the time and steps necessary to find the very best and safest solutions.

Thank you for your consideration,
Dana Killen

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Greg Shaffer
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2024 4:51 AM
To: dara mark
Cc: Dominic J. Sisneros
Subject: Re: AES battery storage project

Dara,

Thank you for your email, which has been forwarded to the Growth Management Department for inclusion in the record for AES's Conditional Use Permit application.

For additional information concerning this application, including public meetings and public hearings, visit <https://www.santafecountynm.gov/growth-management/building-development/large-scale-renewable-energy-projects-2024/uaes>.

Sincerely,

Greg

Gregory S. Shaffer
County Manager
102 Grant Ave., 2nd Floor
PO Box 276
Santa Fe NM 87504-0276
Tele: 505.986.6200
Fax: 505.995.2740

From: dara mark <darawayne@cybermesa.com>
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2024 4:19 PM
To: Greg Shaffer <gshaffer@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: AES battery storage project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Gregory Shaffer,

I am writing to you from my home in Santa Fe County because I am increasingly concerned about the safety, the water use and the environmental dangers posed by the AES battery storage project. The more I read, the more I worry.

Specifically, I doubt that the County has the expertise to evaluate this utility-scale project and its dangers to nearby residential areas. My house is about 5 miles from the site and in a direct line east of any potential toxic fumes or smoke or even fire that could be released in an accident. What if a fire

should happen on a windy day? How will the County respond with fire suppression and/or evacuation plans? Over the 35 year lifespan of this project, how many fires can we expect to occur? Even one is too many as far as I am concerned. Will a toxic plume affect my neighborhood? If so, will I ever be able to return to my home (I am chemically sensitive so any toxic exposure is extremely hard on me)?

According to the information on the cleanenergycoalitionSFC.org website, a six-year study has concluded that the internal battery container fire detection and suppression systems in this type of project fail more than 25% of the time.

There is also the water use issue. Here I am rationing water to my precious trees and limiting my showers, but the AES permit application requests up to 1,000,000 gallons of water per year of operation. Where will all this water come from? We already have a situation in the County of industrial toxins getting into the groundwater. Once that happens there is apparently no remediation possible.

It is better to be safe than sorry.

Thank-you for your attention to this issue.

Dara Mark

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: dara mark <darawayne@cybermesa.com>
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2024 4:05 PM
To: Dominic J. Sisneros
Subject: AES battery storage project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr Sisneros,

I am writing from my home in Santa Fe county because I am increasingly concerned about the safety, the water use, and the environmental dangers posed by the AES battery storage project. The more I read, the more I worry,

Specifically, I doubt that the County has the expertise to evaluate this utility-scale project and its dangers to nearby residential areas. My house is about 5 miles from the site and in a direct line east of any potential toxic fumes or smoke or even fire that could be released in an accident. What if a fire should happen on a windy day? How will the county respond with fire suppression and/or evacuation plans? Over the 35 year lifespan of the project, how many fires can we expect to occur? Even one is too many as far as I am concerned. Will a toxic plume affect my neighborhood? If so, will I ever be able to return to my home (I am chemically sensitive, so any toxic exposure is extremely hard on me)?

According to information on the cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org website, a six-year study has concluded that the internal battery container fire detection and suppression systems in this type of project fail more than 25% of the time.

There is also the water use issue. Here I am rationing water to my precious trees and limiting my showers, but this AES permit application requests up to 1,000,000 gallons of water per year of operation. Where will all this water come from? We already have a situation in the County of industrial toxins getting into the groundwater. Once that happens there is apparently no remediation possible.

It is better to be safe than sorry.

Thank-you for your attention to this issue.

Dara Mark

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Dayna, CEC <cleanenergycoalitionsfc@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2024 8:35 AM
To: Dominic J. Sisneros
Cc: Alexandra Ladd
Subject: In opposition of the AES Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dominic,
Please add this letter to the record in opposition of the AES project:

Commercial Solar vs Utility-Scale Solar

The AES Corporation's proposed Rancho Viejo BESS (Battery Energy Storage System) to be sited just a couple miles south of Santa Fe City is trying to use loopholes in the county codes by calling their project "Commercial" Solar rather than what it really is: a Utility-Scale energy project—a fact admitted to in District Court by their own expert. They are doing this to push through an approval with a CUP (Conditional Use Permit) — the same process used to approve things like a simple retail store, like the Dollar General recently built just off the 285 Highway.

The Commercial Solar designation is used for businesses such as libraries, retail stores, ranches, and even the National Guard solar installation along Hwy 25. The energy these solar projects generate is used for their own power needs. They may have a small amount of batteries to store some of the energy they generate but, again, this is primarily for their own consumption.


In contrast, AES plans to have 570,000 dangerous lithium-ion batteries. That's significantly more storage capacity than needed for the energy produced by their solar panels. Their plan is to pull power off the PNM grid when demand and rates are low and sell it back to us at a profit when demand and rates go up. Most of us agree that we need to transition to renewable energy. But this project is a wolf in sheep's clothing as it's not really about renewable energy at all but a cynical attempt to make massive battery money machines look like they're good for the environment when they in fact a threat to both the environment and the Santa Fe community.

So while AES tries to squeeze a square peg into a round hole, residents are rightly concerned about the serious risks and consequences from a battery storage facility of this size being located so close to their homes and schools. They're angry with AES for putting corporate profits above their health, safety and the general welfare of Santa Fe citizens — and they are wondering who will protect them. Signing the CEC petition at <https://cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org/petition/> at least helps them feel heard. And many plan to attend the first two hearings on December 4th and February 3rd, both scheduled for 9:30 am at the Santa Fe Convention Center. (Dates and times are subject to change by the County).

In the meantime, since we aren't allowed to talk with our County Commissioners about this project (as they will likely be voting on it at some point), there's no way for us to know what their thoughts are about all this. As the community liaison for the Clean Energy Coalition for Santa Fe County, that leaves me fielding neighbors' fears and repeated questioning, "Why isn't the County looking out for us?"— Well, here's hoping our five County Commissioners read this, hear us, and realize that this project is simply not needed or appropriate for Santa Fe.

Dayna Matlin lives in Eldorado at Santa Fe and volunteers on the CEC steering committee, serving over 1,000 members of The Clean Energy Coalition for Santa Fe County.

It's going to take a village to win this fight!



From: [Hank Hughes](#)
To: [Emma Felt](#); [Greg Shaffer](#); [Gabriel C. Bustos](#); [Dominic J. Sisneros](#)
Subject: Fw: Rancho Viejo Solar Project
Date: Monday, June 17, 2024 8:37:14 AM

Hank Hughes
Santa Fe County Commissioner
District 5

From: Donald Van Gelderen <duelin3742@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 15, 2024 10:26 AM
To: Hank Hughes
Subject: Rancho Viejo Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Afternoon,

I am writing to request that the Board of County Commissioners enact a Moratorium on the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Project - Conditional Use Permit.

As you know, the AES planned large-scale power plant location is right next to schools and the encompassing residential areas.

Until the correct codes, guidelines, emergency planning and regulations are established, the safety of all these residents, your constituents, will be placed in jeopardy.

Just weeks ago this past May, the Gateway Energy Storage Facility in Otay Mesa, San Diego had a fire break out and it burned for nearly two weeks, sending smoke and toxic fumes into the neighborhood.

Here again is another example of a Thermal Runaway fire and the dangers associated with lithium-ion batteries...which AES wants to place right next to all of our homes.

Please consider placing a Moratorium on this project.

This way all aspects of this huge project can be studied as well as provide the time to get all the necessary codes, guidelines and regulations in place; avoiding the dangers of another mismanaged project that we all have to live with.

Your attention on this matter is greatly appreciated.

Thank You,
Don Van Gelderen

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Doug <dkonen@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2024 4:05 PM
To: Dominic J. Sisneros
Subject: AES battery storage proposal

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Sisneros,

I understand that the proposal from AES Corp. for their Rancho Viejo Solar development was judged to be inadequate. I also understand that AES Corp. is readying a revised proposal. But in light of the ongoing discussions about the lack of a current County Emergency Response Plan, I am concerned that it is premature to review and/or accept a revised proposal from AES.

I urge that a hold, or moratorium be placed on their proposed Rancho Viejo Solar development until the County Emergency Plan is adopted. It seems to me that to consider a revised proposal would put those of us in nearby neighborhoods and communities at undue risk. Proper guidelines, safety measures and an up-to-the-minute emergency plan is a crucial first step.

Thank you for your continuing attention to this critical issue.

Douglas Konen
26 Panther Peak
Santa Fe NM 87508

Dear Lisaida Archuleta,

I am writing from my home in Santa Fe County because I am increasingly concerned about the safety, the water use and the environmental dangers posed by the AES battery storage project. The more I read, the more I worry.

Specifically, I doubt that the County has the expertise to evaluate this utility-scale project and its dangers to nearby residential areas. My house is about 5 miles from the site and in a direct line east of any potential toxic fumes or fires that could be released in an accident. What if a fire should happen on a windy day? How will the County respond with fire suppression and/or evacuation plans? Over the 35 year lifespan of the project, how many fires can be expected to occur? Even one is too many as far as I am concerned. Should a toxic event reach my neighborhood, I might never be able to return to my home (I am chemically sensitive)>

According to information on the CleanEnergyCoalitionSFC.org website, a six-year study has concluded that the internal battery container fire detection and suppression systems in this type of project fail more than 25% of the time.

There is also the water use issue. I am rationing the water to my precious trees and limiting my showers, but this AES permit application requests up to 1,000,000 gallons of water per year of operation. Where will all this water come from? And will it be poisoned by whatever it is used for? We already have a situation in the County of industrial toxins getting into the groundwater, with apparently no recourse or remediation.

It is better to be safe than sorry, as any parent will tell you.

Thank-you for your attention to this issue.

Dara Mark
37B Old Road
Lamy

From: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 11:35 AM
To: Dennis Kurtz; Ashley Schannauer; Camilla Brom; Carol Culver; Dayna Matlin; Kaye
Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos
Subject: Adoption of 2023 Fire Code Updates

Good morning:

Some of you brought to my attention that the fire code we just adopted at the County was already slightly out of date due to a further update on the federal level this year. I brought this up with the Fire Marshall and the Fire Chief.

As a result, we will begin the process of adopting the most up to date section on battery safety at a special Board of County Commissioners meeting this Friday November 17th. The meeting was originally called to certify the recent election. The update for the fire code was added.

There is no agenda item for public comment on Friday and our action that day merely will authorize the staff to publish the title and general summary of the ordinance updating the fire code in the newspaper and to schedule a public hearing. Once the hearing is scheduled, we will send notice to everyone on my email list. I do not expect there will be any opposition.

Here is the language of the agenda item for Friday:

"Request Authorization to Publish Title and General Summary of an Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 2023-06, the Santa Fe County Fire Code, to Adopt Current NFPA 855 Stationary Energy Storage Systems Standards. (Public Safety Department/Jaome Blay) (Action Item)"

I am only emailing the few of you that I remember talking about this issue to me. Feel free to share it as you see appropriate. As I said above, once the public hearing is scheduled, we will get the word out to everyone on our list.

Thanks for your advocacy.

Hank Hughes
Santa Fe County Commissioner
District 5

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Jordan A. Yutzy
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2024 3:29 PM
To: Dominic J. Sisneros
Subject: FW: AES lithium battery storage project

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

From: Phillip & Jacinta Kehoe <jcandptk@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2024 3:26 PM
To: Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: AES lithium battery storage project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Yutzy,

I am deeply concerned about the proposed AES lithium battery storage project.

My house is set approximately 1 mile from where this project will be in the northwest corner of Eldorado. I am wondering if you realize that those of us on this end of Eldorado have no quick escape route should one of these units break out in fire. One of the commissioners mentioned that we have four escape routes in Eldorado. Are you aware that if fire happens with the gusts of wind when 2,000 plus people are trying to scramble out those four exits, that we would all be consumed in smoke and fire because the traffic would not be moving very fast, if at all. As you know, this is not an unrealistic fear. AES has had several explosions at their sites over the last few years, even though they claim that their facilities are safe. I don't want to live in an area where people's lives are taken for granted.

Do you realize how strong the winds can be out here? On average, that is, a mild day, the winds are about 10 mph. However, during the spring months, and even in the rest of the year, we can have wind gusts as strong as 30-50 mph. It would be a very sorry day for us all if an explosion occurred at the AES facility whether or not it happens on a day when the wind is blowing, especially if it comes in strong gusts.

I urge you to deny AES the ability to build a lithium battery storage within Santa Fe County, especially so close to Eldorado, Rancho Viejo, and San Marcos homes.

Jacinta Hart Kehoe
71 Camerada Loop
Santa Fe, 87508

From: [Hank Hughes](#)
To: [Emma Felt](#); [Greg Shaffer](#); [Gabriel C. Bustos](#); [Dominic J. Sisneros](#)
Subject: Fw: AES Rancho Viejo Solar Application
Date: Monday, June 17, 2024 8:33:52 AM

Hank Hughes
Santa Fe County Commissioner
District 5

From: Janine Lehmann Design <jdlgraphix@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, June 15, 2024 7:09 AM
To: Dominic J. Sisneros; Hank Hughes; Gabriel C. Bustos; Anna C. Hansen; Justin S. Greene; Camilla M. Bustamante; Anna T. Hamilton; Greg Shaffer; Jeff S. Young; Don B. Call; Jacob Black; Jeffrey Carroll; Jaome R. Blay; Leandro R. Cordova
Subject: AES Rancho Viejo Solar Application

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

To All It May Concern,

As a homeowner and longtime resident of Santa Fe County, specifically Eldorado, I strongly urge you to enact a moratorium so that the new AES Conditional Use Permit Application will not be reviewed unless the County has sufficient codes, guidelines and regulations in place in the Sustainable Land Development Code regarding a facility of this scope with known safety and other risks.

A County Emergency Response Plan must be in place before any permits to AES are reviewed and approved. How can a decision be made regarding a project that has known risks to life and property without having plans in place for a worst case scenario county emergency? Are our current roads and exits sufficient for a mass evacuation? How would residents be alerted should a fire occur? Are our local EMS and hospitals even aware of this proposed facility and potential injuries it could bring? An Emergency Response Plan for Santa Fe County needs to be in place, before ever considering a proposal of this kind. Also, a potential toxic plume emitted from burning batteries would trigger a stay-in-place order for the entire area including the city of Santa Fe and that could cause a tremendous amount of bad press for a city that is a major tourist destination, not to mention the affect it would have on the health of residents and visitors.

We know that the County Fire Department codes were not fully updated to current standards regarding BESS battery storage. The codes MUST be amended. A moratorium needn't be lengthy, but it would be a travesty to review any new AES Rancho Viejo Solar applications due this summer when the Country codes and regulations are outdated and inadequate. This is vital for our community not just regarding AES, but any future proposals such as theirs.

Respectfully,

Janine Lehmann
17 Ladera Road
Santa Fe, Nm 87508

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Katie Singer <katie@katiesinger.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2024 1:24 PM
To: Dominic J. Sisneros
Cc: Alexandra Ladd; Jordan A. Yutzy
Subject: AES safer installation

To:
SLDC Hearing Officer
Santa Fe County Planning Commissioners
The Santa Fe County Board of County Commissioners:

I write to support our county's responsible permitting of solar and battery storage facilities.

Given solar PVs' and BESS facilities' fire hazards and toxic emissions, and your duty to protect the public, I trust that you will require a liability-carrying subject matter expert to certify that all of AES's fire and chemical hazards have been mitigated before you permit the installation of these facilities.

Given that at their end-of-life, solar panels and batteries are toxic waste, I trust that you will require AES to post a bond so that if the corporation goes bankrupt, our county will not have the burden of 700 acres of hazardous waste.

I trust you will create an emergency plan before you permit AES' installation.

Finally, here are a Virginia Planning Commission's final conditions for a solar facility without batteries. May they serve as a model of safe requirements.

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Ea0NyIBLdyPHaD_P9nBnoUbDGVwrqHV/view

Sincerely,
Katie Singer
Santa Fe, NM

From: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2023 4:52 PM
To: Kaye
Subject: RE: Rancho Viejo Solar project

Kaye, thank you for your patience. Let me know if this helps answer some of your questions. For whatever reason I am unable to highlight my responses, so I apologize if this is hard to read.

I still need to know who can request a moratorium and if it would apply to AES' Conditional Use Permit application since it was filed in January and is considered to be in process. The community of San Marcos as well as many other members of the community have expressed that a moratorium be placed on large scale solar facilities. A response to this has been drafted by the County Manager, I am just waiting for the green light and I can send over a copy.

Please provide details on:

What is a Resolution? A resolution from my understanding is a legislative directive to the County Manager and other pertinent departments that sets ideals and expresses policy opinions of the Board of County Commissioners.

Who does the work to draft it? These are usually drafted by the Commissioners, resolutions can also come from department directors but are always a collaboration with other pertinent departments.

Who it goes to for approval? Resolutions are vetted by our legal department before being placed on a BCC agenda. Once a resolution is placed on a meeting agenda the Commissioners will vote to approve or deny the resolution.

What bearing it has on AES' CUP application? A resolution would neither slow down or speed up the AES application. However it would address how to evaluate these types of large solar facilities including AES.

Is it legally binding? Yes

If so, how is it enforced? The resolution would be implemented by the County Manager.

Does it take precedence over the SLDC if it specifies issues that are not included in the SLDC? The resolution would not override the SLDC, however it can influence staff to look at amending certain items of the SLDC.

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

From: Kaye [mailto:kaye@coopmead.com]
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 5:05 PM
To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>
Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: Re: Rancho Viejo Solar project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Hank:

Thanks for your response.

I still need to know who can request a moratorium and if it would apply to AES' Conditional Use Permit application since it was filed in January and is considered to be in process.

Please provide details on:

What is a Resolution?

Who does the work to draft it?

Who it goes to for approval?

What bearing it has on AES' CUP application?

Is it legally binding?

If so, how is it enforced?

Does it take precedence over the SLDC if it specifies issues that are not included in the SLDC?

Appreciate the information you provided on the water. I think it says a lot about how bad the water situation actually is in our area if people's wells are already running dry and they need a second bulk water station. And this is all before adding a huge Utility-scale facility and its water needs to this area.

Thank you Hank.

Sent from my iPad

> On Jul 21, 2023, at 2:52 PM, Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov> wrote:

>

> Hi Kaye:

>

> I am not getting any traction for a moratorium. I am trying to see if there is something we can do in the form of a resolution about safety at solar projects.

>

> The waterline will run from the Turquoise Trail school to the County fire station about a mile away. We also plan to put a bulk water station next to the fire station. People use the bulk water stations to get water when their wells are dry, and there has been a of demand for this in recent years at the existing bulk water station. So that is why we want to have a second bulk water station. Also having County water at the fire station will be better for their needs than the existing well that has limited capacity. The water in the County system comes from the Rio Grande via the Buckman Direct Diversion.

>

> Hank Hughes

> Santa Fe County Commissioner, District 5

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Kaye [mailto:kaye@coopmead.com]

> Sent: Friday, July 21, 2023 8:31 AM
> To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>
> Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>
> Subject: Rancho Viejo Solar project
>
> WARNING:
>
> EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.
>
> Hi Hank:
>
> After the last Hank Hour you were going to check on whether you (or someone else) could initiate a Moratorium on this project or other solar projects and if this would apply to the AES Conditional Use Permit application that was submitted in January.
>
> You mentioned the waterline going in on the property that Warren Thompson donated to the county. Where does this water come from — is it water from the city and/or is there a well involved?
>
> Look forward to hearing from you.
>
> Kind regards,
>
> Kaye
>
> Kaye Cooper-Mead
>
>
>

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 9, 2023 6:15 PM
To: ranchoviejosolar@aes.com
Cc: hhughes@santafecountynm.gov; jsgreene@santafecountynm.gov;
athamilton@santafecountynm.gov; ahansen@santafecountynm.gov;
cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov; joselarra@santafecountynm.gov;
gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov
Subject: AES email requesting information on Rancho Viejo Solar Project
Attachments: AES email of July 9th.docx

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear AES:

Please find attached my email to you dated today with information I am requesting on your planned Rancho Viejo Solar Project. I have copied the Santa Fe County Commissioners and staff as I am sure they will be interested in also receiving answers to the questions I pose as well as the photographic material that does not appear in your Conditional Use Permit application or various attachments submitted with the Conditional Use Permit Application.

I look forward to your response. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kaye Cooper-Mead

>
>

July 9, 2023

AES (via email)

Dear AES:

I am a resident of Eldorado and after reviewing the meeting notes of the meeting you held on October 4, 2022, your Conditional Use Permit Application dated January 2023 and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) dated January 2023, I have the following questions and requests in order to fully evaluate your Conditional Use Permit Application (CUP). I have copied the County Commissioners on this email as I think they will also need to receive this information in order to fully evaluate the CUP.

- Please provide the complete specs for the Samsung SDI E5D lithium-ion battery you intend to use and the complete environmental testing and rating data for this battery. I went to the link you provided and it does not reference this battery which you said is confidential. Please understand that we must be able to review the complete data for this battery especially what environment these batteries have been tested and rated for. It is absolutely necessary to review this data prior to any public hearing or vote by the Santa Fe county officials as it is a crucial component of the system and any safety review of this proposal.

I have contacted the manufacturer Samsung and though they acknowledged my call, they have not provided the information so we must receive it from you.

- Where will these thousands of batteries be manufactured?
 - How and where will these batteries be transported to arrive here for installation?
 - One of the major fire risks for BESS systems arise from damage to any one battery cell. How are this many battery cells – over 400,000 – going to be inspected prior to installation to ensure there is not even one damaged cell?
 - How many battery cells will be housed in the revised total of 69 battery containers?
-
- Many of the maps done originally are no longer accurate because the layout of the facility changed after your October meeting. Please provide an updated map that shows the actual layout of the facility and the placement of the BESS system and substation against the actual home placements and streets in the three neighborhoods that were removed from all maps.
-
- Please provide a photo of the actual substation being proposed. If you don't have exactly the same one, provide a photo of a similar sized substation. I have seen some pictures of a substation and they are not at all what I thought they would look like. An extremely industrial looking area that is not in keeping with a residential area and that is why it is vital you supply photos so we all know exactly what this 2 acre portion of the facility would look like.

- Please provide a photo of the proposed high voltage transmission line and its supporting H-frames. I believe these are to be 40' to 50' (one place said 50') with structural spans of 250 feet. What is the correct measurements for these? How many support structures (H-frames) will be used to cover the run of the line stated to be 2.3 miles in one section and 2.4 miles in another section? Believe you indicated 10 poles per mile. I assume the H-frames are different than the poles so how many of each will be used?
- Please provide a photo of the proposed 69 BESS system battery containers. The two HVAC systems on each container are placed where on each container? Do these HVAC systems use any water? Is it correct that only one HVAC unit runs at a time and the other is a backup? Is there any scenario where both HVAC units on each container would run at the same time?
- What happens if the power is cut off to the facility for any reason? How is power generated to the HVAC systems if the power is out? For example a month ago, our power here in Eldorado was out from 9:45 am to 3:15pm with no warning. How would the system operate with power out for 5 ½ hours – are there any backup generators? Are there any plans to add a UPS (Uninterruptable Power Source)?
- We have only been given general references – such as over a mile – as far as the distances to our three communities. It is absolutely necessary for you to provide the following actual footage details for:
 - Actual distance in feet of the BESS to the nearest residence in Eldorado. Please state which residence this is or note it on a map placement.
 - Actual distance in feet of the BESS to the nearest residence in Rancho Viejo. Please state which residence this is or note it on a map placement.
 - Actual distance in feet of the BESS to the nearest residence in Rancho San Marcos. Please state which residence this is or note it on a map placement.
 - Actual distance in feet of the substation to each of the communities listed above.
- Please provide photos of the solar panels in more than their flat position. These panels move and it is deceptive to not show panels in other positions to evaluate glare and landscape views.
- The dB levels provided do not include the tracking motors. Please provide the total number of tracking motors and what the dB level is for all combined.
- What are the dB levels for the increase in HVAC units that will be required when you went from 39 45' battery containers to 69 20' battery containers that each have 2 HVAC's. Why did you choose to go to 20' containers over the original 45' containers?

- What is the dB level of the inverters and how many are now required?
- What is the dB level for the High Transmission line? It is often mentioned that these lines emit a humming sound continuously.
- What is the dB level for the substation and its power transformer? What is the MVA and BIL rating of the high voltage winding?
- The sound maps located on page 3-54 of the EIR show Eldorado homes in the 3200 feet (0.6mile) range to hear 48 dB. So for sound purposes, we are no longer a mile away?
- Water use – under 1.1.2.4 of the EIR, you indicate 100-150 acre-feet over a 12 month construction period. This in gallons is 32,585,143 gallons to 48,877,714 gallons of water. You indicate the water will be sourced from third party providers and trucked to the site or from permitted groundwater wells. We have very limited water resources in this area with a very shallow aquifer. Many of us in Eldorado are on wells so we are opposed to water being taken from the aquifer. It is imperative you give complete information on who the “third party providers” are and if any of these third party providers would be wells. How much water would be coming from “permitted ground water wells”? We are now reading all about utility- size solar projects draining wells of the surrounding homeowners. This is totally unacceptable.
- Now I go back to the CUP because on page 2-7 you indicate that “water would be sourced from third party providers and would be trucked to the site.” The mention of “or from permitted groundwater wells” has disappeared in the CUP. Why was this removed and which document takes precedence? You must be consistent and either add this to the CUP document or remove these references from EIR so they can no longer be considered as part of your Application.
- You indicate on Page 2-7 and Page 3-3 of the CUP that there would be no need for a permanent water supply. So why are there references in the EIR (page 3-65) “If drilling permitted wells associated with the project is necessary, Rancho Viejo will adhere to specific well EPMs listed in Section 3.14.3.” And on page 3-66 of the EIR, “Any new water wells drilled or diversions of existing water rights in the analysis area of the Project will be appropriately permitted with the New Mexico Office of the State Engineer, and the agreement of the water rights holder.”
- We are absolutely opposed to your drilling wells on the Property to remove water from the aquifer we rely on and you must be very specific now as to whether you will drill wells on this property at any time as there seems to be a discrepancy between what you say in the CUP and what is included in the EIR as an attachment to the CUP. And if any of the third party providers you mention will be drawing any water from wells in this area? Without all this specific information this CUP cannot possibly be evaluated for the serious detrimental effect it will have on our water supply.
- There is also no mention of the potential water supply that would be necessary to fight fires in the BESS and exactly where this water would come from. If you don’t have amounts, you need

to indicate where the water would come from. In a fire situation, we could not have you draining our local water supply leaving no water to use for our fire-fighting needs.

- Construction Waste Management – page 2-5 of the EIR – you say “Most of the hazardous waste generated during construction will consist of liquid waste, such as flushing and cleaning fluids and solvents. Please provide complete information on the actual chemicals being used. This is liquid waste so how can it possibly be collected and therefore, prevented from entering the ground water? As you have stated these are hazardous waste and they can not be permitted in any way to enter the groundwater and contaminate our wells.
- Operations and Management – page 2-5 of the EIR – you say, “Water will be trucked to the Project site and will be sourced from local production wells or may include municipal water.” We object to any water for this purpose coming from local production wells. So as not to damage the aquifer, you must use municipal water for this purpose.
- In the meeting notes from the October 4th you mentioned a solvent may be used in cleaning and the mention of this has been removed from the EIR. What is the solvent and why was this removed? Under no circumstances can a toxic solvent be permitted to enter the groundwater so it is vital that you specify any chemical that will be used.
- On page 3-1 of the CUP you mention a fire suppressant to be used but provide no specific information as to the suppressant. At one time there was a mention of Novec 1230 but as we know this is a “forever chemical” along with other forever chemicals produced by 3M, for which it has just been fined \$10.3 Billion for polluting waterways and will no longer be manufactured by them by the end of 2025. The money from the settlement is to be used to build water treatment plants to try and remove the toxic chemical from the municipal water supplies but no one has a way to remove this from the wells they polluted. No “forever chemical” or toxic chemical can be allowed to be used to contaminate our ground water so I believe the Commissioners must ensure that the CUP is revised to specify this before any evaluation of the CUP can go forward.
- Under the new Inflation Reduction Act which offers investment tax credits for battery storage projects, what investment tax credits is AES receiving for the 96MW Rancho Viejo facility with a 48MW BESS?
- Why was a meeting never held with Eldorado residents especially since you have placed the BESS with the most risk of a fire potential nearest to our community?

I have copied the County Commissioners on this email as I think it is imperative that they see the list of questions being asked by those of us impacted by this facility to ensure that AES provide complete information that is lacking in their CUP and/or EIR to all of us. There is no way for the county to determine “if the location will unduly impair important environmental values” as required under the 2016 SLDC without complete information from you as requested in this email. I look forward to

receiving this information in a timely way to allow us to properly evaluate your Conditional Use Permit Application. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kaye Cooper-Mead

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 30, 2023 12:43 PM
To: joselarra@santafecountynm.gov; pengreen@santafecountynm.gov; Lisaida M. Archuleta
Cc: hhughes@santafecountynm.gov; ahansen@santafecountynm.gov; athamilton@santafecountynm.gov; jsgreene@santafecountynm.gov; cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov; Gabriel C. Bustos
Subject: AES no longer responding to our questions on the Rancho Viejo Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Jose:

Would appreciate you providing this information to the Commissioners and Planning Commission that AES informed me yesterday that they will no longer answer our questions. There were a number of questions sent to them on Aug 28th as well as my last email of September 6th that had questions relating to their response on September 1st. They will not answer these questions.

Thank you for passing on this information.

Kaye

Kaye Cooper-Mead

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>
Date: September 29, 2023 at 4:29:58 PM MDT
To: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>, RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>
Subject: Response to emailed questions

Dear Kaye

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude for your ongoing interest and engagement in the Rancho Viejo Solar project. Your commitment to the betterment of your community is commendable, and we appreciate the time and effort you have invested in this endeavor.

As you know, the Rancho Viejo project has been a subject of significant discussion and scrutiny within the community. Our project team has made every effort to ensure transparency and open communication throughout the planning and development stages. We have valued the input and questions raised by community members, including those from the opposition, as they have contributed to the project's refinement.

However, after careful consideration and consultation with our project team, we adjusted our communication approach slightly. Moving forward, we will no longer respond to individual questions about the project via email or other direct channels. Instead, we have established a comprehensive online resource that should address most inquiries related to the project.

I encourage you and all concerned community members to visit our project website at <https://www.aes.com/new-mexico/project/rancho-viejo-solar>. You will find detailed information about the project's scope, objectives, environmental impact assessments, and other relevant documents. This website serves as a valuable reference point for those seeking information about the project.

Also, I would like to draw your attention to the upcoming public permitting hearing, where community members will receive notification once the date is set. This forum will provide an excellent opportunity for community members, including yourself, to ask questions, express concerns, and engage in a productive dialogue regarding the Rancho Viejo project. We highly encourage your attendance, as your input is invaluable to us, and discussing matters in a public forum will enhance transparency and inclusivity.

While we will no longer respond to individual inquiries, rest assured that all questions and concerns raised at the permitting hearing will be carefully considered and addressed by our project team. We remain committed to working collaboratively with the community to ensure the project's success while considering the diverse perspectives and interests involved.

Once again, I want to express our appreciation for your dedication to the community and interest in the Rancho Viejo project. We are looking forward to talking with you at the future public hearing.

I appreciate your understanding.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Halford
AES

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2023 3:51 PM
To: Rebecca Halford <rebecca.halford@aes.com>; RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>
Subject: Fwd: How To Perfect Your Closed-Loop Systems regarding the Rancho Viejo Solar project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside AES. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

And the additional article I sent on Sept. 6th. Thanks.

Kaye

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Date: September 6, 2023 at 2:21:22 PM MDT
To: RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>, Rebecca Halford

<rebecca.halford@aes.com>

Cc: joselarra@santafecountynm.gov, pengreen@santafecountynm.gov,
hhughes@santafecountynm.gov, ahansen@santafecountynm.gov,
athamilton@santafecountynm.gov, jsgreene@santafecountynm.gov,
cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov, "Gabriel C. Bustos"
<gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: How To Perfect Your Closed-Loop Systems regarding the Rancho Viejo Solar project

Hi Rebecca:

This is the article I mentioned in my email responses today about glycol chillers.

Thank you.

Kaye

<https://www.psgdover.com/blackmer/news/article/2018/04/01/how-to-perfect-your-closed-loop-systems-wp>

Sent from my iPad

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 7, 2023 1:29 PM
To: Gabriel C. Bustos
Cc: Hank Hughes
Subject: AES no longer responding to our questions on the Rancho Viejo Solar Project. How do the hearings work?

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Hank and Gabe:

I sent this email earlier to all of you that AES is no longer willing to answer our questions.

They mention the permitting hearing below and “engaging in a productive dialogue” and “discussing matters in a public forum” but it is not clear to me how this would work.

Are we permitted to ask them questions that they have to answer in any of the three hearings?

Is there a question and answer period of time set aside in any of the three hearings where we can ask questions and they have to answer?

Are we limited to asking questions within our two minute allowance for time? Do they have to answer any of these questions at that time?

How much time is AES allowed to speak or make presentations? Are they limited to two minutes?

Any idea of when the first hearing will now take place?

Would appreciate clarification as to how this process works.

Thanks for your time and assistance.

Kaye

Kaye Cooper-Mead

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Date: September 30, 2023 at 12:42:41 PM MDT
To: joselarra@santafecountynm.gov, pengreen@santafecountynm.gov, "Lisaida M. Archuleta" <lmarchuleta@santafecountynm.gov>
Cc: hhughes@santafecountynm.gov, ahansen@santafecountynm.gov,

athamilton@santafecountynm.gov, jsgrune@santafecountynm.gov,
cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov, "Gabriel C. Bustos" <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: AES no longer responding to our questions on the Rancho Viejo Solar Project

Hi Jose:

Would appreciate you providing this information to the Commissioners and Planning Commission that AES informed me yesterday that they will no longer answer our questions. There were a number of questions sent to them on Aug 28th as well as my last email of September 6th that had questions relating to their response on September 1st. They will not answer these questions.

Thank you for passing on this information.

Kaye

Kaye Cooper-Mead

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>
Date: September 29, 2023 at 4:29:58 PM MDT
To: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>, RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>
Subject: Response to emailed questions

Dear Kaye

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude for your ongoing interest and engagement in the Rancho Viejo Solar project. Your commitment to the betterment of your community is commendable, and we appreciate the time and effort you have invested in this endeavor.

As you know, the Rancho Viejo project has been a subject of significant discussion and scrutiny within the community. Our project team has made every effort to ensure transparency and open communication throughout the planning and development stages. We have valued the input and questions raised by community members, including those from the opposition, as they have contributed to the project's refinement.

However, after careful consideration and consultation with our project team, we adjusted our communication approach slightly. Moving forward, we will no longer respond to individual questions about the project via email or other direct channels. Instead, we have established a comprehensive online resource that should address most inquiries related to the project.

I encourage you and all concerned community members to visit our project website at <https://www.aes.com/new-mexico/project/rancho-viejo-solar>. You will find detailed information about the project's scope, objectives, environmental impact assessments,

and other relevant documents. This website serves as a valuable reference point for those seeking information about the project.

Also, I would like to draw your attention to the upcoming public permitting hearing, where community members will receive notification once the date is set. This forum will provide an excellent opportunity for community members, including yourself, to ask questions, express concerns, and engage in a productive dialogue regarding the Rancho Viejo project. We highly encourage your attendance, as your input is invaluable to us, and discussing matters in a public forum will enhance transparency and inclusivity.

While we will no longer respond to individual inquiries, rest assured that all questions and concerns raised at the permitting hearing will be carefully considered and addressed by our project team. We remain committed to working collaboratively with the community to ensure the project's success while considering the diverse perspectives and interests involved.

Once again, I want to express our appreciation for your dedication to the community and interest in the Rancho Viejo project. We are looking forward to talking with you at the future public hearing.

I appreciate your understanding.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Halford
AES

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2023 3:51 PM
To: Rebecca Halford <rebecca.halford@aes.com>; RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>
Subject: Fwd: How To Perfect Your Closed-Loop Systems regarding the Rancho Viejo Solar project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside AES. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

And the additional article I sent on Sept. 6th. Thanks.

Kaye

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Date: September 6, 2023 at 2:21:22 PM MDT
To: RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>, Rebecca Halford <rebecca.halford@aes.com>
Cc: joselarra@santafecountynm.gov, pengreen@santafecountynm.gov, hhughes@santafecountynm.gov, ahansen@santafecountynm.gov, athamilton@santafecountynm.gov, jsgreene@santafecountynm.gov,

cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov, "Gabriel C. Bustos"
<gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>

**Subject: How To Perfect Your Closed-Loop Systems regarding the
Rancho Viejo Solar project**

Hi Rebecca:

This is the article I mentioned in my email responses today about glycol chillers.

Thank you.

Kaye

<https://www.psgdover.com/blackmer/news/article/2018/04/01/how-to-perfect-your-closed-loop-systems-wp>

Sent from my iPad

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Monday, August 14, 2023 10:41 AM
To: Lisaida M. Archuleta
Subject: AES partial response to questions on the Rancho Viejo Solar Project
Attachments: Draft CEN Battery Enclosure.pdf; Distance Images.zip; Q_A for Kaye Cooper-Mead_Part 1.pdf

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

This is the AES email of August 4th showing the changes I just mentioned in my email to you earlier today. Please provide this information to the Hearing Officer and Planning Commission so they can see AES' answers to some of my questions on this project and how they have changed the project to make it even more dangerous.

Thank you.

Kaye Cooper-Mead

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Date: August 10, 2023 at 12:52:29 PM MDT
To: joselarra@santafecountynm.gov
Cc: hhughes@santafecountynm.gov, ahansen@santafecountynm.gov, athamilton@santafecountynm.gov, jsgreene@santafecountynm.gov, cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov
Subject: AES partial response to questions on the Rancho Viejo Solar Project

To: The Sustainable Land Development Code (SLDC) Hearing Officer, the Santa Fe County Planning Commission and the Santa Fe County

Below please find the email I received from Rebecca Halford of AES on August 4th that I incorrectly stated was on August 5th in my previous email sent to you today. This is the email with attachments I referred to in my previous email that contain many changes to AES' Conditional Use Permit Application. They did not respond to the water and sound dab questions I asked in my July 9th email that you were copied on.

Thank you for reading this document from AES.

Also I tried to send the previous email to Jeremy Mier, the liaison for the Planning Commission but it bounced back. Is Jeremy no longer there and is there someone else in this role? I would like a working email for the County Planning Commission please.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Kaye Cooper-Mead

From: RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>

Date: August 4, 2023 at 5:26:34 PM MDT

To: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>, RanchoViejoSolar
<RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>

Subject: RE: Follow up on AES email requesting information on Rancho Viejo Solar Project and request for HMA and UL 9540a tests. And battery container specs

Hello Kaye,


I am sending responses to many of your questions, including image and pdf attachments. We are continuing to gather information related to the sound and water questions. We are sourcing those responses from the engineering teams responsible for transmission work, and the construction team responsible for project construction. Those responses will be delivered in a Part 2 document as soon as possible.

The 30% iteration is the project design stage the team is currently working at. This staged approach is often why you may see changes to our early versions of the proposed design or equipment. The phased approach lays out the major design elements and establishes a cost and timeline. During the 30% stage, the drawing, project scope, and budget will be fine-tuned.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this Part 1 response and know that we are working on finalizing responses to your sound and water questions.

Thank you,
Rebecca

Rebecca Halford
Sr. Manager, Stakeholder Relations, WECC
The AES Corporation
AES Clean Energy | Louisville, CO 80027
rebecca.halford@aes.com
Mobile: 303-204-9348
Board member, Women of AES Clean Energy
Visit our WACE SharePoint site!



Dimensions of BESS enclosure	40 x 8 x 9.5	ft
Chiller Dimensions (JC)	2.3 x 1.2 x 2.44	m (LxWxH)
Enclosure footprint	320	sqft
Spacing between enclosures	see below	
Door Clearance	6	ft (front battery access + 1' 8" side for aux access)
Rated power (DC bus BESS-PCS)	4034.016	kW
Rated Energy (DC bus BESS-PCS)	8068.032	kWh
Maximum current	1218	A
Maximum Voltage	1494	Vdc
Minimum Voltage	1116	Vdc
Maximum C-rate	0.5	CP (0.25 recommended)
Degradation Profile of Batteries	E5S indicative performance.xlsx Powered by Box	
Electrical Aux load per enclosure	~1	kW
ESS Thermal Heat Generation load per enclosure	97.0	kW @ 0.5C (6.8kW @ 0.2C)
Battery Temperature Requirements	18-28	°C
Ambient Temperature Requirements of Chiller	-4 - 43	°C
Estimated Gross Weight	71,000	kg

Notes: Each enclosure is capable of 2 banks (2 DC disconnects) for connection of 2 different PCS per enclosure if desired.

Question	Response
Please provide the complete specs for the Samsung SDI E5D lithium-ion battery you intend to use and the complete environmental testing and rating data for this battery.	No public data sheet is available for the E5S and without an NDA in place, we are not authorized to share it with the public. Draft specifications of the CEN enclosure are included as an attachment.
Where will these thousands of batteries be manufactured?	South Korea
How and where will these batteries be transported to arrive here for installation?	Stored individually in cardboard boxes, and loaded on pallets, the batteries will arrive to US port by boat, then arrive to site by truck. Unpacking and loading into secure and climate controlled containers will occur immediately upon arrival on-site by trained technicians.
One of the major fire risks for BESS systems arise from damage to any one battery cell. How are this many battery cells – over 400,000 – going to be inspected prior to installation to ensure there is not even one damaged cell?	All battery cells are inspected during manufacturing. The plant's layered risk mitigation mechanisms are designed for the planned failure of any one battery cell. The systems in place maintain system stability and integrity in the event of a cell failure. It is an unfortunate reality of lithium ion batteries and in order to make use of their benefits, we have taken great care to understand, quantify, and address their risks. We accept the possibility, then design and test safety measures to mitigate probability and severity of the result.
How many battery cells will be housed in the revised total of 69 battery containers?	Each enclosure has 21 strings, each with 720 cells: 15,120 cells/enclosure for a grand total of 1,043,280 battery cells across 69 battery containers.
Please provide an updated map that shows the actual facility and the placement of the BESS system and substation against the actual home placements and streets in the three neighborhoods that were removed from all maps.	This current site layout is available on the project website: https://www.aes.com/sites/default/files/2023-02/Rancho%20Viejo%20Solar-Site%20Development%20Plan.pdf This map is available on the website and pulled from Google Maps: https://www.aes.com/sites/aesvault.com/files/images/RanchoViejo-2.jpg
Please provide a photo of the actual substation being proposed. If you don't have exactly the same one, provide a photo of a similar sized substation.	Project is currently advancing design set from conceptual 10 percent design to a more detailed 30 percent design. A representative


	<p>photo will be provided at a forthcoming community meeting. Nonetheless, the substation will be located approximately 1.45 miles from 47 Encanto Loop (understood to be the closest property in Eldorado to the substation).</p>
<p>Please provide a photo of the proposed 69 BESS system battery containers. The two HVAC systems on each container are placed where on each container? Do these HVAC systems use any water? Is it correct that only one HVAC unit runs at a time and the other is a backup? Is there any scenario where both HVAC units on each container would run at the same time?</p>	<p>The latest design includes 0 HVAC and instead uses a dual compressor chiller unit that uses a 50% water-glycol mixture. to maintain even temperatures among the battery modules. These units near 70 dB.</p> <p>Image attached – BESS Container_AC.jpg</p>
<p>What happens if the power is cut off to the facility for any reason? How is power generated to the HVAC systems if the power is out? are there any backup generators? Are there any plans to add a UPS (Uninterruptable Power Source)?</p>	<p>All enclosures are equipped with UPS systems to maintain communications and control functions. AES BESS plants can be equipped with black start capabilities to enable self-supply of auxiliary power in the event of an outage. However, wide temperature swings [while not desirable for battery longevity] are acceptable and pose no hazard when the batteries are in shutdown.</p>
<p>It is absolutely necessary for you to provide the following actual footage details for:</p> <p>Actual distance in feet of the BESS to the nearest residence in Eldorado. Please state which residence this is or note it on a map placement.</p> <p>Actual distance in feet of the BESS to the nearest residence in Rancho Viejo. Please state which residence this is or note it on a map placement.</p> <p>Actual distance in feet of the BESS to the nearest residence in Rancho San Marcos. Please state which residence this is or note it on a map placement.</p> <p>Actual distance in feet of the substation to each of the communities listed above.</p>	<p>Image files provided in zip file as a separate attachment.</p> <p>Please note, the substation will be located in the same corner as the BESS containers. The distance from the BESS and Substation are the same for each identified address.</p>
<p>Please provide photos of the solar panels in more than their flat position. These panels move and it is deceptive to not show panels in other positions to evaluate glare and landscape views.</p>	<p>Images are included as an attachment – Solar Panel Height.pdf</p> <p>Solar panels include anti-reflective coating and produce negligible glare, as can be observed at currently operating solar facilities.</p>

<p>Construction Waste Management – page 2-5 of the EIR – you say “Most of the hazardous waste generated during construction will consist of liquid waste, such as flushing and cleaning fluids and solvents. Please provide complete information on the actual chemicals being used. This is liquid waste so how can it possibly be collected and therefore, prevented from entering the ground water? As you have stated these are hazardous waste and they can not be permitted in any way to enter the groundwater and contaminate our wells.</p>	<p>Hazardous waste would be managed in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations. These are not anticipated release of liquid hazardous waste. Rather, they are containerized fluids within operating vehicles and equipment. Refer to Section’s 3.6, 3.8, and 3.14 for discussion of waste management, including mitigation measures to avoid and minimize impacts to soil resources, health and safety, and water resources.</p>
<p>In the meeting notes from the October 4th you mentioned a solvent may be used in cleaning and the mention of this has been removed from the EIR. What is the solvent and why was this removed?</p>	<p>Panel cleaning would be limited to just water, if necessary during exceptionally prolonged periods of no rainfall.</p>
<p>Under the new Inflation Reduction Act which offers investment tax credits for battery storage projects, what investment tax credits is AES receiving for the 96MW Rancho Viejo facility with a 48MW BESS?</p>	<p>The project, not AES directly, anticipates qualifying for a 30 percent investment tax credit, which is sourced from a third-party tax equity investor. This tax credit ultimately contributes to a lowest cost of energy and capacity to benefit PNM and its rate payers.</p>
<p>Why was a meeting never held with Eldorado residents especially since you have placed the BESS with the most risk of a fire potential nearest to our community?</p>	<p>The three community meetings hosted by AES were open to the public and advertised in the Santa Fe New Mexican, inviting all interested community members to attend. No meeting was hosted for one particular neighborhood; all were welcome to attend either in person or in one instance, virtually. AES is planning to host an additional meeting to be held in a location convenient for Eldorado residents to attend. Details of that meeting will be shared when available.</p>
<p>We would like to see the Hazard Mitigation Analysis that you would have done for this project. I think the details in this report that you must provide to the fire department are really necessary for the County to review in detail the hazards you identified and the mitigation strategies for these hazards before they can make any decision on approving your Conditional Use Permit application.</p>	<p>A Hazard Mitigation Analysis (HMA) will be performed as part of the detailed engineering process. This HMA will include site and product specific fire risk assessment and a first responder plan. Local first responders will have access to these reports. AES will provide on-site and in-person training to the local responders prior to commercial operation of the system. There are no special materials required to respond to a fire event for the containerized BESS units. Only standard water application to the adjacent BESS containers is required and this is only in the case where all internal fire suppression systems may fail. All information required by the first responders will be included in the first responder plan part</p>

	<p>of the HMA. To prevent accidents like the Arizona case, the containers are non-occupiable, meaning the first responders do not open or enter any container under any circumstance.</p>
<p>The other report that we would like to request are the UL 9540a tests that were performed on the battery and battery containers you intend to use in the facility. Again, important information that the County should review at this stage concerning safety of materials proposed to be used before they can fully evaluate your application.</p>	<p>We have UL9540A test results for the cell, module, and unit level tests. These are all that's required due to the successful fire mitigation at the unit level. AES is determining if detailed test reports can be provided publicly, as they are not owned by AES but by the manufacturer.</p>
<p>A question that has come up about the battery storage containers you intend to use. The specs say CEN 20' ISO. Can you please tell me if these are the new Centipede containers?</p> <p>The reason I ask for more information on this is because I just finished reading several stories (one attached below) about the Centipede system that was used in a facility in Warwick, NY that just had two battery fires in these containers. I believe they were to have the design that separates the battery cells with in the modules making them less prone to fire? But I guess they did not work as intended.</p>	<p>These are not "Centipedes", but are designed and integrated by AES with battery and enclosure supplier partners. They occupy the same footprint as 40' ISO containers. These use different battery chemistry and different approach to hazard mitigation.</p>

Introduction of Samsung Battery System ESS 2022 rev0.17 v0.47.pdf Powered by Box	Estimates 14 Dec 2022	Units
Dimensions of BESS enclosure	40 x 8 x 9.5	ft
Chiller Dimensions (JC)	2.3 x 1.2 x 2.44	m (LxWxH)
Enclosure footprint	320	sqft
Spacing between enclosures	see below	
Door Clearance	6	ft (front battery access + 1 8' side for aux access)
Rated power (DC bus BESS-PCS)	4034.016	kW
Rated Energy (DC bus BESS-PCS)	8068.032	kWh
Maximum current	1218	A
Maximum Voltage	1494	Vdc
Minimum Voltage	1116	Vdc
Maximum C-rate	0.5	CP (0.25 recommended)
Degradation Profile of Batteries	ESS indicative performance.xlsx Powered by Box	
Electrical Aux load per enclosure	~1	kW
ESS Thermal Heat Generation load per enclosure	97.0	kW @ 0.5C (6.8kW @ 0.2C)
Battery Temperature Requirements	18-28	°C
Ambient Temperature Requirements of Chiller	-4 - 43	°C
Estimated Gross Weight	71,000	kg

Notes: Each enclosure is capable of 2 banks (2 DC disconnects) for connection of 2 different PCS per enclosure if desired.



From: Kaye <kaye@coopmeal.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 3, 2023 1:39 PM
To: joselarra@santafecountynm.gov
Cc: hhughes@santafecountynm.gov; athamilton@santafecountynm.gov;
ahansen@santafecountynm.gov; jsgreene@santafecountynm.gov;
cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov
Subject: Alberta pausing approvals for new renewable-energy utilities to assess development rules | CBC News

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Jose:

Wanted everyone to see this article on a pause that Alberta is doing on all renewable energy plants over 1 MW to ensure growth is balanced with responsible development. This is something we would like our county to consider until regulations can catch up to Utility-scale projects.

Thanks for reading and adding to the records concerning the Rancho Viejo Solar Project.

Kaye

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/edmonton/alberta-pausing-approvals-for-new-renewable-energy-utilities-to-assess-development-rules-1.6926094>

Sent from my iPad

Camille C. Padilla

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Monday, August 14, 2023 2:46 PM
To: Lisaida M. Archuleta
Subject: Re: Partial response from AES regarding immense changes in Rancho Viejo Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Lisaida:

Thanks for responding so quickly. So I assume the county has not replaced Jeremy Mier as the liaison to the Planning Commission? Gabe Bustos gave me your name to write to instead and just wanted to understand your connection to to the Planning Commission as I don't know that much about the various County Departments.

So if I may ask what your connection is to the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Project? If I send you information on this do you then forward it to the SLDC Hearing Officer and to the Planning Commission? Who is the SLDC Hearing Officer?

So the AES Conditional Use Permit Application is reviewed first by the SLDC Hearing Officer and that person says it meets all the county's requirements or doesn't regarding a CUP Application and if so, then refers it to the Planning Commission for review which is when the first public hearing occurs? And if approved, we can then appeal? If we appeal, it goes on to the five county commissioners and a public hearing for approval or denial? If approved, we can then appeal and what happens at that time?

Do I have the above steps correct?

Thanks very much for your help.

Kaye

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 14, 2023, at 10:59 AM, Lisaida M. Archuleta <lmarchuleta@santafecountynm.gov> wrote:

Good Morning,
I am Growth management Deputy Director. Of Course you can continue emailing me information.

Respectfully,

Lisaida M. Archuleta
Growth Management
Deputy Director

From: Kaye [mailto:kaye@coopmead.com]
Sent: Monday, August 14, 2023 10:38 AM
To: Lisaida M. Archuleta <lmarchuleta@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: Partial response from AES regarding immense changes in Rancho Viejo Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Lisaida:

I understand you are the new liaison for the Planning Commission. I will be sending various emails concerning my correspondence with AES who is the developer that has filed a Conditional Use Permit Application with the county for the utility-scale Rancho Viejo Solar Facility. I would like the Planning commission and Hearing Officer to see these emails because they contain very important information about how AES continues to change the very basic and crucial details of the project that they did not include in their Conditional Use Permit Application for the project.

These include increasing the number of lithium-ion battery cells that will be used in the Battery Energy Storage System from 415,000 cells to an astonishing 1,043,280 battery cells. It takes one degraded battery cell to start a thermal runaway fire and potential explosion so this incredible increase creates a much greater risk of fire.

These BESS fires are happening with frightening regularity as more solar facilities use them and there were three new fires in New York in the last two months alone in much smaller BESS systems (4 to 8 MW systems compared to the 48 MW BESS system AES wants to do here). After the last three BESS fires in NY and now 14 deaths there this year from lithium-ion battery fires from e-bikes, the Governor of NY just called for a fire safety council to investigate these systems.

AES also just doubled the battery container size from 69 20' containers to 69 40' containers to load even more batteries on site.

More details of the changes AES made are in the attached and were only released to us because I asked for them on July 9th. It is very important that the Planning Commission take a look at all of these details for this facility.

Thank you for passing on this information to the Commission.

Sincerely,

Kaye Cooper-Mead

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>

Date: August 10, 2023 at 12:25:21 PM MDT

To: joselarra@santafecountynm.gov

Cc: hhughes@santafecountynm.gov, athamilton@santafecountynm.gov,

ahansen@santafecountynm.gov, jsgreene@santafecountynm.gov,

cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov, jmier@santafecountynm.gov

Subject: Partial response from AES regarding immense changes in Rancho Viejo Solar Project

To: The Sustainable Land Development Code(SLDC) Hearing Officer, the Santa Fe County Planning Commission and the Santa Fe County Commissioners

Dear Jose:

Attached please find my letter concerning the changes that have been made by AES in the Rancho Viejo Solar Project

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 8:55 AM
To: Hank Hughes; Anna T. Hamilton; Anna C. Hansen; Justin S. Greene; Camilla M. Bustamante; Jose Larranaga; Gabriel C. Bustos
Subject: Alsym Energy: Fires in Warwick, NY Highlight Dangers of Lithium-Ion Storage in Urban Centers

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning:

Wanted to send you all this story as it quotes the Town Supervisor for Warwick, NY where the two latest battery storage containers with lithium-ion batteries just caught fire.

He states that municipalities should take more time to evaluate safety protocols specific to lithium-ion storage systems, and would also encourage communities to reevaluate zoning and permitting requirements to prevent these facilities from being sited near schools, parks, and other places where large numbers of people congregate.

I also attach a picture of the container that burned quite extensively.

Thanks for considering this new and growing information about the dangers of lithium-ion batteries.

<https://finance.yahoo.com/news/alsym-energy-fires-warwick-ny-140000462.html>

Home

Live

Reels

Shows

Explore



Sent from my iPad

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Friday, July 28, 2023 4:38 PM
To: hhughes@santafecountynm.gov; athamilton@santafecountynm.gov;
ahansen@santafecountynm.gov; jsgreene@santafecountynm.gov;
cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov; joselarra@santafecountynm.gov; Gabriel C.
Bustos
Subject: As e-bikes proliferate, so do deadly fires blamed on exploding lithium-ion batteries | Ap
| santafenewmexican.com

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi everyone:

Just in case you did not see the story about lithium-ion battery fires in New York in today's Santa Fe New Mexican the link is below.

NY City Fire Commissioner said, "These aren't typical fires. The batteries don't smolder, they explode. We have reached a point of crisis in New York City with ion batteries now a top cause of fatal fires in New York."

These type of batteries store an explosive amount of energy and are too dangerous for use in a Utility-size facility within a mile of three communities, Turquoise Trail Charter School and a mile south of Santa Fe.

Thanks for reading.

Kaye

Kaye Cooper-Mead

<https://apnews.com/article/ebike-fires-lithium-ion-batteries-b5ab9acf9ca317a1b5b917097ac5210d>

Sent from my iPad

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 20, 2024 3:43 PM
To: Gabriel C. Bustos
Cc: hhughes@santafecountynm.gov
Subject: Battery cell discrepancy from AES

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Gabe:

This is the email I mentioned to you showing that AES made an error in battery cell numbers. When I questioned it, she came back with the correct figure.

They made the same mistake in the Sept. 19th document with the county and I don't see that it has been corrected by AES or the county.

This document also shows the latest information regarding the number of 40 foot battery containers at 38. I see where AES indicated in the Sept 19th document the container specs including their length at 40 feet but I see no mention on the number of battery containers being asked by the county or specified by AES in this Sept. 19th document.

Thank you.

Kaye

Kaye Cooper-Mead

Begin forwarded message:

From: Rebecca Halford <rebecca.halford@aes.com>
Date: September 1, 2023 at 8:30:36 AM MDT
To: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>, RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>
Subject: RE: Battery cell discrepancy

This information may be the cause of some confusion. Correction: The strings do not include 60 cells. The strings include 720 cells each. I'm not sure where the typo came from.

Please let me know if this creates additional questions.

Rebecca

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

From: Rebecca Halford

Sent: Friday, September 1, 2023 8:23 AM

To: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>; RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>

Subject: RE: Battery cell discrepancy

Kaye,

The information provided in the documents yesterday represents the most recent iteration of the project design.

This is correct:

"The total MWh is the same as before with the change being utilization of a 40' container instead of a 20' container. Container density is varied throughout the site. The maximum allowable is 21 strings per 40' container. Each string contains 60 battery cells per string for a physical maximum cell count of 15,120 cells per container"

"The current project design includes 38, 40' containers."

Thanks,

Rebecca

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

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>

Sent: Friday, September 1, 2023 7:58 AM

To: RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>; Rebecca Halford

<rebecca.halford@aes.com>

Subject: Battery cell discrepancy

CAUTION: This email originated from outside AES. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Hi Rebecca:

Thanks for your email yesterday which I will review and come back to you on. But there is one glaring change about the battery cells and containers that I wanted to discuss with you immediately.

On August 4th you said,

"Each enclosure has 21 strings, each with 720 cells: 15,120 cells/enclosure for a grand total of 1,043,280 battery cells across 69 containers". At that time you informed us the containers were 40' instead of 20'.

Yesterday, your document attached below, says:

“The total MWh is the same as before with the change being utilization of a 40’ container instead of a 20’ container. Container density is varied throughout the site. The maximum allowable is 21 strings per 40’ container. Each string contains 60 battery cells per string for a physical maximum cell count of 15,120 cells per container”

“The current project design includes 38, 40’ containers.

If the maximum allowable is 21 strings per 40’ container and there are 60 battery cells per string (not the 720 battery cells per string you mentioned Aug 4th) that would total 1,260 battery cells per container not the physical maximum cell count of 15,120 cells per container you quoted on both Aug 4th and yesterday.

Please provide the correct information as to how many maximum strings per container, maximum battery cells per string per container and total maximum battery cells per container.

Was the 720 battery cells per string you mentioned on August 4th an incorrect number? I don’t know how this figure could go from 720 per string to 60 per string you mentioned yesterday.

What is the grand total number of battery cells for the site — on August 4th it was 1,043,280. What is it now?

And please confirm that it is now 38 40’ containers instead of the 69 40’ containers you mentioned on August 4th.

Would very much appreciate hearing from you today on this matter as it doesn’t make sense mathematically in the document you sent yesterday,

Thank you very much.

Kaye

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 31, 2023, at 4:46 PM, RanchoViejoSolar
<RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com> wrote:

Hi Kaye,

I've attached responses to your letters dated August 11 and August 15 and files including additional requested information. Just so you know, responses to your questions sent on August 28 are still being processed and will be returned to you as soon as possible.

Thank you,
Rebecca

-

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2023 8:26 AM
To: Gabriel C. Bustos
Cc: Camilla Brom
Subject: Battery information

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning Gabe:

Rebecca Halford of AES told me they couldn't yet answer my questions because they were busy getting the county the battery information last week. We would like to see the information that the county received last week from AES. Please let me know how we can receive this.

Thanks.

Kaye

Sent from my iPad

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 9, 2023 9:09 AM
To: Jaome R. Blay
Cc: Jacob Black; Jeffrey Carroll; Enrique A. Romero; Wallace S. Starks
Subject: Big Batteries Are Booming. So Are Fears They'll Catch Fire | WIRED

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning:

Thought this was a very good look at the issues involved with large scale battery energy storage systems and the problems of lithium-ion batteries especially when many are packed into the utility-scale BESS.

Have a nice fire-free weekend.

Kaye

<https://www.wired.com/story/big-grid-batteries-are-booming-so-are-fears-fire/>

Sent from my iPad

From: Lisaida M. Archuleta <lmarchuleta@santafecountynm.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 14, 2023 3:04 PM
To: Kaye
Subject: RE: Partial response from AES regarding immense changes in Rancho Viejo Solar Project

Kaye,

Jose Larranaga is the Case Manager for AES Rancho Viejo Solar Project. Right now I know that we are looking into more studies (impact) so there is going to be a long process before it goes to Hearing Officer.

You can email Jose with any information you want.

Hearing officer is also for public. Then it goes to Planning commission, then to BCC. BCC could approve, denial or table it.

Lisaida

From: Kaye [mailto:kaye@coopmead.com]
Sent: Monday, August 14, 2023 2:46 PM
To: Lisaida M. Archuleta <lmarchuleta@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: Re: Partial response from AES regarding immense changes in Rancho Viejo Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Lisaida:

Thanks for responding so quickly. So I assume the county has not replaced Jeremy Mier as the liaison to the Planning Commission? Gabe Bustos gave me your name to write to instead and just wanted to understand your connection to the Planning Commission as I don't know that much about the various County Departments.

So if I may ask what your connection is to the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Project? If I send you information on this do you then forward it to the SLDC Hearing Officer and to the Planning Commission? Who is the SLDC Hearing Officer?

So the AES Conditional Use Permit Application is reviewed first by the SLDC Hearing Officer and that person says it meets all the county's requirements or doesn't regarding a CUP Application and if so, then refers it to the Planning Commission for review which is when the first public hearing occurs? And if approved, we can then appeal? If we appeal, it goes on to the five county commissioners and a public hearing for approval or denial? If approved, we can then appeal and what happens at that time?

Do I have the above steps correct?

Thanks very much for your help.

Kaye

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 14, 2023, at 10:59 AM, Lisaida M. Archuleta <lmarchuleta@santafecountynm.gov> wrote:

Good Morning,

I am Growth management Deputy Director. Of Course you can continue emailing me information.

Respectfully,

Lisaida M. Archuleta

Growth Management

Deputy Director

505-986-6222

From: Kaye [<mailto:kaye@coopmead.com>]

Sent: Monday, August 14, 2023 10:38 AM

To: Lisaida M. Archuleta <lmarchuleta@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Partial response from AES regarding immense changes in Rancho Viejo Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Lisaida:

I understand you are the new liaison for the Planning Commission. I will be sending various emails concerning my correspondence with AES who is the developer that has filed a Conditional Use Permit Application with the county for the utility-scale Rancho Viejo Solar Facility. I would like the Planning commission and Hearing Officer to see these emails because they contain very important information about how AES continues to change the very basic and crucial details of the project that they did not include in their Conditional Use Permit Application for the project.

These include increasing the number of lithium-ion battery cells that will be used in the Battery Energy Storage System from 415,000 cells to an astonishing 1,043,280 battery cells. It takes one degraded battery cell to start a thermal runaway fire and potential explosion so this incredible increase creates a much greater risk of fire.

These BESS fires are happening with frightening regularity as more solar facilities use them and there were three new fires in New York in the last two months alone in much smaller BESS systems (4 to 8 MW systems compared to the 48 MW BESS system AES wants to do here). After the last three BESS fires in NY and now 14 deaths there this year from lithium-ion

battery fires from e-bikes, the Governor of NY just called for a fire safety council to investigate these systems.

AES also just doubled the battery container size from 69 20' containers to 69 40' containers to load even more batteries on site.

More details of the changes AES made are in the attached and were only released to us because I asked for them on July 9th. It is very important that the Planning Commission take a look at all of these details for this facility.

Thank you for passing on this information to the Commission.

Sincerely,

Kaye Cooper-Mead

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Date: August 10, 2023 at 12:25:21 PM MDT
To: josearra@santafecountynm.gov
Cc: hhughes@santafecountynm.gov, athamilton@santafecountynm.gov,
ahansen@santafecountynm.gov, jsgreene@santafecountynm.gov,
cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov, jmier@santafecountynm.gov
Subject: Partial response from AES regarding immense changes in Rancho Viejo Solar Project

To: The Sustainable Land Development Code(SLDC) Hearing Officer, the Santa Fe County Planning Commission and the Santa Fe County Commissioners

Dear Jose:

Attached please find my letter concerning the changes that have been made by AES in the Rancho Viejo Solar Project

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2023 8:27 AM
To: Gabriel C. Bustos
Subject: Re: Rancho Viejo Solar project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Gabe:

Thanks for getting back to me with this information. We will look forward to receiving the County Manager's response as soon as it is available.

Kaye

Sent from my iPad

> On Jul 26, 2023, at 4:51 PM, Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov> wrote:

>

> Kaye, thank you for your patience. Let me know if this helps answer some of your questions. For whatever reason I am unable to highlight my responses, so I apologize if this is hard to read.

>

> I still need to know who can request a moratorium and if it would apply to AES' Conditional Use Permit application since it was filed in January and is considered to be in process. The community of San Marcos as well as many other members of the community have expressed that a moratorium be placed on large scale solar facilities. A response to this has been drafted by the County Manager, I am just waiting for the green light and I can send over a copy.

>

> Please provide details on:

>

> What is a Resolution? A resolution from my understanding is a legislative directive to the County Manager and other pertinent departments that sets ideals and expresses policy opinions of the Board of County Commissioners.

>

> Who does the work to draft it? These are usually drafted by the Commissioners, resolutions can also come from department directors but are always a collaboration with other pertinent departments.

>

> Who it goes to for approval? Resolutions are vetted by our legal department before being placed on a BCC agenda. Once a resolution is placed on a meeting agenda the Commissioners will vote to approve or deny the resolution.

>

> What bearing it has on AES' CUP application? A resolution would neither slow down or speed up the AES application. However it would address how to evaluate these types of large solar facilities including AES.

>

> Is it legally binding? Yes

>

> If so, how is it enforced? The resolution would be implemented by the County Manager.

>

> Does it take precedence over the SLDC if it specifies issues that are not included in the SLDC? The resolution would not override the SLDC, however it can influence staff to look at amending certain items of the SLDC.

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Kaye [mailto:kaye@coopmead.com]

> Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 5:05 PM

> To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>

> Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>

> Subject: Re: Rancho Viejo Solar project

>

> WARNING:

>

> EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

>

> Hi Hank:

>

> Thanks for your response.

>

> I still need to know who can request a moratorium and if it would apply to AES' Conditional Use Permit application since it was filed in January and is considered to be in process.

>

> Please provide details on:

>

> What is a Resolution?

>

> Who does the work to draft it?

>

> Who it goes to for approval?

>

> What bearing it has on AES' CUP application?

>

> Is it legally binding?

>

> If so, how is it enforced?

>

> Does it take precedence over the SLDC if it specifies issues that are not included in the SLDC?

>

> Appreciate the information you provided on the water. I think it says a lot about how bad the water situation actually is in our area if people's wells are already running dry and they need a second bulk water station. And this is all before adding a huge Utility-scale facility and its water needs to this area.

>

> Thank you Hank.

>

>

>

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

>> On Jul 21, 2023, at 2:52 PM, Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov> wrote:

>>

>> Hi Kaye:

>>

>> I am not getting any traction for a moratorium. I am trying to see if there is something we can do in the form of a resolution about safety at solar projects.

>>

>> The waterline will run from the Turquoise Trail school to the County fire station about a mile away. We also plan to put a bulk water station next to the fire station. People use the bulk water stations to get water when their wells are dry, and there has been a of demand for this in recent years at the existing bulk water station. So that is why we want to have a second bulk water station. Also having County water at the fire station will be better for their needs than the existing well that has limited capacity. The water in the County system comes from the Rio Grande via the Buckman Direct Diversion.

>>

>> Hank Hughes

>> Santa Fe County Commissioner, District 5

>>

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Kaye [mailto:kaye@coopmead.com]

>> Sent: Friday, July 21, 2023 8:31 AM

>> To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>

>> Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>

>> Subject: Rancho Viejo Solar project

>>

>> WARNING:

>>

>> EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

>>

>> Hi Hank:

>>

>> After the last Hank Hour you were going to check on whether you (or someone else) could initiate a Moratorium on this project or other solar projects and if this would apply to the AES Conditional Use Permit application that was submitted in January.

>>

>> You mentioned the waterline going in on the property that Warren Thompson donated to the county. Where does this water come from — is it water from the city and/or is there a well involved?

>>

>> Look forward to hearing from you.

>>

>> Kind regards,

>>

>> Kaye

>>

>> Kaye Cooper-Mead

>>

>>

>>

>

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2023 8:27 AM
To: Gabriel C. Bustos
Subject: Re: Rancho Viejo Solar project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Gabe:

Thanks for getting back to me with this information. We will look forward to receiving the County Manager's response as soon as it is available.

Kaye

Sent from my iPad

> On Jul 26, 2023, at 4:51 PM, Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov> wrote:

>

> Kaye, thank you for your patience. Let me know if this helps answer some of your questions. For whatever reason I am unable to highlight my responses, so I apologize if this is hard to read.

>

> I still need to know who can request a moratorium and if it would apply to AES' Conditional Use Permit application since it was filed in January and is considered to be in process. The community of San Marcos as well as many other members of the community have expressed that a moratorium be placed on large scale solar facilities. A response to this has been drafted by the County Manager, I am just waiting for the green light and I can send over a copy.

>

> Please provide details on:

>

> What is a Resolution? A resolution from my understanding is a legislative directive to the County Manager and other pertinent departments that sets ideals and expresses policy opinions of the Board of County Commissioners.

>

> Who does the work to draft it? These are usually drafted by the Commissioners, resolutions can also come from department directors but are always a collaboration with other pertinent departments.

>

> Who it goes to for approval? Resolutions are vetted by our legal department before being placed on a BCC agenda. Once a resolution is placed on a meeting agenda the Commissioners will vote to approve or deny the resolution.

>

> What bearing it has on AES' CUP application? A resolution would neither slow down or speed up the AES application. However it would address how to evaluate these types of large solar facilities including AES.

>

> Is it legally binding? Yes

>

> If so, how is it enforced? The resolution would be implemented by the County Manager.

>

> Does it take precedence over the SLDC if it specifies issues that are not included in the SLDC? The resolution would not override the SLDC, however it can influence staff to look at amending certain items of the SLDC.

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Kaye [mailto:kaye@coopmead.com]

> Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 5:05 PM

> To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>

> Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>

> Subject: Re: Rancho Viejo Solar project

>

> WARNING:

>

> EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

>

> Hi Hank:

>

> Thanks for your response.

>

> I still need to know who can request a moratorium and if it would apply to AES' Conditional Use Permit application since it was filed in January and is considered to be in process.

>

> Please provide details on:

>

> What is a Resolution?

>

> Who does the work to draft it?

>

> Who it goes to for approval?

>

> What bearing it has on AES' CUP application?

>

> Is it legally binding?

>

> If so, how is it enforced?

>

> Does it take precedence over the SLDC if it specifies issues that are not included in the SLDC?

>

> Appreciate the information you provided on the water. I think it says a lot about how bad the water situation actually is in our area if people's wells are already running dry and they need a second bulk water station. And this is all before adding a huge Utility-scale facility and its water needs to this area.

>

> Thank you Hank.

>

>

>

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

>> On Jul 21, 2023, at 2:52 PM, Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov> wrote:

>>

>> Hi Kaye:

>>

>> I am not getting any traction for a moratorium. I am trying to see if there is something we can do in the form of a resolution about safety at solar projects.

>>

>> The waterline will run from the Turquoise Trail school to the County fire station about a mile away. We also plan to put a bulk water station next to the fire station. People use the bulk water stations to get water when their wells are dry, and there has been a of demand for this in recent years at the existing bulk water station. So that is why we want to have a second bulk water station. Also having County water at the fire station will be better for their needs than the existing well that has limited capacity. The water in the County system comes from the Rio Grande via the Buckman Direct Diversion.

>>

>> Hank Hughes

>> Santa Fe County Commissioner, District 5

>>

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Kaye [mailto:kaye@coopmead.com]

>> Sent: Friday, July 21, 2023 8:31 AM

>> To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>

>> Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>

>> Subject: Rancho Viejo Solar project

>>

>> WARNING:

>>

>> EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

>>

>> Hi Hank:

>>

>> After the last Hank Hour you were going to check on whether you (or someone else) could initiate a Moratorium on this project or other solar projects and if this would apply to the AES Conditional Use Permit application that was submitted in January.

>>

>> You mentioned the waterline going in on the property that Warren Thompson donated to the county. Where does this water come from — is it water from the city and/or is there a well involved?

>>

>> Look forward to hearing from you.

>>

>> Kind regards,

>>

>> Kaye

>>

>> Kaye Cooper-Mead

>>

>>

>>

>

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2023 3:51 PM
To: Gabriel C. Bustos
Subject: Re: Rancho Viejo Solar project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Thanks very much Gabe.

Sent from my iPad

> On Jul 25, 2023, at 3:30 PM, Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov> wrote:

>

> Kaye, I just wanted to let you know your email has been received. I am working with staff on providing a response to the questions you have below.

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Kaye [mailto:kaye@coopmead.com]

> Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 5:05 PM

> To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>

> Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>

> Subject: Re: Rancho Viejo Solar project

>

> WARNING:

>

> EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

>

> Hi Hank:

>

> Thanks for your response.

>

> I still need to know who can request a moratorium and if it would apply to AES' Conditional Use Permit application since it was filed in January and is considered to be in process.

>

> Please provide details on:

>

> What is a Resolution?

>

> Who does the work to draft it?

>

> Who it goes to for approval?

>

> What bearing it has on AES' CUP application?

>

> Is it legally binding?
>
> If so, how is it enforced?
>
> Does it take precedence over the SLDC if it specifies issues that are not included in the SLDC?
>
> Appreciate the information you provided on the water. I think it says a lot about how bad the water situation actually is in our area if people's wells are already running dry and they need a second bulk water station. And this is all before adding a huge Utility-scale facility and its water needs to this area.
>
> Thank you Hank.
>
>
>
>
> Sent from my iPad
>
>> On Jul 21, 2023, at 2:52 PM, Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov> wrote:
>>
>> Hi Kaye:
>>
>> I am not getting any traction for a moratorium. I am trying to see if there is something we can do in the form of a resolution about safety at solar projects.
>>
>> The waterline will run from the Turquoise Trail school to the County fire station about a mile away. We also plan to put a bulk water station next to the fire station. People use the bulk water stations to get water when their wells are dry, and there has been a of demand for this in recent years at the existing bulk water station. So that is why we want to have a second bulk water station. Also having County water at the fire station will be better for their needs than the existing well that has limited capacity. The water in the County system comes from the Rio Grande via the Buckman Direct Diversion.
>>
>> Hank Hughes
>> Santa Fe County Commissioner, District 5
>>
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Kaye [mailto:kaye@coopmead.com]
>> Sent: Friday, July 21, 2023 8:31 AM
>> To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>
>> Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>
>> Subject: Rancho Viejo Solar project
>>
>> WARNING:
>>
>> EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.
>>
>> Hi Hank:
>>
>> After the last Hank Hour you were going to check on whether you (or someone else) could initiate a Moratorium on this project or other solar projects and if this would apply to the AES Conditional Use Permit application that was submitted in January.
>>

>> You mentioned the waterline going in on the property that Warren Thompson donated to the county. Where does this water come from — is it water from the city and/or is there a well involved?

>>

>> Look forward to hearing from you.

>>

>> Kind regards,

>>

>> Kaye

>>

>> Kaye Cooper-Mead

>>

>>

>>

>

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Monday, July 24, 2023 5:05 PM
To: Hank Hughes
Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos
Subject: Re: Rancho Viejo Solar project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Hank:

Thanks for your response.

I still need to know who can request a moratorium and if it would apply to AES' Conditional Use Permit application since it was filed in January and is considered to be in process.

Please provide details on:

What is a Resolution?

Who does the work to draft it?

Who it goes to for approval?

What bearing it has on AES' CUP application?

Is it legally binding?

If so, how is it enforced?

Does it take precedence over the SLDC if it specifies issues that are not included in the SLDC?

Appreciate the information you provided on the water. I think it says a lot about how bad the water situation actually is in our area if people's wells are already running dry and they need a second bulk water station. And this is all before adding a huge Utility-scale facility and its water needs to this area.

Thank you Hank.

Sent from my iPad

> On Jul 21, 2023, at 2:52 PM, Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov> wrote:

>

> Hi Kaye:

>
> I am not getting any traction for a moratorium. I am trying to see if there is something we can do in the form of a resolution about safety at solar projects.
>
> The waterline will run from the Turquoise Trail school to the County fire station about a mile away. We also plan to put a bulk water station next to the fire station. People use the bulk water stations to get water when their wells are dry, and there has been a of demand for this in recent years at the existing bulk water station. So that is why we want to have a second bulk water station. Also having County water at the fire station will be better for their needs than the existing well that has limited capacity. The water in the County system comes from the Rio Grande via the Buckman Direct Diversion.
>
> Hank Hughes
> Santa Fe County Commissioner, District 5
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Kaye [mailto:kaye@coopmead.com]
> Sent: Friday, July 21, 2023 8:31 AM
> To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>
> Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>
> Subject: Rancho Viejo Solar project
>
> WARNING:
>
> EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.
>
> Hi Hank:
>
> After the last Hank Hour you were going to check on whether you (or someone else) could initiate a Moratorium on this project or other solar projects and if this would apply to the AES Conditional Use Permit application that was submitted in January.
>
> You mentioned the waterline going in on the property that Warren Thompson donated to the county. Where does this water come from — is it water from the city and/or is there a well involved?
>
> Look forward to hearing from you.
>
> Kind regards,
>
> Kaye
>
> Kaye Cooper-Mead
>
>
>

From: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 21, 2023 2:52 PM
To: Kaye
Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos
Subject: RE: Rancho Viejo Solar project

Hi Kaye:

I am not getting any traction for a moratorium. I am trying to see if there is something we can do in the form of a resolution about safety at solar projects.

The waterline will run from the Turquoise Trail school to the County fire station about a mile away. We also plan to put a bulk water station next to the fire station. People use the bulk water stations to get water when their wells are dry, and there has been a of demand for this in recent years at the existing bulk water station. So that is why we want to have a second bulk water station. Also having County water at the fire station will be better for their needs than the existing well that has limited capacity. The water in the County system comes from the Rio Grande via the Buckman Direct Diversion.

Hank Hughes
Santa Fe County Commissioner, District 5

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

From: Kaye [mailto:kaye@coopmead.com]
Sent: Friday, July 21, 2023 8:31 AM
To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>
Cc: Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: Rancho Viejo Solar project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Hank:

After the last Hank Hour you were going to check on whether you (or someone else) could initiate a Moratorium on this project or other solar projects and if this would apply to the AES Conditional Use Permit application that was submitted in January.

You mentioned the waterline going in on the property that Warren Thompson donated to the county. Where does this water come from — is it water from the city and/or is there a well involved?

Look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Kaye

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 3, 2023 11:32 AM
To: joselarra@santafecountynm.gov; pengreen@santafecountynm.gov
Cc: hhughes@santafecountynm.gov; ahansen@santafecountynm.gov;
athamilton@santafecountynm.gov; jsgreene@santafecountynm.gov;
cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov; Gabriel C. Bustos
Subject: 'Not yet time-tested': City urged to halt lithium-ion battery storage sites on Staten Island - silive.com. (Rancho Viejo Solar Project)

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

To: the SLDC Hearing Officer, the Planning Commission, and the Santa Fe County Commissioners

Hi Jose:

I would appreciate you sharing this with all of the above showing that other cities across the county are grappling with the serious problems of lithium-ion Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) and calling for Moratoriums on siting these facilities in residential areas.

Staten Island, NY Borough President Vito Fossella asks for "an immediate moratorium of approvals for BESS applications filed within the Department of Building (DOB) near residential and in local commercial districts."

He said, "They cannot continue to be air dropped into residential communities."

Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,

Kaye

Kaye Cooper-Mead

<https://www.silive.com/business/2023/01/city-urged-to-issue-moratorium-on-approving-applications-for-lithium-ion-battery-storage-sites-on-si.html>

Sent from my iPad

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Friday, August 25, 2023 6:14 PM
To: RanchoViejoSolar; Rebecca Halford
Cc: Jose Larranaga; Hank Hughes; Anna C. Hansen; Anna T. Hamilton; Justin S. Greene; Camilla M. Bustamante; Gabriel C. Bustos
Subject: Additional List of questions regarding Rancho Viejo Solar Project
Attachments: AES Questions_v2_Number 1.docx

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Rebecca:

Here is a one page list of questions regarding the AES solar facility that we would appreciate your team working on. Looking forward to the response on my earlier questions of August 11th as you mentioned early next week.

Thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Kaye

Kaye Cooper-Mead

Sent from my iPad

AES Ranch Viejo Solar Project Questions

Category	Question	Comment
Financial	How is the project funded?	
Property	What is the physical size of the substation connecting the facility to the grid?	
Property	Will the facility cabling be located underground?	
Property	What is the decommissioning plan for the project and when would it take effect?	
Technology	What is the storage capacity (MWh) and total Power (MW) for each 40-ft AES Container?	
Technology	How many inverters will be at the site and what is power rating of each inverter (MW)? How will they be connected?	
Technology	Can the storage batteries be charged from the grid?	
Technology	What is the grid voltage of the substation?	
Technology	What is the pedigree of the SCADA systems?	
Technology	What is the calculated Reliability (Hours) and Availability (%) of the facility?	
Technology	What is the size and operating specifications of the individual batteries (operating temp, humidity, etc)?	

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 6, 2023 1:17 PM
To: Jose Larranaga; Penny Ellis-Green
Cc: Hank Hughes; Anna C. Hansen; Anna T. Hamilton; Justin S. Greene; Camilla M. Bustamante; Gabriel C. Bustos
Subject: AES comments to questions of August 11th and August 15th re: Rancho Viejo Solar Project
Attachments: Distance Images.zip; Q_A for Kaye Cooper-Mead_Aug 11.pdf; Q_A for Kaye Cooper-Mead_Aug 15.pdf; ResponseAttachments.zip

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

To: The SLDC Hearing Officer, the Planning Commission, and the Santa Fe County Commissioners

Hi Jose:

Please share this information with all noted above. It is the latest set of answers from AES concerning my emails of August 11th and August 15th.

More significant changes including the reduction of battery cells from the 1,043,280 battery cells they told me on August 4th (which I have asked them to add back in on the information about battery cells so it is a written history of the information they provided and she is saying she will do this next week) to 520,560 battery cells. This change comes about as a result of the new information they are providing on the number of battery storage containers from 69 40' containers as of her Aug 4th email to to the 38 40' containers she now mentions in this email.

I will be doing a response to these documents shortly and will copy all of you on that correspondence but wanted you have all of her attachments before that email as I will be referring to them in my response.

Thank you for reading.

Sincerely,

Kaye

Kaye Cooper-Mead

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>
Date: September 1, 2023 at 4:50:41 PM MDT
To: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Subject: RE: Battery cell discrepancy

Hi Kaye,

I was able to source additional information from the project team about the battery system at its current design stage. I've updated the Aug 11 document and reattached all the files I sent yesterday.

Please let me know if you have other questions that need to be addressed. I hope you all have a great holiday weekend.

Rebecca

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

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>
Sent: Friday, September 1, 2023 8:44 AM
To: Rebecca Halford <rebecca.halford@aes.com>
Subject: Re: Battery cell discrepancy

CAUTION: This email originated from outside AES. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Yes that is the difference as $21 \times 720 = 15,120$. Could you please send me a newly revised email that you sent yesterday with all the attachments again and the revised Q & A document that shows this correction and could you please add the total number of battery cells over the 38 40' containers on the site?

Thank you very much.

Kaye

Sent from my iPad

On Sep 1, 2023, at 8:30 AM, Rebecca Halford <rebecca.halford@aes.com> wrote:

This information may be the cause of some confusion. Correction: The strings do not include 60 cells. The strings include 720 cells each. I'm not sure where the typo came from.

Please let me know if this creates additional questions.

Rebecca

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

From: Rebecca Halford

Sent: Friday, September 1, 2023 8:23 AM

To: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>; RanchoViejoSolar
<RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>

Subject: RE: Battery cell discrepancy

Kaye,

The information provided in the documents yesterday represents the most recent iteration of the project design.

This is correct:

"The total MWh is the same as before with the change being utilization of a 40' container instead of a 20' container. Container density is varied throughout the site. The maximum allowable is 21 strings per 40' container. Each string contains 60 battery cells per string for a physical maximum cell count of 15,120 cells per container"

"The current project design includes 38, 40' containers."

Thanks,

Rebecca

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

From: Kaye <kaye@coopmead.com>

Sent: Friday, September 1, 2023 7:58 AM

To: RanchoViejoSolar <RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com>; Rebecca Halford
<rebecca.halford@aes.com>

Subject: Battery cell discrepancy

CAUTION: This email originated from outside AES. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Hi Rebecca:

Thanks for your email yesterday which I will review and come back to you on. But there is one glaring change about the battery cells and containers that I wanted to discuss with you immediately.

On August 4th you said,

“Each enclosure has 21 strings, each with 720 cells: 15,120 cells/enclosure for a grand total of 1,043,280 battery cells across 69 containers”. At that time you informed us the containers were 40’ instead of 20’.

Yesterday, your document attached below, says:

“The total MWh is the same as before with the change being utilization of a 40’ container instead of a 20’ container. Container density is varied throughout the site. The maximum allowable is 21 strings per 40’ container. Each string contains 60 battery cells per string for a physical maximum cell count of 15,120 cells per container”

“The current project design includes 38, 40’ containers.

If the maximum allowable is 21 strings per 40’ container and there are 60 battery cells per string (not the 720 battery cells per string you mentioned Aug 4th) that would total 1,260 battery cells per container not the physical maximum cell count of 15,120 cells per container you quoted on both Aug 4th and yesterday.

Please provide the correct information as to how many maximum strings per container, maximum battery cells per string per container and total maximum battery cells per container.

Was the 720 battery cells per string you mentioned on August 4th an incorrect number? I don’t know how this figure could go from 720 per string to 60 per string you mentioned yesterday.

What is the grand total number of battery cells for the site — on August 4th it was 1,043,280. What is it now?

And please confirm that it is now 38 40' containers instead of the 69 40' containers you mentioned on August 4th.

Would very much appreciate hearing from you today on this matter as it doesn't make sense mathematically in the document you sent yesterday,

Thank you very much.

Kaye

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 31, 2023, at 4:46 PM, RanchoViejoSolar
<RanchoViejoSolar@aes.com> wrote:

Hi Kaye,

I've attached responses to your letters dated August 11 and August 15 and files including additional requested information. Just so you know, responses to your questions sent on August 28 are still being processed and will be returned to you as soon as possible.

Thank you,
Rebecca

-

1. Samsung SDI E5S - I see that you have now changed to a different Samsung battery. Since you indicate you cannot release the crucial information on the battery's chemistry and its environmental testing and rating information without an NDA, I have asked the County to get involved with obtaining this information. No safety review of this project can be done without the details on the battery as requested.

Comment noted. Responses are being provided to the County, as appropriate.

2. Battery containers – the draft specification you attached is dated December 14, 2022. More than a month before you submitted your Conditional Use Permit Application. Why weren't we told about the larger containers until I asked? In the fall meeting you had in San Marcos, the containers were to be 39 45' containers, then it became 69 20' containers and now you say 69 40' containers. During that fall meeting, it was said that project would not expand. This is clearly an expansion of the project.

Project refinements are made as part of design development. The current project design includes 38, 40' containers. Storage capacity has not expanded, and remain 48 MW, for 4-hours.

3. Battery cells -- Talk about an expansion of the project! This is a shocking increase in the number of battery cells indicated previously from 415,000 to almost triple of 1,043,280 cells. Why have the battery cell numbers which hold the most fire risks along with the electrical equipment in the substation area, been raised to this level and how does this impact the MW numbers you have stated for the project of 96MW solar and 48 MW BESS? What is the storage MW now?

As stated above, the total energy storage capacity has not changed and remains 48 MW - r hour system. The total MWh is the same as before with the change being utilization of a 40' container instead of a 20' container. Container density is varied throughout the site. The maximum allowable is 21 strings per 40' container. Each string contains 720 battery cells per string for a physical maximum cell count of 15,120 cells per container. The number of strings per container and containers per site is in adjustment through final design. Currently, the design includes 38 enclosures.

The current BESS design is as follows and is subject to change as we progress through design:

30% Design Stage:

48 MW - 4 Hour System

Total Qty. 38 of the CEN 40' Containers

Total Qty. 723 of Samsung E5S battery strings Total Qty. 8676 battery modules Total Qty. 520,560 battery cells

The last 10% design stage was as follows:

10% Design Stage:

48 MW - 4 Hour System

Total Qty. 69 of the CEN 20' Containers

Total Qty. 690 of Samsung E5S battery strings Total Qty. 8280 battery modules Total Qty. 496,800 battery cells

4. Battery transportation – how can battery cells be protected in cardboard boxes on their long journey here from South Korea and how long does it take to install 1,043,280 battery cells in 69 containers. I don't believe the statement that installation will "occur immediately upon arrival." How long does it take to install battery cells in just one container? You say battery cells will be inspected during manufacturing but damage to any one cell (all it takes to start a thermal runaway fire) can happen in any step of the process from boat shipment, to the truck loading and shipment and during the installation process. When installing, does the installer inspect each battery cell?

The battery modules are transported in individual non-conductive casing (formed from cardboard), strapped to pallets inside ISO shipping enclosures, designed for water tight transport across the sea. The packaging restricts motion and prevents any module from touching another module. Installation of batteries in one enclosure requires roughly one day. Multiple construction teams can install multiple enclosures simultaneously and the project schedule allows contingency for adverse weather and shipping delays, maintaining the integrity and ambient conditions required for battery health. The batteries are packed tightly and the only way for damage to occur in shipment is via collision with an external object. Detailed inspection of the container and module casing upon arrival ensures that only undamaged modules are installed. Other commissioning steps review the status of key parameters (temperatures, voltages, and functional sensors) prior to connection to other parts of the plant or the grid. The BMS communicates with every cell. Any abnormalities result in repair or replacement.

5. It is frightening to hear you talk of cell failure as an "unfortunate reality." This unfortunate reality is what leads to fires so please go into detail with what exact mitigation measures you will use to stop fires. Please provide details on the "different approach to hazard mitigation" you mention. How does it differ from what you stated in the Conditional Use Permit Application? What is the exact firefighting suppressant you intend to use and how is this applied in the battery containers? You indicate the battery containers are not occupiable and first responders do not open any of them. How do the containers vent the toxic gases that build up in a thermal runaway fire?

The containers include self-contained fire suppression that can address both non-battery electrical fires (via conventional suppressant) and battery fires via direct injection of clean agent fire suppressant into the cell on fire. The solution has been tested by UL and found to fully suppress a fire internal to the battery enclosure. Fires external to the enclosure are mitigated by first reducing combustible load, and then through conventional firefighting measures.

6. Maps – you did not include any new maps as requested and some of the distance measures may be inaccurate as you are using a cut off version of the original map when the facility still had the left arm area that was close to Rancho San Marcos.

The maps previously provided are as accurate as possible, using the ruler feature on Google Earth Maps. The boundary on the left side of the map indicates the location of the access road from Hwy 14 to the facility's entrance.
Images are provided again as an attached zip folder.

7. Substation photo -- not sure why you have to wait for a future meeting to provide this. When is the meeting to occur?

Representative substation photo provided on August 11. A higher resolution file is included in this response.

8. Proposed high voltage transmission line and H-frames -- you dropped out this entire question from my July 9th email in your recent response so I repeat it below:
Please provide a photo of the proposed high voltage transmission line and its supporting H-frames. I believe these are to be 40' to 50' (one place said 50') with structural spans of 250 feet. What is the correct measurement for these? How many support structures (H-frames) will be used to cover the run of the line stated to be 2.3 miles in one section and 2.4 miles in another section? Believe you indicated 10 poles per mile. I assume the H-frames are different than the poles, so how many of each will be used?

Response provided on August 11.

Photo is representative of what would be anticipated for the transmission line.

What is the correct measurements for these?

- 50' H-Frame structures with an average span of 376 feet.

How many support structures (H-frames) will be used to cover the run of the line stated to be 2.3 miles in one section and 2.4 miles in another section?

- 31 H-Frame structures for the 2.3 miles.

9. Why is the high-voltage transmission line not buried underground to avoid the huge fire risk of transmission lines? Many of California's biggest fires were caused by transmission lines to they have started burying them.

Fault detection: for overhead lines, the detection and clearance of a fault is readily discernable while it is very difficult to detect and clear the fault in underground cables.

Line life expectancy is over double for overhead vs underground.

10. HVAC to Dual Compressor Chiller Units - please advise why you went to these units over the HVAC units.

What specific type of glycol (you mentioned glycol but I believe you meant glycol) you intend to use in the chiller units?

Will these be a closed-loop design?

How many gallons of water does each chiller unit hold and how many chiller units will be required for the 69 40' containers?

Will you be using distilled or reverse osmosis purified water or municipal water in the chiller units?

How and how often will the chiller units be monitored for leaks which happen in even a closed-loop system?

When the chiller units leak how are you going to prevent the glycol from entering the groundwater?

How will you continuously monitor the ratio of glycol to water in each chiller unit to make sure the 50% is being maintained?

How and how often will the chiller units be monitored for corrosion?

How will the chiller units be pre-cleaned?

How will the chiller units be filtered to prevent corrosion?

States, counties and cities have different regulations regarding the use of glycol to protect water tables, drainage and disposal of fluids. Have you contacted the state and county regarding any regulations for these chiller units to ensure compliance with the regulations?

What other AES BESS facilities have used the chiller units instead of HVAC units? Please specify those facilities, how long they have been running and where they are located?

Many battery suppliers have discontinued air-cooled battery modules and packs. Liquid cooling can enable more uniform temperatures throughout a bank of batteries, which helps balance voltages (allowing for more consistent use of the full energy capacity) and improve lifetime. Liquid cooling has demonstrated additional safety features in some batteries as well (reducing the potential for thermal runaway propagation). Importantly, the integration headaches with early liquid cooled systems have largely been sorted out with the recent generation of batteries - leaks are no longer a concern.

These are closed-loop systems. The coolant is specified as a 50-50 water-ethylene-glycol mixture.

Each 40' enclosure utilizes roughly 65 gal of coolant.

The mixture is shipped to site and not mixed on-site. Pressure and flow rates are monitored continuously - this data is available multiple times per minute.

The EPA says "Ethylene glycol may be discharged into wastewater from its production and use." - <https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2016-09/documents/ethylene-glycol.pdf>

However, AES first response can include dry absorbent spill kits.

Glycol and water form a solution; the mixture does not separate.

Annual maintenance includes inspection of the enclosure and ancillary gear to monitor for defects and degradation, like corrosion.

I'm not aware of any pre-cleaning for the chiller units.

Filtering provisions are source from the chiller manufacturer.

Relevant government-issued permits address the specific technology and equipment specified at these plants.

AES and its affiliates have been operating liquid cooled energy storage systems since 2019. These are located in the US in CA and NY, Chile, and several locations in Europe.

11. Sound level of chiller units – at 70dB you are now above what you stated in your Conditional Use Permit Application for the 60 dB for the HVAC's. Have you filed an amendment with the County to increase the dB level above what was stated in your Application?

Updates to the CUP Application will be provided to the County, accordingly.

12. With the increase in the dB level for the chillers, it is important that you answer all the other dB level questions I asked in my letter of July 9th so we can look at the overall dB for the facility with all the other equipment that will be emitting sound.

Responses provided on August 11.

Chiller db:

The units now forego HVAC in favor of chillers to supply liquid coolant directly to the battery modules. These units operate near 70 decibel (dB), which is similar to a dishwasher. At 15 meters the sound attenuates to less than 50 dB, very faint – similar to moderate rainfall.

Inverter db:

The project will have approximately 25 solar inverters, which are dispersed throughout the facility. The project will also have approximately 19 battery storage inverters.

Inverters have a sound that can be characterized as a low hum. At 15 meters have a decibel (dB) level of 61, which is similar to a normal conversation. At 50 meters the sound attenuates to 50 dB, very faint – similar to moderate rainfall. At 200 meters the sound attenuates to 44 dB, which is a very low perceptibility.

Transmission db:

During relatively dry conditions, High voltage transmission lines emit noise levels of 40 to 50 dBA in close proximity to the transmission line, such as at the edge of the right-of-way. In many locations, this noise level is similar to ambient noise conditions in the environment. Depending on conditions, wet weather could cause levels to increase to 50 to 60 dBA.

Transformer db:

Transformer 115MVA

High Voltage (H): 115kV, 550kV BIL, 1200A
continuous (minimum)

Typical noise level(Max): 73 dbA

13. Panels – since you have changed about everything else in the project, how many solar panels will be used on the entire site and what is their size and height in various positions?

Project refinements are made as part of design development. Panel numbers may change as part of final design. The current design includes 205,712 panels, which are 2,278 x 1,134 x 35 millimeters. Module and distance presented are subject to further refinement as part of design development. Assuming the currently proposed panels in the 30 percent design are used, the distance from the ground to the highest point of the solar module at maximum tilt (52 degrees) is approximately 8 feet.

14. Power – glad to hear you will have UPS systems but you only say AES BESS systems can be equipped with black start capabilities to enable self supply of auxiliary power in the event of an outage. Why don't you confirm that the facility will be equipped with these capabilities?

Where are the UPS systems located and are these battery back ups or some other technology?

You mention “wide temperature swings (while not desirable for battery longevity) are acceptable and pose no hazard when the batteries are in shutdown” but what if the batteries have not been shutdown by the Battery Management System before these temperature variations occur? The previous Battery Management Systems in your Arizona facilities did not function properly during the thermal runaway events there with only 3,000 battery cells in your Chandler, AZ facility as compared to the 1,043,280 battery cells you intend to use here -- why should we trust that these systems will work when you are monitoring such an incredibly exponential number of battery cells here?

AES incorporates backup power procedures into our storage sites. We confirm this. The UPS systems are located inside the battery enclosures (traditional data center style UPS systems). The BMS have been tested and confirmed for this operation. The events occurring elsewhere were not the result of poor performance of a BMS and those lessons learned have been incorporated into other subsystems: enclosure design, mitigation design, and mitigation procedures. We don't trust that those systems work - we rely on multiple layers of safety in which the BMS is a first line of defense (not the last).

15. Construction Waste Management – you say “These are not anticipated release of liquid hazardous waste.” I don’t trust when people insert “anticipated” into any statement so you can just say we did not anticipate this when it happens. This statement is in direct conflict with what you have stated on page 2-5 of the EIR when you say, “Most of the hazardous waste generated during construction will consist of liquid waste such as flushing and cleaning fluids and solvents.” Your EIR needs to be amended officially with the County to reflect what you are now saying or your current ERI information allows you to have hazardous liquid waste which cannot be permitted due to the contamination of groundwater when we are on wells in neighboring communities.

Please recognize that there is a difference between a release of hazardous waste and hazardous waste generated as part of construction. As stated, releases during construction are not anticipated, and any such release would be incidental (e.g. drips) and would be immediately cleaned up and disposed of in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations.

16. Hazard Mitigation Analysis – surely you prepared, at minimum, a Hazard Mitigation Analysis for the site when you chose the site so this should be provided to the County at this time. And now that you have chosen a new battery cell, battery containers and the chiller units why would you not have this Hazard Mitigation Analysis for these products? It makes no sense for the County to provide any review or approval of your Conditional Use Permit Application without complete information on what hazards and mitigation strategies AES would have already had to research. Why would you withhold this information from the County at this time? The County absolutely needs this information to properly evaluate and assess the dangers of this facility and would be remiss if they did not ask you for these documents before evaluating your Application.

We want to know if your Hazard Mitigation Analysis has the natural gas line that runs along the boundary of Eldorado and has a gas regulating station that comes up above ground about 150 feet from residences on the west end. A gas company representative told us the regulating station with rubber gaskets that could be damaged in a fire and stop regulating the gas flow would cause an explosion at this site. On your list of companies that you contacted we see no mention of the Gas Company. Did you contact the Gas Company to discuss where the gas lines are in the area and any possible hazards if a fire should sweep the area?

AES does create the HMAs and has no intent to operate ESS without one. AES is prepared to share any and all details of our HMAs. This enclosure is a derivative design of enclosures deployed by AES for the previous 6 years. All changes have been documented and the final HMA will be available prior to any construction.

A crossing consent will be obtained from the Gas Company for the gen-tie crossing.

17. UL 9540A tests for the cells, module and unit level tests – you have confirmed you have these and we have asked the County to get involved to request this information which you must supply to the fire department and as you have them now, you should provide them now. Your Application should not be reviewed without these safety details.

Comment noted. Responses are being provided to the County, as appropriate.

18. All the missing water and dB level questions in my letter of July 9th – please provide the date you will deliver this very important information.

Responses provided on August 11.

19. When looking back at the San Marcos video of the meeting you had in the fall, a Matthew from AES said you were completing an analysis of property value studies from a national firm and a local firm and it would be part of your Application. Please provide this analysis from these firms.

A property values impact study was performed by Kirkland Appraisals, LLC in February, 2023. A professional opinion states that the solar farm proposed at the subject property will not be injurious to or diminish the use, value and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity.

The study, along with additional project information is available on the project website as a downloadable PDF - <https://www.aes.com/new-mexico/project/rancho-viejo-solar>

20. High winds – You mention requirements for high wind periods. What are those guidelines and at what wind speed (mph) would you stop work as you mention during construction? We have so many wind advisory and red flag days here that this could push your construction time frame considerably.

Requirements for stopping work during high wind periods would be identified in coordination with New Mexico Environmental Department (NMED), Air Quality Bureau.

21. Please provide your wind upload analysis for the panels due to our high wind conditions in this area.

AES hired a third party consultant to conduct a wind and snow load study analysis. These results have been incorporated into AES 30 percent structural design.

22. The two black and white map diagrams on your website of the facility look like they have different boundaries to the right between the two. The first one shows the C-106 and c-109 sections to the right and then a boundary line. On the diagram below it you don't see the site boundaries or it is right up to the panels? Also on the Legend the section that has the crosses design that are supposed to denote the prairie dog colonies but this same symbol seems to be used in the pond areas, why is that? The unusual shape above Pond C1-A and the triangle shape above Pond C2 have similar markings – horizontal marks – that do not seem to appear in the Legend. What are the symbols in those shapes supposed to represent? These diagrams have no dates on them. When were they done? Do you have any updated site plans?

Updates to the site plan will be provided to the County, accordingly.

23. You mention in the EIR, that construction work could be done on Saturdays. Your Conditional Use Permit Application has removed mention of Saturdays. Which is correct?

The typical construction work schedules are included in the EIR.

24. Understand the greatest damage to solar panels from all weather events is actually hail which we certainly have here. Is the system designed to change the panels into a different position quickly in the event of a hail storm to minimize damage? Saw that all panels in a solar farm in Nebraska were completely destroyed recently.

Based on the Swiss Re CatNet report this facility is in an area with a very low risk of hail, thus a severe hail storm is not expected. However, the facility can have a procedure to pre-emptively manually stow the arrays to protect against hail based on forecast of severe convective storm where hail is expected. Also while hail may be prevalent in that part of New Mexico as indicated by the comment the size of hail stones are small, thus the low hail risk identified by the Swiss Re.

25. IRB – have you received or applied for an Industrial Revenue Bond from the County for this facility? What are the details on this IRB?

AES has not yet applied for an IRB from the County for this facility. This application would occur following the acquisition of the CUP.

26. Battery Management System (BMS) – how is the BMS connected to the battery modules – over the internet or on an icloud platform? Our internet service here is very unreliable. What happens to the BMS when it goes down? How is it protected from security/hacking concerns?

BMS will have UL approved ethernet cables connecting container BMS to site controls. AES works with plant construction teams to select proper shielding and armoring (in addition to conduit protection) for all cables deployed throughout the site based on environmental conditions such as soil corrosivity and animals. Internet is often sourced via fiber connections and backed up with cell connections. When a portion of the BMS is offline, plant controls issue a shutdown to the affected power blocks. PCS do not operate without data from the BMS, which is maintained live via "heartbeat" signals that ensure data is representative of a live connection to the source.

27. Battery Cell Cycling – how are the battery cells to be cycled? What is the planned Depth of Discharge (DOD)? If it is limited, what percentage is the DOD limited to?

The batteries are able to cycle many times each day, but our expectation is that the best use for this plant will be 1-2 cycles per day at a depth of discharge of approximately 80%. The DOD is unlimited and available between 0% and 100% chemical state of charge.

28. Are there any other changes you have made to the system that I have not asked about?

Project refinements are made as part of design development.

29. Please provide a list of any changes you have made in the facility that differ from what you submitted in your Conditional Use Permit Application and any underlying attached documents you provided as part of your Conditional Use Permit Application.

Updates to the CUP Application will be provided to the County, accordingly.

1. Thanks for providing the photo/diagram of the substation but these images as well as the transmission line photo are not high enough resolution to read. Can you please provide a higher resolution image of these?

Higher resolution images are attached.

2. Thanks for the measurements of the H-frame. In addition you mentioned that there were ten poles per mile so I assume these poles are different than the H-frames? If so, please advise with the number and height of poles that will be used in addition to the H-frames.

The current design includes 31 H-frame structures.

3. We still need to know the dB level of the 72 tracker motors that will be at the site. What is the individual dB level of each and what is the combined dB for 72.

Trackers are powered by quiet 2 HP motors that power up to 32 trackers, which is about 703' E/W distance powered by 1 ATI tracker motor.

4. We are glad to see that AES nor your construction partners will be using well water at the site or drilling any wells on the property of the facility. We are now asking that you put these changes and any other changes you have made in information provided previously in your Conditional Use Permit Application or any attachments including the Environmental Impact Report in writing to the County in an Amendment to your Application so the amended information becomes the legally operable information for your Application.

Updates to the CUP Application will be provided to the County, accordingly.

5. Please confirm what water supply will be used to fight fires in the BESS.

Water supply will be identified in coordination with Santa Fe County Fire Department. Provisions for on-site water storage are available and may be applied to minimize disruption to neighboring communities.

6. Please confirm what water supply will be used for Operations and Management since you mention on page 2-5 of the EIR, "Water will be trucked to the Project site and will be sourced from local production wells."

Water may be acquired from the following offsite sources, or a combination thereof: Santa Fe County bulk water station commercial pipe water; Ranchland Utility Company Class A reclaimed water; Santa Fe County reclaimed water; or any other legally permitted commercial water sales.

7. This question from my July 9th letter was not included:

On page 3-1 of the CUP you mention a fire suppressant to be used but provide no specific information as to the suppressant. In the fall meeting you mention Novec 1230 but as we know this is a "forever chemical" along with other forever chemicals produced by 3M, for which it has just been fined \$10.3 Billion for polluting waterways and will no longer be manufactured by them by the end of 2025. The money from the settlement is to be used to build water treatment plants to try and remove the toxic chemical from the municipal water supplies but no one has a way to remove this from the wells they polluted. No "forever

chemical” or toxic chemical can be allowed to be used to contaminate our groundwater so I believe the Commissioners must ensure that the CUP is revised to specify this before any evaluation of the CUP can go forward.

In your latest response, you mention “The enclosures include self-contained fire suppression that can address both non-battery electrical fires (via conventional suppressant) and battery fires via direct injection of clean agent fire suppressant into the cell on fire.”

Please provide the exact details on what the conventional suppressant is as well as the clean agent fire suppressant to be injected directly into the cells.

You mention “Fires external the enclosures are mitigated by first reducing combustible load, then through conventional fire fighting measures.” Please explain what mitigation is used to reduce the combustible load and what conventional fire fighting measures include. If a chemical suppressant is used, please provide specifics and if water is used, what is the source of the water?

AES ESS apply FK-5-1-12 fire suppressant to mitigate propagation of thermal runaway in the enclosure. Based on independent assessment, AES finds this chemical poses no threat to the environment.

https://www.nist.gov/system/files/documents/el/fire_research/R0301570.pdf
"atmospheric lifetime of FK-5-1-12 to be on the order of 5 days or about one week"

"FK-5-1-12, like other compounds containing only the halogen fluorine, has an ozone depletion potential of zero"

"Both the direct and indirect GWP for FK-5-1-12 are less than one."

"Though FK-5-1-12 degrades rapidly in the environment, use as a clean agent requires that the material possess the chemical stability to remain unchanged throughout the working life of a fire protection system. Several factors need to be considered for their potential effects on an agent during handling, storage and use in a fire protection system."

A small aerosol fire suppressant (FirePro) is employed in the auxiliary electrical compartment of the enclosure (similar to what would be used in an industrial kitchen or even in a home). This poses no additional threat to the environment from what would already be present in the surrounding environment due to human occupation.

It has been listed by the EPA, UL, and California State Fire Marshall.

https://www.hochikiamerica.com/img/product/description/FirePro%20Xtinguish%20Datasheet_02-2017.pdf

The enclosures are designed to avoid paper and other easily ignitable products. The site and operations have been designed to enable low and regular maintenance, with defensible separation between enclosures and brush as well as regular brush removal. This minimizes the combustible load. Conventional fire fighting relies on on-site water. This water source is coordinated with local utilities

and may be trucked in and stored locally if unavailable on-site. This will be planned ahead of construction to minimize any disruption to the neighboring communities.

Dear Lisaida Archuleta,

It is vital for all city and county residents to be publicly informed of and understand the dangers of the proposed AES battery storage facility/solar farm with approximately 550,000 batteries in the middle of three large residential areas, the community college, elementary schools, the penitentiary, etc. AES has had three lithium-ion battery fires at their facilities within the last five years. These fires produce extremely toxic smoke, can cause explosions and cannot be extinguished. They must be allowed to burn themselves out, taking several days or even weeks. Sparks from these fires could easily start a wildfire that would spread rapidly in our windy climate. The hazardous chemicals in the smoke will go whichever direction the wind blows. Vast amounts of our priceless water must be used to cool adjacent areas. This water will be contaminated with “forever chemicals” (as will our land) and will seep into our aquifer. These kinds of incidents will likely cause evacuations or shelter-in-place orders for all the surrounding areas. The only way to evacuate the Eldorado area’s 2700 homes is to one road, Highway 285. Where would the residents go if they were even able to get to 285? Where would they send the prisoners from the state penitentiary? If a shelter-in-place order is given, you must close windows and doors and turn off any venting and air conditioning. Nobody would be able to survive that in the summer heat. These facilities are meant to last approximately 35 years, so multiple events are possible. AES has been fined over \$40 million for environmental damage and other violations. To me, that shows a lack of corporate ethical standards. AES will make lots of money while all Santa Feans will live with lots of risks. Lithium batteries are not safe and are definitely not “green.”

Our county fire departments are mostly staffed with volunteers. I appreciate the great work they do to protect us all. However, they are not equipped nor trained to handle this kind of major incident, nor is it fair to have them exposed to these dangerous toxins at extremely high levels. I have heard it would take them at least 20 – 30 minutes to arrive on scene, in which time major problems can occur. Who will be required to pay for the equipment and training needed?

The Sustainable Land Development Code (SLDC) contains many references to protecting citizens, the environment, conservation, high regard for the protection of individual property rights, minimizing environmental impacts, conserving natural resources, enhancing the quality of life and to promote the health, safety and welfare of the residents of the surrounding properties. Many insurance companies are drastically raising their rates because of the wildfire risks we already live with. Some are no longer doing business in the county. What will the dangers from this facility do to our premiums if we will even be able to get insurance? AES sent a report stating that this facility will not impact property

values in the area. I disagree. Would you want to live next to these potential dangers? I certainly do not want to live anywhere near this project and feel I am being forced from my home for my own safety because of bad decisions by our county leaders who should be doing their job to protect the residents and the environment. This project will also require a 2.5-mile-long high voltage power line to be built to connect to PNM. It will cross many residents' views and be visible from miles away, which does not protect the "scenic vistas" described in section 1.5-3 of the SLDC. We also know that these high voltage transmission lines can cause devastation, as seen in Hawaii.

I understand we need solar and wind power to avoid using fossil fuels for energy production and it can and **must** be done with safety as the first priority. This project is not in a safe nor reasonable location for protecting the residents and environment. I am very frustrated that the health and welfare of the residents and the environment are being ignored so that a big corporation can come to this county (and even the entire state) and destroy the livability of New Mexico. We need to have strong regulations that protect all citizens and the environment **before** allowing any of these kinds of installations to be approved.

I wonder if the appropriate due diligence is being done in researching the hazards of placing these extremely toxic batteries in the proposed location. I have read articles that state that lithium-ion batteries emit forever chemicals just by being "in use." It is even worse if they catch fire, experience thermal runaway and/or explode. I have attended most of the meetings regarding this project and have **not heard any** care, concern nor information from county representatives about the health issues (cancer, liver and kidney disease, fertility issues and many more) that residents in the surrounding areas will be exposed to. I am appalled that Santa Fe County is seriously considering locating this utility-scale monster anywhere near residential areas. New Mexico has millions of acres of empty land that would be much more suitable to locate this installation if it is deemed necessary at all, given that the forever chemicals will be dispersed at any location and cause great harm to any environment. Are any county representatives even thinking of these risks, the costs involved in cleaning up potential disasters from lithium batteries, the illnesses people may suffer from these toxic chemicals, not to mention the probable lawsuits from these dangers? Have residents been informed that there will be industrial revenue bonds to pay for this and that their property taxes will increase by unknown amounts?

I urge all Santa Fe County representatives to reject this dangerous utility-scale lithium-ion battery installation at the proposed location and hope they understand the irreparable damage that will unfold if it is allowed.

Sincerely,

Nancy Peterson, Eldorado resident

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Greg Shaffer
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2024 6:14 AM
To: Nina Beucler Rebstock
Cc: Dominic J. Sisneros
Subject: Re: proposed AES project

Ms. Rebstock,

Thank you for your email, which I have forwarded to the Case Manager working on the conditional use permit application, Dominic Sisneros.

Staff contacts for the project, information about scheduled public hearings at which you can also make your views known, and application material are available here, <https://www.santafecountynm.gov/growth-management/building-development/large-scale-renewable-energy-projects-2024/uaes>.

Sincerely,

Greg

Gregory S. Shaffer
County Manager
102 Grant Ave., 2nd Floor
PO Box 276
Santa Fe NM 87504-0276
Tele: 505.986.6200
Fax: 505.995.2740

From: Nina Beucler Rebstock <ninabeucler@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2024 3:01 PM
To: Greg Shaffer <gshaffer@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: proposed AES project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Shaffer,

I am writing today to urge you to reject the AES proposal to build an industrial scale power plant next to my neighborhood.

I support solar energy, but my husband and I live only one mile away from the proposed lithium -ion battery storage system. These battery farms have proven to be extremely dangerous, prone to explosions and fire. In a dry, windy climate such as ours, a fire in this facility could reach our home in approximately 3 minutes. An industrial facility such as this should be located in a remote area, far from existing neighborhoods. We are in alignment with the Clean Energy Coalition which supports the power of the local community, and seeks to develop renewable energy alternatives, including community-based solar and sustainable storage solutions.

We residents of Eldorado implore you to stand up to this threat to Santa Fe County, vote NO on this project, and insist that AES relocate this project to a more appropriate site.

Sincerely,
Nina Rebstock

Nina

bigpicturelonglife.com

Nina Beucler Rebstock
Nutrition Coach, Health Planner

"Let thy food be thy medicine, and thy medicine be thy food" Hippocrates

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Nina Beucler Rebstock <ninabeucler@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2024 1:23 PM
To: Dominic J. Sisneros
Subject: Proposed AES site

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Sisneros,

I am writing today to urge you to reject the AES proposal to build an industrial scale power plant next to my neighborhood.

I support solar energy, but my husband and I live only one mile away from the proposed lithium -ion battery storage system. These battery farms have proven to be extremely dangerous, prone to explosions and fire. In a dry, windy climate such as ours, a fire in this facility could reach our home in approximately 3 minutes. An industrial facility such as this should be located in a remote area, far from existing neighborhoods. We are in alignment with the Clean Energy Coalition which supports the power of the local community, and seeks to develop renewable energy alternatives, including community-based solar and sustainable storage solutions. We residents of Eldorado implore you to stand up to this threat to Santa Fe County, vote NO on this project, and insist that AES relocate this project to a more appropriate site.

Sincerely,
Nina Rebstock

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: patczeto@volitionwellness.com
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2024 3:44 PM
To: Dominic J. Sisneros
Subject: AES Project Concerns

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

November 22, 2024

Service by Email

Dear Dominic Sisneros, Santa Fe County AES Case Manager,

Reference: A Global energy company called AES has proposed to build a utility-scale lithium-ion battery facility just outside the city of Santa Fe in the center of three residential communities. They are proposing to build on 724 acres in what is currently zoned as a residential area less than a mile from homes in an urban-wilderness area of Santa Fe County. This facility would pose a significant risk of fire, explosions, and toxic chemicals, threatening our air, water, and our homes.

Please know that I support solar projects with proven safety records. I am concerned that the AES' project (size, location, poor track record, etc.) has not been sufficiently vetted by science and data to guarantee its safety for the residents of our County. AND, I am opposed to any massive solar/lithium battery storage facility **next** to residential communities. I believe the location of this industrial-sized plant poses significant danger and has a potential for dire consequences. It's a disaster waiting to happen.

Here are a few safety factors that scare me and that need to be addressed and considered further:

- In a case of an emergency evacuation, Highway 14 would be the only road available to handle emergency responders, vehicles and equipment, water tanks, community evacuations (penitentiary inmates, National Guard members, and Turquoise Trail community (Elementary school and the growing population of the Turquoise Trail area). Has anyone checked with Department of Transportation for input on the maximum traffic capacity of this Highway?

- The proposed project would be located in a rural area, where there would be less access to timely and sufficient emergency services should there be some type of malfunction resulting in a fire, explosion, toxic fumes, or gas leak. I understand that Santa Fe County emergency personnel indicated that it would take 20 to 40 minutes to get on the scene. Many Santa Fe firefighters are volunteers.
- The continued drought and climate change has further increased the risk of significant consequences should a malfunction occur. The devastating ramifications of wildfires are all too familiar. What safety measures are needed now? What County emergency plans are in place?

I do not believe enough research, answers, coordinated oversight and assessments have been provided to approve and build a utility-scale lithium-ion battery facility as proposed by AES. Bottom line: AES and this project are the wrong fit for Santa Fe! Thank you for your review and consideration of these points.

Sincerely,

Pat Czeto
1 Altura Road
Santa Fe, NM 87508

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Tony Ricketts <rickettsap@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 15, 2024 2:11 PM
To: Dominic J. Sisneros; Jordan A. Yutz; Alexandra Ladd
Subject: AES Rancho Viejo proposed battery storage facility

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dominic, Alexandra, Jordan,

I am a proponent of reducing greenhouse gasses and pollution from fossil fuel combustion, to do our part we have solar panels on our house and drive a plug-in electric vehicle.

However I have great concern about the utility-scale battery installation proposed next door to our property. We live close to the western edge of Eldorado, in the line of fire should a disaster happen at the proposed facility. The risks clearly outweigh any benefit.

I would recommend building the entire facility, or at least the battery storage component, far enough from dense population that firefighters would have time to set up fire breaks to protect our property and lives.

RISKS

Eldorado was designated at high-risk of wildland fire by the New Mexico Forestry Division's "2023 Communities at Risk Assessment Plan," it is prone to high winds, dry lightning, and often has desiccated vegetation so it is tempting fate to locate nearby a facility prone to starting fires. Although technology has advanced, BESS fires continue to happen around the world, 21 BESS failure incidents are listed in the BESS Failure Incident Database for 2023 plus 2024. Battery fires often spread from one battery container to others, and produce a plume of toxic fumes, while being notoriously difficult to extinguish often burning for 5 days or more. Residents exposed to the smoke are advised to shelter in place, but long-term consequences are unknown.

No battery fire I am aware of has jumped the fence, but what if it happens first at this proposed AES facility? In 2021 the Marshall Fire in Boulder County CO, started in part by a sparking transmission line, traveled with alarming speed and destroyed 1000 structures causing 2 billion dollars worth of damage before it was snuffed out by a chance snowfall. That could be a relevant case study for what might happen here. Who pays the 2 billion should something similar happen here?


If it happens, could Eldorado be evacuated efficiently? Is there a way to contact all Eldorado property owners? Our western half of the development only has 2 railway crossings to make it to route 285 and safety. Emergency vehicles would be trying to enter at the same time as everyone is trying to leave. Avenida Vista Grande and Avenida Eldorado would certainly grid-lock, how many properties and lives would be lost? Are there sufficient emergency personnel to fight a quick-moving grass fire, protect 1000 or more homes, and go door-to-door to ensure everyone evacuated safely? A practice evacuation would be instructive: I suspect the result would be horrifyingly chaotic, and made many fold worse by panic and smoke.

CLAIMED BENEFITS

Proponents of utility scale variable renewable energy facilities maintain it is vital to continue to build them to replace fossil fuels. However, US consumption of fossil fuels has stayed flat for the last 15 years. Deploying renewables rising to 20% of national supply has done nothing to reduce consumption of fossil fuels, so that claimed benefit cannot be part of the justification.

Fossil fuel energy consumption in the United States from 1985 to 2023

(in quadrillion British thermal units)



Furthermore, 100% renewable is a fantasy: a recent Cato Institute analysis concluded:

“The consensus is that grid instability and power cost increases will occur as renewable penetration increases, though there is no consensus on what level of renewable penetration will be the threshold of serious problems. ... Going well beyond the current 20% penetration of Variable renewable energy (VRE) sources like wind and solar is a risk, with skyrocketing electricity prices and grid instability as consequences.”

So fossil fuel use is flat, and although no one knows how much variable renewable energy is too much it is likely not that much more than we have now. So what is the driver for continuing to build facilities like the proposed AES one? Profit of course, this is America. There will be little or no local benefit as the power will go to the national grid. The landowner will profit and will benefit from trading the stored energy at times of higher electricity price.

Is the benefit worth the risks involved? In my mind the answer is a clear NO.

Tony Ricketts
40 Estambre Rd

Joel Yelich & Valerie Nye
71 San Marcos Loop
Santa Fe, NM 87508

November 8, 2024

Hearing Officer Hebert
Marilyn S Hebert
100 Catron St. & 102 Grant Ave.
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Dear Hearing Officer Hebert:

My wife and I live at 71 San Marcos Loop, Santa Fe, NM 87508 and directly share a border with the land to the north where the AES industrial energy project and road are being proposed. This property border is also the boundary of the San Marcos Community District. We are requesting to be an interested party with standing on any and all proceedings concerning this project. If this isn't the correct avenue for our views, please let us know.

Our position can be summarized with the fact that this effort goes beyond a simple solar installation and crosses the line into an industrial energy project. The 30 plus cargo containers with batteries should be located within industrial or similarly zoned property. These energy storage systems are designed to be located at a grid-tied site. Many industrial sites exist with grid ties under the correct and appropriate zoning. The SLDC states with regard to Rural Fringe where the proposal exists, "This zone also serves to protect agricultural and environmental areas that are inappropriate for more intense development due to their sensitivity." The size of this project is clearly inconsistent with the property's zoning classification along with its complexity, hazards and potential harm to the welfare of the area.

In addition to the zoning requirements, the project's construction period will cause a significant increase in particulate matter in the air regardless of mitigation efforts. The potential fire and water pollution risks are also serious concerns during such construction with or without the energy storage proposed and will continue once the project is complete.

Please deny this conditional use permit and let the parties find land with the appropriate zoning. AES Corporation is a Fortune 500 power generator with the experience and resources to find such property.

Thank you for your consideration,

Joel Yelich & Valerie Nye
home office 505-474-6680
mobile 505-490-3868

Joel Yelich & Valerie Nye
71 San Marcos Loop
Santa Fe, NM 87508

November 8, 2024

Hearing Officer Hebert
Marilyn S Hebert
100 Catron St. & 102 Grant Ave.
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Dear Hearing Officer Hebert:


My wife and I live at 71 San Marcos Loop, Santa Fe, NM 87508 and directly share a border with the land to the north where the AES industrial energy project and road are being proposed. This property border is also the boundary of the San Marcos Community District. We are requesting to be an interested party with standing on any and all proceedings concerning this project. If this isn't the correct avenue for our views, please let us know.

Our position can be summarized with the fact that this effort goes beyond a simple solar installation and crosses the line into an industrial energy project. The 30 plus cargo containers with batteries should be located within industrial or similarly zoned property. These energy storage systems are designed to be located at a grid-tied site. Many industrial sites exist with grid ties under the correct and appropriate zoning. The SLDC states with regard to Rural Fringe where the proposal exists, "This zone also serves to protect agricultural and environmental areas that are inappropriate for more intense development due to their sensitivity." The size of this project is clearly inconsistent with the property's zoning classification along with its complexity, hazards and potential harm to the welfare of the area.

In addition to the zoning requirements, the project's construction period will cause a significant increase in particulate matter in the air regardless of mitigation efforts. The potential fire and water pollution risks are also serious concerns during such construction with or without the energy storage proposed and will continue once the project is complete.

Please deny this conditional use permit and let the parties find land with the appropriate zoning. AES Corporation is a Fortune 500 power generator with the experience and resources to find such property.

Thank you for your consideration,



Joel Yelich & Valerie Nye
home office 505-474-6680
mobile 505-490-3868

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Greg Shaffer
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2024 6:14 AM
To: Nina Beucler Rebstock
Cc: Dominic J. Sisneros
Subject: Re: proposed AES project

Ms. Rebstock,

Thank you for your email, which I have forwarded to the Case Manager working on the conditional use permit application, Dominic Sisneros.

Staff contacts for the project, information about scheduled public hearings at which you can also make your views known, and application material are available here, <https://www.santafecountynm.gov/growth-management/building-development/large-scale-renewable-energy-projects-2024/uaes>.

Sincerely,

Greg

Gregory S. Shaffer
County Manager
102 Grant Ave., 2nd Floor
PO Box 276
Santa Fe NM 87504-0276
Tele: 505.986.6200
Fax: 505.995.2740

From: Nina Beucler Rebstock <ninabeucler@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2024 3:01 PM
To: Greg Shaffer <gshaffer@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: proposed AES project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Shaffer,

I am writing today to urge you to reject the AES proposal to build an industrial scale power plant next to my neighborhood.

I support solar energy, but my husband and I live only one mile away from the proposed lithium -ion battery storage system. These battery farms have proven to be extremely dangerous, prone to explosions and fire. In a dry, windy climate such as ours, a fire in this facility could reach our home in approximately 3 minutes. An industrial facility such as this should be located in a remote area, far from existing neighborhoods. We are in alignment with the Clean Energy Coalition which supports the power of the local community, and seeks to develop renewable energy alternatives, including community-based solar and sustainable storage solutions.

We residents of Eldorado implore you to stand up to this threat to Santa Fe County, vote NO on this project, and insist that AES relocate this project to a more appropriate site.

Sincerely,
Nina Rebstock

Nina

bigpicturelonglife.com

Nina Beucler Rebstock
Nutrition Coach, Health Planner

"Let thy food be thy medicine, and thy medicine be thy food" Hippocrates

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Nina Beucler Rebstock <ninabeucler@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 18, 2024 1:23 PM
To: Dominic J. Sisneros
Subject: Proposed AES site

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Sisneros,

I am writing today to urge you to reject the AES proposal to build an industrial scale power plant next to my neighborhood.

I support solar energy, but my husband and I live only one mile away from the proposed lithium -ion battery storage system. These battery farms have proven to be extremely dangerous, prone to explosions and fire. In a dry, windy climate such as ours, a fire in this facility could reach our home in approximately 3 minutes. An industrial facility such as this should be located in a remote area, far from existing neighborhoods. We are in alignment with the Clean Energy Coalition which supports the power of the local community, and seeks to develop renewable energy alternatives, including community-based solar and sustainable storage solutions. We residents of Eldorado implore you to stand up to this threat to Santa Fe County, vote NO on this project, and insist that AES relocate this project to a more appropriate site.

Sincerely,
Nina Rebstock

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Jordan A. Yutzy
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2024 3:29 PM
To: Dominic J. Sisneros
Subject: FW: AES lithium battery storage project

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

From: Phillip & Jacinta Kehoe <jcandptk@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2024 3:26 PM
To: Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: AES lithium battery storage project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Yutzy,

I am deeply concerned about the proposed AES lithium battery storage project.

My house is set approximately 1 mile from where this project will be in the northwest corner of Eldorado. I am wondering if you realize that those of us on this end of Eldorado have no quick escape route should one of these units break out in fire. One of the commissioners mentioned that we have four escape routes in Eldorado. Are you aware that if fire happens with the gusts of wind when 2,000 plus people are trying to scramble out those four exits, that we would all be consumed in smoke and fire because the traffic would not be moving very fast, if at all. As you know, this is not an unrealistic fear. AES has had several explosions at their sites over the last few years, even though they claim that their facilities are safe. I don't want to live in an area where people's lives are taken for granted.

Do you realize how strong the winds can be out here? On average, that is, a mild day, the winds are about 10 mph. However, during the spring months, and even in the rest of the year, we can have wind gusts as strong as 30-50 mph. It would be a very sorry day for us all if an explosion occurred at the AES facility whether or not it happens on a day when the wind is blowing, especially if it comes in strong gusts.

I urge you to deny AES the ability to build a lithium battery storage within Santa Fe County, especially so close to Eldorado, Rancho Viejo, and San Marcos homes.

Jacinta Hart Kehoe
71 Camerada Loop
Santa Fe, 87508

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Dayna, CEC <cleanenergycoalitionsfc@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2024 8:35 AM
To: Dominic J. Sisneros
Cc: Alexandra Ladd
Subject: In opposition of the AES Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dominic,
Please add this letter to the record in opposition of the AES project:

Commercial Solar vs Utility-Scale Solar

The AES Corporation's proposed Rancho Viejo BESS (Battery Energy Storage System) to be sited just a couple miles south of Santa Fe City is trying to use loopholes in the county codes by calling their project "Commercial" Solar rather than what it really is: a Utility-Scale energy project—a fact admitted to in District Court by their own expert. They are doing this to push through an approval with a CUP (Conditional Use Permit) — the same process used to approve things like a simple retail store, like the Dollar General recently built just off the 285 Highway.

The Commercial Solar designation is used for businesses such as libraries, retail stores, ranches, and even the National Guard solar installation along Hwy 25. The energy these solar projects generate is used for their own power needs. They may have a small amount of batteries to store some of the energy they generate but, again, this is primarily for their own consumption.


In contrast, AES plans to have 570,000 dangerous lithium-ion batteries. That's significantly more storage capacity than needed for the energy produced by their solar panels. Their plan is to pull power off the PNM grid when demand and rates are low and sell it back to us at a profit when demand and rates go up. Most of us agree that we need to transition to renewable energy. But this project is a wolf in sheep's clothing as it's not really about renewable energy at all but a cynical attempt to make massive battery money machines look like they're good for the environment when they in fact a threat to both the environment and the Santa Fe community.

So while AES tries to squeeze a square peg into a round hole, residents are rightly concerned about the serious risks and consequences from a battery storage facility of this size being located so close to their homes and schools. They're angry with AES for putting corporate profits above their health, safety and the general welfare of Santa Fe citizens — and they are wondering who will protect them. Signing the CEC petition at <https://cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org/petition/> at least helps them feel heard. And many plan to attend the first two hearings on December 4th and February 3rd, both scheduled for 9:30 am at the Santa Fe Convention Center. (Dates and times are subject to change by the County).

In the meantime, since we aren't allowed to talk with our County Commissioners about this project (as they will likely be voting on it at some point), there's no way for us to know what their thoughts are about all this. As the community liaison for the Clean Energy Coalition for Santa Fe County, that leaves me fielding neighbors' fears and repeated questioning, "Why isn't the County looking out for us?"— Well, here's hoping our five County Commissioners read this, hear us, and realize that this project is simply not needed or appropriate for Santa Fe.

Dayna Matlin lives in Eldorado at Santa Fe and volunteers on the CEC steering committee, serving over 1,000 members of The Clean Energy Coalition for Santa Fe County.

It's going to take a village to win this fight!



Justin S. Greene
Commissioner, District 1

Anna Hansen
Commissioner, District 2

Camilla M. Bustamante
Commissioner, District 3



Anna T. Hamilton
Commissioner, District 4

Hank Hughes
Commissioner, District 5

Gregory S. Shaffer
County Manager

July 24, 2023

BY EMAIL AND REGULAR MAIL

Dennis Kurtz, President
The San Marcos Association
PO Box 722
Cerrillos NM 87010
Email: dennisdkurtz@gmail.com

RE: Commercial Solar Energy Production Facilities

Dear Mr. Kurtz:

I am writing in response to your January 3, 2023, letter to Santa Fe County (County) Commissioners and communications from other community members requesting that (1) the County impose a moratorium on commercial solar energy production facilities and (2) develop regulations to treat commercial solar energy production facilities as a Development of Countywide Impact (DCI) under Chapter 11 of the Sustainable Land Development Code (SLDC). Based on the following, County staff does not support these requests at this time.

First, there is no basis in existing County planning documents to treat commercial solar energy production facilities as a DCI. Neither the SLDC nor the Sustainable Growth Management Plan (SGMP) identifies this use as a potential DCI.

The SGMP has an entire element (Chapter 7) concerning renewable energy and energy efficiency premised on the following:

Energy sources which are not renewable, such as fossil fuels, are not only in limited supply but they contribute detrimentally to the environment, and adversely affect the sustainability of the economy. Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions contribute greatly to climate change and its negative impact. The implementation of renewable energy and energy efficiency initiatives are vital to sustainability for the County. The SGMP sets forth policies to establish Santa Fe County as a model in the efficient production and use of renewable energy and energy self-reliance through the development of a local green workforce and renewable energy infrastructure.

Second, notwithstanding the above, the SLDC already goes into a significant detail regarding permissible, prohibited, and conditional use locations of commercial solar energy production facilities and contains safeguards to ensure that specific concerns with these facilities can be addressed in almost all instances. In those zoning districts where commercial solar energy production facilities are potentially allowed, they are, with limited

exceptions, a conditional use.¹ The approval criteria for conditional uses also ensure that general health, safety, and welfare concerns, as well as specific fire and other hazards, can be addressed, as follows:

4.9.6.5. Approval Criteria. CUPs [Conditional Use Permits] may only be approved if it is determined that the use for which the permit is requested will not:

1. be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the area;
2. tend to create congestion in roads;
3. create a potential hazard for fire, panic, or other danger;
4. tend to overcrowd land and cause undue concentration of population;
5. interfere with adequate provisions for schools, parks, water, sewerage, transportation or other public requirements, conveniences or improvements;
6. interfere with adequate light and air; and
7. be inconsistent with the purposes of the property's zoning classification or in any other way inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the SLDC or SGMP.

In addition, the SLDC empowers the Planning Commission (and Board of County Commissioners on appeal) to “[i]mpose such reasonable standards, conditions, or mitigation requirements, in addition to any general standard specified in the SLDC or the SGMP, as the Planning Commission may deem necessary.” [SLDC, Section 4.9.6.6.]

County staff believes that these approval criteria and the authority of the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners (on appeal) to impose reasonable standards, conditions, or mitigation requirements are adequate to address any bona fide safety or other concerns related to approval criteria that may be demonstrated by competent evidence introduced at public hearings on conditional use permits.

Further, conditional use permits require hearings before the Hearing Officer and Planning Commission, as well as the Board of County Commissioners (if the Planning Commission’s decision is appealed to it). These hearings allow members of the public to both educate themselves concerning commercial solar energy production facilities as well as voice their concerns regarding such facilities.

The record created during the review and decision on conditional use permit applications for commercial solar energy production facilities could change County staff’s perspective. But, at this time, for the reasons stated above, County staff does not support

¹ According to the use tables within the SLDC, there are already many areas where commercial solar energy production facilities are prohibited. The only zoning districts where commercial solar energy production facilities are a “permitted use” are Industrial General and Industrial Light (and, potentially, Planned Development Districts). Further, each community district has restrictions on where commercial solar energy production facilities may be located. As one example, commercial solar energy production facilities are not permissible within any zoning districts of the San Marcos Community District.

Dennis Kurtz
July 24, 2023
Page 3 of 3

either a moratorium on commercial solar energy production facilities or regulating such facilities as a DCI.

Thank you for your January 3 letter. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss County staff's views on these matters further.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gregory S. Shaffer', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Gregory S. Shaffer
County Manager

cc (by email):

Penny Ellis Green, Growth Management Department Director
Lisaida M. Archuleta, Growth Management Department Deputy Director

Dominic J. Sisneros

From: Hank Hughes
Sent: Friday, March 1, 2024 2:09 PM
To: Gabriel C. Bustos; Penny Ellis-Green; Emma Felt; Greg Shaffer; Dominic J. Sisneros; Dominic J. Sisneros
Subject: FW: AES

For the file.

Hank Hughes
Santa Fe County Commissioner, District 5



From: Linda Barlow [mailto:lindabarlow5@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 1, 2024 12:55 PM
To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: AES

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners,

I'm very concerned about the lack of critical public safety planning and a seemingly lack of concern for residents living near the proposed AES environmental nightmare. Must corporate greed always win?

I'm writing to request that the Board of County Commissioners expressly adopt Annex G of the 2023 edition of National Fire Protection Association Standard 855 (NFPA 855) as a mandatory requirement for Santa Fe County. This appendix, titled "Annex G - Guide for Suppression and Safety of Lithium-Ion Battery (LIB) Energy Storage Systems (ESS)," was the major change in the 2023 update to the 2020 edition of NFPA 855. The NFPA developed the 2023 edition to address the fire and other risks of battery energy storage systems that have become known since the 2020 edition of NFPA 855.

The reason for my request is that the County Fire Department appears to have interpreted the Board's December 2023 adoption of the 2023 edition as not including Annex G, since the Department is not requiring the Rancho Viejo Solar Project to comply with it.

Thank you.
Linda Barlow

Dear Jose Larrañaga,

La Candelas writes in response to AES Conditional Use Permit filing.

Most citizens are positive about solar energy, but careful consideration should always be given to large industrial projects. In the present case, the proposed use of 800 acres of open grassland adjacent to Highway 14, a designated Scenic Byway, is inappropriate in both scale and location.

We do not support projects like this one that mar the open landscape near the Turquoise Trail. We support a moratorium on industrial-scale solar projects in our area until public hearings can be held and appropriate regulations are established to satisfy both our need for electricity and our need to protect our open spaces.

In addition, the County must require solar panels on all new structures (including parking lot shade structures), and minimize the destruction of open spaces as is being proposed by AES.

Solar energy has its place on rooftops and appropriate commercial installations, but not on hundreds of acres of beautiful open prairie as AES proposes. We firmly oppose this project, based on its size and location.

Thank you for careful consideration regarding this important issue.

Respectfully,

Las Candelas De Los Cerrillos Board
Cerrillos - CO

Dear Mr. Larra,

We are residents of Eldorado and own our home on Tetilla Road, the front line of the lands where this solar array and lithium-ion battery storage are planned. The plan to place this kind of installation on this tract of land, firmly situated so close among established residential areas, is mind-boggling. A thermal runaway fire in this battery storage installation would decimate this entire area and do great damage to the city of Santa Fe and, in particular, our lives.

The known issues of how lithium-ion batteries can spontaneously combust cannot be ignored. AES Corp, being a global corporation, has no true interest in the community except how to sidestep our local concerns and build their for-profit installation. I'm sure they are a powerful entity to deal with, but if we don't tell them "NO" now, we and the city are the ones dealing with any bad fallout from their money-centered decisions.

I am not anti-capitalist in any way. But their company decisions don't have our best interests at heart. Hopefully Santa Fe city and county officials do.

New Mexico is filled with large land areas where this installation could more safely be placed. Please fight the Rancho Viejo installation on our behalf.

Cheers,
Nadine Huva
2 Tetilla Road
Santa Fe NM 87508
(713) 542-3230

Dear Jose,

I am writing to you concerning the AES Corporation Conditional Use Permit. I feel that this corporation should be granted "Developments of Countywide Impact" status. I feel that this status will allow this project to be considered on it's merits and avoid hyperbolic angst about fantasy issues. This recognized "Not In My Back Yard" tendency to resist change is understandable but misguided.

I personally have installed a photovoltaic array at my home and I feel that it is one of the best investments that I have made for myself and my daughter's generation.

Many people in our extended Eldorado community have environmental values. But when NIMBYism raises it's head it is small minded.

Please feel free to contact me if you like,

Frank Kilmer
Eldorado resident for six years
505 780-1203

Hi Jose,

I am writing to lodge a concern about the proposed large scale solar project that is being proposed in Santa Fe County.

I want to say that I am in favor of solar power, I have it installed on my home.

I understand that the large-scale lithium-ion batteries that are being proposed to be used with this project present a high potential of wildfire. This proposed solar installation is so close to several residential areas including ECIA – Eldorado, where I live. As you may be aware, Eldorado and the surrounding communities really has only one way out – 3 roads all heading towards Highway 285. If all 2770 homes and the many others that are not ECIA homes in the area tried to evacuate at the same time, it would result in a disaster.

Although I am on the board of the HOA here, I am not writing this as a statement for ECIA, rather as a concerned citizen.

Please do not approve this project until a less highly concerning storage containment system can be found and used instead. Or have this project moved to a location that is much further away from residential areas.

Thank you for your consideration,

Carol Sanguinetti
928-300-6013

Mr. Larranaga,

I would like to express my opposition to the AES Plan. My guess is they are paying some of our state reps who are sponsoring the bill to have local communities take over the power supply for their residents. Are they lining up for some of Biden's EPA dollars? It usually pays to just follow the money when these sort of projects come about. Solar power as well as wind are so unreliable and expensive that I do not wish to have my energy needs dictated by a group determined to be 100% sustainable. These solar fields are huge and ugly and inefficient. Let PNC and New Mexico Gas do what they know how to do without making life more expensive and unreliable for us all.

Thank you for taking the time to hear me out.

Kathleen McLean
30 Herrada Road
Santa Fe, NM87508

Here are my thoughts as a resident of Eldorado, living only about one and a half miles from the proposed solar project. I did see a presentation earlier this week that did put all the bits of information about the project together, so myself and others living here could get a better handle on the proposed project. I had many questions after I left.

The first is: with New Mexico being the 5th largest state with so much open land, why did they decide to put a very large “solar power plant” so close to where thousands of people live between San Marcos, Rancho Viejo and Eldorado when there are so many open locations around the state that have no humans living within miles of the facility? This facility is not being built to supply energy to these neighbors.

I have two thoughts that were ignored in this plan: first ... every action does have a reaction (and the proposed project does not seem to have thought through the reactions) and second ...there is the law of unintended consequences.

- As they would prepare the 1000 acres to build the “solar power project”, where is all the wildlife that has lived there for centuries to move? Or don't they care about burrowing owls, coyotes, jackrabbits, hawks et al? Eldorado homeowners are not permitted to have fenced in properties, yet the “solar project” will be fenced in so the wildlife will not have access to their traditional homeland.
- Are there going to be toxic chemicals used as AES prepares the land for the set-up of the solar panels? How long will these chemicals remain in the soil and make the possibility of wildlife returning to this land impossible? As they prepare the land, there will be a great deal of dust that is churned up. And with our frequent 20+ mph winds here in Eldorado blowing west to east, what will that impact be if the dust is contaminated with these toxic chemicals? Will we have to stay indoors so we do not have exposure to the chemicals? Who will be liable for these health hazards?
- Are the roads that AES intends to use to bring in all the construction materials (with the number of trucks and their weights) prepared to handle that amount of traffic and weight in addition to the normal traffic load or will new roads have to be built or existing roads reinforced (and who is responsible and pays for that)?
- As this Utility Scale Solar Power Plant gets up and running, there will be the need for fire protection, especially with the lithium-ion batteries (and so many of them that 69 storage units of 20' each will be required.) And where does this fire protection come from? A survey of all the local fire departments (paid or volunteer) report that they are neither trained for this type of fire nor have the equipment. Who pays so that they will be prepared?
- If there is a fire and living so very close to what might be the source of the fire, who pays for any damage to homes and property? Or, will residents be required to get expensive upgrades to their home owner and business insurances? With the Calf Canyon/ Hermit's Peak fire, which was started by the Forest Service, the federal government has taken responsibility,

though slow to get people “whole” again. Would AES take responsibility, or declare bankruptcy to avoid paying and leave one or more of these communities in ruin forever?

- At the end of the normal life of this Utility-Scale Solar Power Plant’s life, I was told that AES indicated that the 239,000 solar panels would become landfill and not recycled. Doesn’t that make this entire Project less attractive since it starts out “green”, but at the end of its life, it will be very un-environmentally correct? Who knows what will be “correct” in 35 years, but I can guess that a landfill will not be correct. Much cheaper for AES but a bad environmentally focused strategy.
- Finally, will the land be returned to open space, although potentially the land itself may remain toxic for generations to come?

These are just a few of my thoughts. It seems that AES has a short term view of the Project and hasn’t bothered to think through all the implications that will impact the residents for the next 35 years. I have already been here for 20 years so the thought of another 35 is questionable since I would be 108.

Thanks for “listening.”

Nancy E. Johnson

9 Avenida Casa del Oro

Santa Fe, NM 87508

505-466-1982 home

505-603-3588 cell

> Dear Friends,

>

> Although I am not highly informed, I have read just enough about this oversized project to recognize the VERY REAL dangers involved with so many thousands of lithium batteries stored in one place. The last thing New Mexico needs is anything that is such a huge FIRE RISK to our State. It is obvious that any fires that could start would be nigh impossible to contain or control, and thus could ENDANGER MILES of Santa Fe County.

>

> In fact, although I live in Eldorado, that feels too close for safety, and hundreds of homes and thousands of people stand in potential danger. The dangers of such a huge and unprecedented project in N.M. have NOT been transparently disclosed, but glossed over by the company that stands to profit from building this facility. It is difficult to trust profit-driven companies with our welfare and future.

>

> I do support small solar projects with proven safety data. The fact is, as I understand it, a project of this size is not sufficiently vetted by science and data to guarantee its safety for the residents of our County.

>

> Therefore, I distrust and oppose further development on this scale.

>

> Sincerely,

> A Concerned Citizen of Santa Fe County, Naima Shea

> 87508

>

>

> Sent from my iPad

I am definitely opposed to this project. Why?

It will be a fire hazard.

It will be a blight on the landscape.

It will be an environmental disaster.

It will destroy property values in the area.

It is not in keeping with Santa Fe's image as an historic tourist area.

It will only line the pockets of a few.

It will be disgusting.

It will be terrible.

Sincerely,

Brian Cassidy

24 Quedo Road

Santa Fe NM

87508

Jose Larra,

As a land owner in Rancho San Marcos, I am opposed to any massive development of a solar farm next to residential communities. Many factors have not been thoroughly addressed or answered by AES.

- 1) mitigating the potential of fire hazards from runaway lithium batteries- this is unacceptable to homeowners as well as our animals in my case my horses.
- 2) destruction of a known wildlife corridor- I have photos of burrowing owls within our development, evidence of prairie dog communities as evidenced by their dens, 250 animals have a symbiotic relationship to the Parker dogs based on utilizing the dens they make, peregrine falcons, redtail hawks also hunt in this area. Believe it would be useful for the county to utilize cameras and take the time to monitor the wildlife within this area, our HOA has documentation of mountain lions hunting in our development as well. Wildlife needs to be protected as part of a viable natural environment.
- 3) based on what AES provided very few jobs are created once the facility is up, in addition no answers have been provided as to the disposal of the used panels and batteries which needs to be addressed. In California they have built some of these farms on BLM land away from population centers which to me might be a better option as long as they address wildlife and the disposal of these panels and batteries in future.

The reason people live and come to Santa Fe County is for the natural beauty, culture and to appreciate a healthy environment and wildlife. I do not believe enough research and answers have been provided to give AES a green light for their project.

Thank you,

Kay Marshall
221 San Marcos Loop
Santa Fe, NM 87508
ekaym13@hotmail.com

Greetings. I hope this note finds all of you well.

I'm a newer resident of Eldorado at Santa Fe and learned about AES' plan for a large solar array with lithium-ion storage. **Though I'm a supporter of the project, what prompts me to write is a significant concern.**

My undergraduate degree is in mechanical engineering (Colorado State University, 1982), and my area of concentration was energy conversion and power systems. When I began college, the US was on the heels of the Arab Oil Embargo, and I chose to attend CSU because of their solar engineering courses and concentration. Because the market for solar heating and power had dried up with the expiration of federal tax credits in 1980, my first job after graduation was with Public Service Company of Colorado working on *conventional* power generation control.

With today's materials and technology, solar is very affordable, and here in New Mexico, it makes a great deal of sense to use the sun to generate power. That's why **I remain a fan of solar-powered electricity sources.**

My *concern* about this project is the lithium-ion **battery energy storage system (BESS)** and the possibility of **thermal runaway**. What many other residents and I want to know is whether AES is investing in the construction and maintenance of the proper safety systems. Please allow me to offer a few specifics here:

- Lithium-ion batteries are designed to operate safely in a relatively narrow range of temperatures. Typically, their ideal storage temperature is between 59 and 95° F. Obviously, our ambient temperatures often fall well outside that range. (https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Optimal-operating-temperature-of-Li-ion-battery-26_fig3_327966044)
- AES has not offered details about *which* Samsung SDI E5G battery modules it intends to use and the optimal operating temperature range of those. Samsung manufactures a wide variety of SDI E5G batteries. If AES were forthcoming about the specific battery model, citizens like me could determine from Samsung the operating parameters of those batteries. (See, for example, https://www.samsungsdi.com/upload/ess_brochure/Samsung%20SDI%20brochure_EN.pdf).
- Without ventilation and temperature control, large-capacity batteries are subject to overheating, which can cause thermal runaway. We've seen examples of this in laptop batteries, hoverboards, and electric vehicles. For a large power-storage facility, therefore, it's imperative to have a Battery Management System (BMS) that includes...
 - Ventilation and temperature control
 - Internal short-circuit detection
 - Sensors and control systems for detecting and managing cell temperature, current, and voltage, as well as charge balancing. (<https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/engineering/battery-management-system>)
- AES has not offered members of the public details about their planned storage facility. Instead, their Rancho Viejo project website provides a link to a generic fact sheet from the American Clean Power Association (ACPA). (<https://cleanpower.org/facts/clean->

[energy-storage/battery-storage/](https://www.aes.com/rancho-viejo-solar), accessed from the link <https://cleanpower.org/facts/clean-energy-storage/battery-storage/> found from the “Learn more about BESS technology and management here” button at <https://www.aes.com/rancho-viejo-solar>)

- The ACPA received nearly 99% of its 2022 funds from political action committees. Almost 75% of ACPA’s lobbyists have previously held government jobs. This gives the appearance of potential conflicts of interest. These lobbyists have connections to political donors and to legislators at the federal level. They are not accountable to the real people affected by projects like Ranch Viejo. (<https://www.opensecrets.org/orgs/american-clean-power-assn/summary?id=D000024034>)

In short, I have a difficult time supporting this project wholeheartedly at this time. **I ask that as Santa Fe County officials who represent and *are* accountable to us citizens, you require that AES release a detailed plan for its BESS, including its BMS**, and that they make it available to all of us in Santa Fe County. While clean energy, development, and the jobs and money they bring are sorely needed in our County and State, I implore you not to rush this project through without offering the public the technical details to make an informed decision about whether AES will in fact operate Rancho Viejo safely.

Thank you for your consideration. Please feel free to reply to this email or to call me at the number below.

With appreciation and best regards,

-----**Stace**



Stace (Stacey L) Williams (she/her)
InterActive Dynamics, LLC
+1 303-915-9434

Good morning,

We appreciate the opportunity to offer our thoughts and comments on the proposed AES Rancho Viejo Solar Project. On the surface, this project seems to be the right thing to do, as solar energy is responsible energy, and New Mexico has abundant sunshine.

However, we have concerns regarding this specific project for the following reasons:

- The scope of the project appears to be large. As such, the consequences of a malfunction could be significant.
- Since the proposed project would be located in a rural area, there would be less access to timely and sufficient emergency services should there be some type of malfunction resulting in a fire, explosion, or gas leak.
- The continued drought and climate change in our area further increases the risk of significant consequences should a malfunction occur. The devastating consequences of wildfires are all too familiar given last year's wildfires that resulted from prescribed burns.
- In addition to these potential threats to our personal safety and property, we are concerned that the cost of our homeowner's insurance policy will increase significantly due to our insurance company's perception that the risk of loss associated with our property has increased significantly.

We thank you for your time and consideration of our concerns.

Respectfully,

Claire and Stephan Dobyms
2 Lobo Lane
Santa Fe, NM 87508

Hello Mr. Larranaga:

I am a lifelong resident of Santa Fe and have lived in Rancho San Marcos for over 27 years. I chose this area because it is a quiet peaceful part of Santa Fe County. This rural area is also home to an abundance of natural wildlife native plants all of which have been here for hundreds of years. My ancestors have been in this part of New Mexico for 15 generations. The idea of putting a huge Solar Industrial Power plant in this area is completely foreign to the entire natural habitat. A power plant of this size should not be near heavily populated residential areas such as Rancho San Marcos, Rancho Viejo, Eldorado and the area around the Santa Fe movie studios. This plant not only poses a threat to the community populations but also the native flora and fauna of the area.

I am not opposed to solar energy or other alternative energy sources however, the location of this industrial sized plant is terrible planning on the part of Santa Fe County government, the AES company, and the property owners.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Paul V. Romero
19 Calle Maria N.
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87508

Dear Mr. Larranaga, Ms. Green and Ms. Romo:

We are writing to express our deep concerns about the plans to build the large solar power facility near Rancho Viejo on the Turquoise Trail Scenic Byway in Santa Fe County. It is our understanding that there will be a large lithium-**iON** battery storage facility at the site.

We live in the western most area of Eldorado very near the proposed AES project. From our information we understand that lithium-**iON** battery fires are very difficult to suppress, producing toxic gasses and groundwater pollutants. We **believe that** alternatives to lithium-**iON** storage batteries should be pursued to mitigate the impact that lithium batteries present relating to fire danger in the dry southwest. Our fire departments in Eldorado are volunteer staffed. The nature of a lithium battery fire would require new equipment and training in an area that has limited resources.

We believe that the plan to locate this array so near the Turquoise Trail Elementary and the growing population of the Turquoise Trail area as well as Eldorado and Rancho Viejo is a terrible and unwise idea. It is well known that lithium-**iON** battery storage can be volatile. Considering the chance of explosion, fire and groundwater contamination this plan seems to be completely out of touch with the safety and needs of our county and our state as a whole.

In addition to the huge fire danger we are also concerned about the impact on native wildlife and the natural beauty of this area.

We want you to seriously consider our concerns and we would invite you to contact us for further conversation.

Alice and Charlie Springer
36 Camerada Road
Santa Fe 87508
505-670-4731

Dear Jose,

Please find below my comment on the proposed Rancho Viejo Solar Project, for which AES Corporation has recently submitted a Conditional Use Permit to Santa Fe County.

STATEMENT BY CAROL BEIDLEMAN, ELDORADO OF SANTA FE RESIDENT, TO JOSE LARRANAGA, SANTA FE COUNTY, 2/20/23, REGARDING PROPOSED RANCHO VIEJO SOLAR PROJECT:

I would like to thank you for this procedural opportunity to share with Santa Fe County my serious concerns about the proposed Rancho Viejo Solar Project.

As a wildlife biologist who has dedicated my career to conservation and land stewardship, I am concerned about the world not taking the devastating effects of climate change seriously and urgently enough. I try to do my part to limit my impacts on climate change through the actions I take and choices I make, from the vehicle I drive to my rooftop solar panels. However, like all proposed solutions to environmental challenges, whether related to “forest restoration” or “renewable energy,” close scrutiny and careful evaluation is required before jumping on board.

When it comes to renewables, the devil is in the details. Of course we want to see more renewables in our energy portfolio, but proposed projects may have aspects that are more detrimental to the environment and/or neighboring communities than they are beneficial. Usually, it’s about the scale of the project and its location, but it can also be about the state or choice of technology. Utility-scale solar and other renewable energy projects can have high environmental and community costs, including destruction of wildlife habitat and scenic vistas and potential issues with fires and hazardous materials. Where utility-scale projects are proposed in proximity to residential neighborhoods, the public and our elected leaders must carefully vet these plans, first and foremost for safety reasons.

This is the case with this proposed 800-acre Rancho Viejo Solar project, whose partner company, AES, has just filed a Conditional Use Permit application with Santa Fe County. I am most concerned that this 96MW solar project is an industrial complex close to Eldorado where I live, which will include a large 48MW lithium-ion Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). This BESS will have 39 45’ semi-trailer size containers (AES has been changing this information) of lithium-ion batteries located just over a mile from the northwest edge of Eldorado, and will necessitate construction of a 40 to 50-foot-high power line half a mile from the northwest edge of Eldorado.

This solar project is massive; it would be the second largest in New Mexico. The number of solar panels for this project have now increased from 206,000 to 239,000. But, I am focused on this Battery Energy Storage System because BESS battery technology is vulnerable to runaway fires, explosions, and gas leaks, as has happened at two AES facilities in Arizona recently, and such an incident could cause a wildfire affecting our community and the surrounding neighborhoods. The suppression of fires at BESS facilities is technically very difficult, and neither the Turquoise Trail Volunteer Fire Department nor El

Dorado Fire & Rescue have the capability to deal with a fire involving these hazardous materials. Please see this recent NBC report on the risks of these BESS systems and about the firefighters seriously injured in one of these AES BESS facility fires (Surprise, Arizona): <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/exploding-problem-fires-sparked-lithium-batteries-are-confounding-fire-rcna65739>.

The December 2021 Marshall grassland fire in Boulder County, Colorado, burned just over 1,000 homes, at a cost estimated by the Boulder County Assessor's Office of \$2 billion. Eldorado has about 2,200 homes, mostly in juniper-savanna (grassland), plus the residences in the Rancho San Marcos and Rancho Viejo neighborhoods. All these Eldorado homes are situated just to the east of this proposed project, with the prevailing and strong winds coming out of the west from the proposed project area towards Eldorado. Should any fire start in this facility, all of Eldorado (and the other neighbors) will be at risk.

Here are the actions I am requesting Santa Fe County take. First, Santa Fe County can NOT allow this project in this inappropriate location; it belongs in an industrial area, not near residential neighborhoods. Second, Santa Fe County needs to put a moratorium on such utility scale renewable projects in order to first develop and implement regulations for these utility-scale projects. This especially applies to those with Battery Energy Storage Systems, and those between private landowners and private companies who stand to benefit greatly financially with no say by neighbors. The public MUST have direct input into these projects. Third, Santa Fe County should develop a strategic plan for where such projects might be appropriately located, with minimal impacts on residential communities and the environment. Lastly, I encourage Santa Fe County to focus instead on supporting and incentivizing plans for distributed rooftop solar on homes and businesses in our area, to help New Mexicans benefit directly from the sun that shines on us and reduce the need for utility-scale solar projects that can have negative consequences for our local communities and the environment.

Thank you.

Carol Beidleman

35 Tetilla Rd.

Santa Fe, NM 87508



Citizens for Resp

Unifying and Raising the

Name

Carol Beidleman

Email

beidlemanc@aol.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

When it comes to renewables, the devil is in the details. Of course we want to see more renewables in our energy portfolio, but proposed projects may have aspects that are more detrimental to the environment and/or neighboring communities than they are beneficial. Usually, it's about the scale of the project and its location, but it can also be about the state or choice of technology. Certainly anyone can do what they want to on their private land, within the law, but where utility-scale projects are proposed in proximity to residential neighborhoods then the public and our elected leaders must become engaged to vet these plans and ensure that the benefits outweigh the risks. This is the case with this proposed 800-acre Rancho Viejo Solar project, whose partner company, AES, will be filing a Conditional Use Permit application with Santa Fe County. I am most concerned that this project is an industrial complex close to Eldorado where I live, which will include a large lithium-ion Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). BESS battery technology is vulnerable to runaway fires, explosions, and gas leaks, as has happened at two AES facilities in Arizona recently, and such an incident could cause a wildfire affecting our entire community. Please do not allow this project in this inappropriate location.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from [West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy](#)

Name

Richard Martinez

Address (Optional)

58 Via Punto Nuevo
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

richard.martinez@sharpusa.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I feel the fire hazard of this project is to great and I would not want to see a big fire break out that we are not prepared to handle.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Name

Deena Joseph

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

deenajo16@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Devalued real estate, unpleasant views, health risks, etc.

There is so much land in NM that is not next to prime real estate to located a project like this.

Do not support.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.



Citizens for Respons

Unifying and Raising the Voice

Name

Mary Anne Schadler

Address (Optional)

476 San Marcos Loop
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

supayas@juno.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I built my home in Rancho San Marcos in 1993 on 15 acres of our beautiful and fragile desert with ever changing 360 degree vistas. This community development from its inception was designed to preserve this unique and irreplaceable environment. I've spent 29 years thoughtfully avoiding the "usual" things our society unwittingly but with good intentions has done and continues to do that have resulted in the extinction of animal and plant species, the endangered species list, the devastation of the bee and other populations, the horrific fires and other "natural" disasters we are still struggling to understand and mitigate, and consequences we don't yet realize.

I support "green" energy but these massive industrial solar installations are not "green". This proposed installation will at least damage and very likely destroy not only the reality of this unique area but the reality of my home, a hard won refuge fundamental to my mental and emotional well being, a huge portion of my financial well being, and a cherished slice of as close to natural and balanced an environment remaining in our world.

This area is our home. We must protect it as fiercely and thoughtfully as we protect our children and our families. We must insist on having the time and enough detailed factual information to understand the potential ramifications of this very significant influence on our present and our futures.

We must remember the consequences we are struggling with from prior "progressive" actions taken with too little foresight and understanding.

I respectfully ask that you, our allies in protecting our communities, do what you can to give us an opportunity to be smarter about the consequences of our actions, and decisions.

Sincerely,

MaryAnne Schadler, DVM

Santa Fe resident since 1984

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from [West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy](#)

Name

Marcia Morrow

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

snicks0332@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This is way too big a commercial project to be located in the middle of 3 major residential areas- Rancho Viejo, Eldorado, and Rancho San Marcos. This is an important piece of open space and one that should be protected as such for all the reasons listed in the petition above.

Sent from [West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy](#)

Name

Michael Rogers

Address (Optional)

2 Sombra Ct
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

opermann.mr@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This project, although necessary for sustainable energy, is slotted to be located in an area near to several thousand residents. This is a very important corridor for wildlife heading to and from the Galisteo Basin and acts as home for resident wildlife. The local fire departments (many volunteer) aren't trained or equipped to fight the type of toxic fires that are caused by the Lithium-ion battery storage units.

This project will negatively impact property values for those residents that neighbor the array and they will not benefit from the project. Please, don't let this go through. Thank you.

Name

Mark Young

Address (Optional)

47 Camerada Road
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

myoungeld@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Because we are very concerned about the potential risk of fire and explosion due to a “thermal runaway”. T We feel that this would degrade the quality of life for hundreds of area residents and negatively impact land values, property values, flora and fauna. To top that off,. currently there is no robust framework, nor are there regulatory requirements or standards in the US to evaluate health risks in case of Lithium-ion battery failure.

Additionally there is not the needed and trained Fire Departments to deal with such a potential fire. This will not benefits the Eldorado or other communities in any way!

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from [West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy](#)

Name

Ewan Young

Address (Optional)

1004 Calle La Resolana

Santa Fe, NM

87507

US

Email

ewan.young70@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 660-8097

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

what environments, fire, economical or other impacts /risks does this project pose to surrounding residence like myself?

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Sharon Key

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

sharonkey42@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I am extremely concerned with the potential for fire and chemical exposure. This proposed solar complex is much too close to homes and will be in a very dry area where a fire would easily, rapidly spread and would need to be responded to by local volunteer firefighters most likely lacking the specialized equipment and training needed to deal with lithium ion battery exposure. After learning of the past fires in similar complexes built by this same company in states such as ca and az, it seems that it would only be a matter of time for fires to occur here as well.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Kay Marshall

Address (Optional)

221 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

ekaym13@hotmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I own land Rancho San Marcos and own horses, also Burrowing Owls, Peregrine Falcons and Prairie Dogs live and hunt these very lands they are wanting to use for solar.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Name

Richard Martinez

Address (Optional)

58 Via Punto Nuevo

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

richard.martinez@sharpusa.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I feel the fire hazard of this project is to great and I would not want to see a big fire break out that we are not prepared to handle.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Deena Joseph

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

deenajo16@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Devalued real estate, unpleasant views, health risks, etc.

There is so much land in NM that is not next to prime real estate to located a project like this.

Do not support.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Mary Anne Schadler

Address (Optional)
476 San Marcos Loop
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
supayas@juno.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I built my home in Rancho San Marcos in 1993 on 15 acres of our beautiful and fragile desert with ever changing 360 degree vistas. This community development from its inception was designed to preserve this unique and irreplaceable environment. I've spent 29 years thoughtfully avoiding the "usual" things our society unwittingly but with good intentions has done and continues to do that have resulted in the extinction of animal and plant species, the endangered species list, the devastation of the bee and other populations, the horrific fires and other "natural" disasters we are still struggling to understand and mitigate, and consequences we don't yet realize.

I support "green" energy but these massive industrial solar installations are not "green". This proposed installation will at least damage and very likely destroy not only the reality of this unique area but the reality of my home, a hard won refuge fundamental to my mental and emotional well being, a huge portion of my financial well being, and a cherished slice of as close to natural and balanced an environment remaining in our world.

This area is our home. We must protect it as fiercely and thoughtfully as we protect our children and our families. We must insist on having the time and enough detailed factual information to understand the potential ramifications of this very significant influence on our present and our futures.

We must remember the consequences we are struggling with from prior "progressive" actions taken with too little foresight and understanding.

I respectfully ask that you, our allies in protecting our communities, do what you can to give us an opportunity to be smarter about the consequences of our actions, and decisions.

Sincerely,
MaryAnne Schadler, DVM
Santa Fe resident since 1984

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Name
Marcia Morrow

Address (Optional)
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
snicks0332@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.
This is way too big a commercial project to be located in the middle of 3 major residential areas- Rancho Viejo, Eldorado, and Rancho San Marcos. This is an important piece of open space and one that should be protected as such for all the reasons listed in the petition above.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Michael Rogers

Address (Optional)
2 Sombra Ct
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
opermann.mr@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.
This project, although necessary for sustainable energy, is slotted to be located in an area near to several thousand residents. This is a very important corridor for wildlife heading to and from the Galisteo Basin and acts as home for resident wildlife. The local fire departments (many volunteer) aren't trained or equipped to fight the type of toxic fires that are caused by the Lithium-ion battery storage units.
This project will negatively impact property values for those residents that neighbor the array and they will not benefit from the project. Please, don't let this go through. Thank you.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Charles Wright

Address (Optional)

96 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

ctw4155@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 490-3259

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This is an industrial scale power plant 1000 feet from a residential area. The battery energy storage system will have an experimental fire prevention system not tested at this scale and no fire suppression system. This is a dangerous proposition for several nearby communities.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

S Thompson

Address (Optional)

57 Camino Los Abuelos

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

thompson.online@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

The solar panels will cover a huge area within visible distance of our residential areas. It will be one big black hole, destroying any enjoyment of the environment.

The advantage is all for the developer without consideration for the surrounding environment nor the residents who live here and value our surroundings. (Why we chose to live here in the first place)

It's cheaper for energy companies to use our open spaces and agriculturally zoned land to take advantage of lower development costs.

It's cheaper for them and too costly to quality of life in the long run.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Leonard Burrows

Address (Optional)

214 Calle Galisteo

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

colesfishin@yahoo.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

My family lives in Rancho San Marcos and we enjoy the wildlife and panoramic views. We are also very concerned about fire issues. We are totally opposed to this massive solar farm. There is plenty of other land that doesn't impact so many people and animals.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Kristina Cetrulo

Address (Optional)

214 Calle Galisteo

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

cetrulo7@aol.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I live in Rancho San Marcos. I am deeply concerned about the impact this enormous solar farm would have on our land: financially, environmentally and physically.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Allison Peacock

Address (Optional)

117 SAN MARCOS LOOP

SANTA FE, NM

87508
US

Email
peacock.allison@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)
(505) 501-1285

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.
The fire danger exhibited by previous AES facilities is very concerning, especially due to the planned location. The two communities it will be built between have very little ability to fight fires, lacking in fire hydrants and insufficient fire fighting staff/resources. I am not against solar, I truly believe we need to use it as an energy source but this is not the right location for this facility. Please consider the lives, human and animal, that could be harmed by choosing this location.

Keep Me Informed
I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Cindy Fuqua

Address (Optional)
Santa Fe, NM
US

Email
cinfuq@msn.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.
Preserving wildlife and open views

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Kim Nitschke

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM

US

Email

kim.nitschke@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I would like residents to be better informed of the consideration to install a utility scale solar farm in the scenic byway corridor. Is this a good fit for our community. Is there any benefit to the local community given power generation could be located anywhere on the PNM grid. This needs to be transparent. Replacing fossil fuel power generation with renewables sources is an important issue but this must be measured against site location and potential hazards that adversely impact the local community.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Nate Gallo

Address (Optional)
Santa Fe, NM
US

Email
mulga.nc@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.
Climate resilience is imperative.

Keep Me Informed
I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Thomas Trezona

Address (Optional)
138 San Marcos Loop, Santa Fe, NM 87508
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
gerintrez@aol.com

Phone (Optional)
(505) 204-8336

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.
This solar power plant is huge and, as it is proposed, is to be located only 1000 feet from the RSM property line. This solar/power storage facility is just close to any community because it contains any number of little understood hazards to the community and the environment. It will

be bordered on three sides including Rancho Viejo, Eldorado and Rancho San Marcos not to mention the proposed housing development just west of the AIAI.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Gregg Hoffman

Address (Optional)

P. O. Box 28100

Santa Fe, NM

87592

US

Email

gahoffman2004@yahoo.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 780-5223

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This proposed mammoth Industrial, 800 square acre, Solar Complex is to be located between the three large residential communities of Rancho Viejo, Rancho San Marcos and Eldorado. This Industrial Solar Plant does not fit the character or zoning requirements for the surrounding residential areas.

This Industrial Solar installation will negatively impact the irreplaceable character and vistas provided within our Open space National Scenic Byway.

I am concerned with the fire hazard potential posed by the 39 BESS battery storage containment units housing highly combustible Lithium-Ion batteries to be located in this Industrial Project. It is my understanding that some new untested technologies will be used in this project. This in essence makes our communities Guinea Pigs, while the contractor, AES Corp., discovers how the new technology will work. This Industrial project consisting of 84,000 lineal feet of 205,000

solar panels MUST NOT be approved. We hope that you will be able to help us with this very important matter.

Respectfully Yours,
Gregg A. Hoffman

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Theresa Mendoza

Address (Optional)

137 San Marcos Loop
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

mendoza.theresa1234@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)

(619) 820-3770

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

We support responsibly sited alternative energy. Utility scale solar plants should be appropriately sited where the many dangerous incidents that can and have occurred can be properly addressed without endangering residents, our neighborhood middle school or our open spaces which are part of the County's land use plans. Current regulations only address 'smaller community solar farms' or large major public utilities. Utility scale solar plants which fall in the middle range of power production but are hundred of acres in size, and are sited within 500-1000' of residential homes do not have the kinds of regulations that would offer protection to adjacent neighbors in case of thermal runaway, pollution of the aquifer, devaluation of property, wildlife endangerment and a loss of quality of life.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Lauren Nitschke

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM

US

Email

lauren.e.nitschke@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 310-2896

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

The safety of residents and the environment always takes priority.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Catherine Babbitt

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM

US

Email

catherinedbabbitt@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I live in Eldorado and am concerned about disruption to wildlife, the very real danger of fire associated with the battery storage units, and the size of this proposed project.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Kim Kaufman

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

khk123@hotmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Please consider the safety of the area residents first and foremost over that of an outside entity (AES and its partners). A potential explosion and wild fire in an area known for high winds is a high risk factor that could lead to an under prepared evacuation causing a hardship to so many. This project also impacts the surface water and adjacent aquifers that we rely on. New Mexico is known for scenic byways and wildlife corridors, this needs to be preserved for those who live here and those who come to visit Santa Fe. Santa Fe County does not need to have such a high liability on their hands with an industry that remains unregulated.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Judy Perkins

Address (Optional)

10 Silver Rock Rd

Santa Fe, NM

87508-1362

US

Email

judithperkins@comcast.net

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Moving ahead without guidelines and rules that regulate large solar installations is fool-hardy and will have unintended consequences. Locating such a large industrial solar commercial plant between three large residential areas is unwise and will also negatively affect wildlife. Locating this huge solar power plant will have negative ramifications for many generations to come.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Name

Katherine Bilton

Address (Optional)

131 E Chili Line Rd

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

kmbilton@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 471-3227

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Concerns for safety and security of desert area and communities surrounding the proposed site. Building an industrial solar farm on the high desert struggling under continuing severe drought conditions is irresponsible. When car manufacturers, airlines and others routinely recall and must mitigate damages from lithium battery fires and risks, it is unconscionable to put profit of over community well being. The technology is not yet safe.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Patricia Phyfe

Address (Optional)

201 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

tinktwins@aol.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I've studied this issue and I'm concerned about the safety of the batteries, the upkeep of the area, wildlife, and the fact it is being built so close to homes, mine included.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Sandra Nitschke

Address (Optional)

17 Serena Road

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

thenits5@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 577-0260

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This looks like it is to be a utility sized solar farm. My concerns lay in the large scale battery storage facility In a residential zone, not industrial... and the potential fall out of fire danger to the surrounding areas as the the battery storage containers are largely untested at this scale. Lithium batteries pose a threat to the environment and local people, livestock and fauna and flora of this New Mexico county area as they will require extraordinary measures and copious amount of water should a fire spontaneously start. This area in Santa Fe county is I'll equipped to deal with this situation. A fire could be catastrophic for the populous of this area and Santa Fe residents and county.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Michael Knarr

Address (Optional)

47 ENCANTADO LOOP

SANTE FE, NM

87508

US

Email

michaelknarr@comcast.net

Phone (Optional)

(130) 392-9483

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Lithium Ion batteries of the numbers this project requires close to two residential developments with mostly dry grass as ground cover is at best unwise. Surely something could be done to mitigate the risk of fire reaching homes nearby is in order, either a fire-retardant berm or relocation of the project should be required.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Edwenna Earnheart

Address (Optional)

4350 San Benito St., Unit A

Santa Fe, NM

87507

US

Email

edwenna@comcast.net

Phone (Optional)
(505) 557-5853

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I am a landowner in the Rancho San Marcos subdivision. I am concerned about the Industrial solar plant being situated right next to this residential area and the Turquoise Trail school. Although I certainly support alternative energy projects, I believe that the size of this project should require that it be installed in an area that is not adjacent to large residential areas. The risk of fire & explosion is a legitimate risk that I am concerned about. This is a private partnership with Rancho Viejo and is inappropriate for this location. This facility should be relocated, and I request that the Commission adopt regulations for these type of installations before approving them.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Scott Seldin Seldin

Address (Optional)
4 Mariposa Road
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
scottseldin@comcast.net

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

We who cherish the open lands we see for miles and miles would have our reason for living here destroyed by "a massive 800 acre, 96 megawatt Industrial Utility Scale Solar Power Plant + 48 megawatt Lithium-ion Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) placed in 39 large containers."

This would "increase the risk of fire and explosion due to a "thermal runaway ... degrade the quality of life for hundreds of area residents and negatively impact land values, property values, flora and fauna. Currently there is no robust framework, nor are there regulatory requirements or standards in the US to evaluate health risks in case of Lithium-ion battery failure."

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Sandra Seldin Seldin

Address (Optional)

4 Mariposa Road

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

sandraseldin@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

The size of this project ...numbers of lithium ion batteries and risk of explosions and/or fires to the surrounding areas.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Joyce Bustos

Address (Optional)
330 SAN MARCOS LOOP
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
joyce.bustos@outlook.com

Phone (Optional)
(505) 690-8423

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

AES is the same company that built the facilities in Arizona that exploded, and one burned for 10 days before firefighters could get near enough to fight it. If this happens here in Santa Fe, at the proposed location, will we have to evacuate from Rancho San Marcos, Rancho Viejo, Eldorado, the movie studio, the jail, and the Penitentiary of NM? Will our property value decrease while our homeowners insurance increase? Will be able to sell our house in the future as we down size or family? These are my concerns as I live in the Rancho San Marcos sub-division. Also, remember that Highway 14 is a designated Scenic Byway and I don't believe that this project is conducive to this designation.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Name
Claudia Daigle

Address (Optional)
4 Conchas Place
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
cdaigle2003@comcast.net

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This issue is very important to me as I cannot understand why Santa Fe County would agree to such an installation in such a location that will affect my life and so many of its constituents'

lives and properties, and not even provide solar energy for New Mexico, as it is all going elsewhere. New Mexico is a huge state with lots of open land, why this particular space? I can see the pictures now in real estate magazines of beautiful homes next to such an installation. Not quite what people think about when considering the purchase of a home in New Mexico. Who will want to buy and what kind of a state would create such an abomination near large residential areas? Of course, it will mean lower property taxes. And god forbid if there is a fire or health disaster, what will be the costs? Such obvious questions that the County doesn't seem to have bothered to consider. AES has a long history of environmental infractions to air, fire, and ground water, which would be right next to aquifers we get our drinking water from that Santa Fe County doesn't appear to have taken into consideration, as it appears to be about money and not much about the environment or quality of life for people or the animals that live in the area whose lives will be forever changed. Santa Fe County can do better, but will it?

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Yarrott Benz

Address (Optional)

13 Ladera Road
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

ymbenz@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I am concerned as a resident of Eldorado, whose house looks straight out to the area in question. I worry about the safety of the battery containers and the potential for causing disastrous fires. I worry about the new power lines' invasion of the landscape and their potential to cause fires during winds. I worry about the scarring of the land that we have cherished since moving here.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Marilynn Weaver

Address (Optional)
56 Herrada Rd
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
mommemuse@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)
(720) 266-3223

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.
Too close to neighborhoods pose danger,

Keep Me Informed
I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Michael Hemperley

Address (Optional)

18 Calle Maria N
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

sfhemperley@yahoo.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 695-5595

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Resident of Rancho San Marcos and project in my backyard

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Stacey Williams

Address (Optional)

36 Cerrado Loop
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

slwilliams@iadllc.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Though I'm in favor of buying electricity produced from zero-emission, renewable sources, I OPPOSE this project for the following reasons:

- 1) Safety concerns about the BESS. No detailed information is publicly available about the specific battery model or the Battery Management System (BMS).
- 2) Though it is to be developed on private land, this utility-scale renewable energy project should be designated a development of county-wide impact. The scale and scope, including elimination of open-space and impacts on wildlife, as well as the temporary construction and visual impact to all citizens who live near or even pass by the side, make this project significant enough to warrant considerable public input and oversight.
- 3) The power produced by the project will be sold, at a profit, by the developer (AES) to a for-profit, public utility (PNM) with no requirement that it specifically supply PNM's customers in the vicinity (i.e., the power produced will be added to PNM's transmission grid and can be sold to ANY customer, including those who do not face the permanent negative impacts and ongoing risk.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Janet Persons

Address (Optional)

Cerrillos, NM

87010

US

Email

janet.persons@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

If the issue is to get PNM to comply with a green-energy mandate, why not follow France in legislating that all parking lots be covered 80% with solar panels? Of what benefit is this commercial, industrial solar farm to the community in which it is proposed to be located? The area is definitely a wildlife corridor, what effect will it have? Has that been studied? Wouldn't it be more efficient to put the power generated back into the grid than to store it in batteries? We need to look at electrical infrastructure, and I don't mean by private companies like AES and Avangrid. Please think about long-term environmental effects on flora and fauna in rural areas, when locating panels in urban paved areas is more sensible financially and environmentally.

<https://www.cnbc.com/2022/12/03/parking-lots-becoming-as-important-as-cars-in-climate-change-efforts.html>

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Rebecca Walding

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM

US

Email

studio50@swcp.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I do not think that this is a viable place to put an industrial solar power plant. This is not an industrial area. There are homes and a school in the area. There are wonderful wildlife corridors here. We are still in drought and our future is already fire-ridden as it was last summer. A fire here (which is noted in a number of other places that AES has plants, is a strong possibility) would be devastating very quickly. To make matters worse that energy is not even locked into our state or specifically for the residents taking the risk. I love solar. I am a huge believer in it. But I am not in favor at all of putting solar plants in residential areas... no matter how it is zoned. JUST SAY "NO!"

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Name

Victoria Warner

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM

87540

US

Email
filmandvideoart@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

The current situation is working and implementing the risk of what may happen or not happen to the battery and power containers in 20 years is the main concern. The property value of the surrounding homes will diminish, the desire to live in the Rancho Viejo and far Eldorado will decrease along with the desire to enjoy the views... While I am not exceedingly well versed on the entire operation and proposal, my fear of long-term effects is prevalent. Keep in mind that part of what makes Santa Fe and it's surrounding areas desirable is the beautiful scenery, healthy landscape and clean air. Comparing this to the abandoned mines and other projects that appeared attributable at first, we are still dealing with the spoil and refuse today... Are we well prepared for another company to close out on us and leave us with the harmful remnants?

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Raymond Singer

Address (Optional)
36 Alondra Road
Santa Fe, NM
US

Email
ray.singer@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Concerned about safety and wildlife

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Paul Romero

Address (Optional)

19 Called Maria N.

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

promero661@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 490-2877

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Industrial size solar plant should not be placed near residential areas.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Margaret Loose

Address (Optional)

3 Dulce Rd.

Santa Fe, NM

87508
US

Email
mloose4@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

While I believe it is urgent to convert our energy sources away from fossil fuels, we should be as careful as possible to protect homes and wildlife from the blight and major fire risks associated with utility-scale solar farms. Despite AES's assurances of safety, many large, recent, devastating wildfires in Arizona and NM have directly resulted from such large-scale solar plants. People like me bought their homes in rural areas not because we love the inconvenience of being out of town, but because we treasure the undeveloped state of nearby lands more than convenience. Please, please require developers to site such giant, demonstrably dangerous utilities far from where they pose immediate peril of fire to homes, lives, and delicate ecosystems.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Gijs Van oort

Address (Optional)
Santa Fe, NM
US

Email
gvanootboerne@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Concerns about fire danger due to battery storage malfunction. Fires can reach residences in matter of minutes. Local fire departments are not prepared to handle these chemical fires. AES has indicated that proper protective measures are cost prohibitive. So the dangers outweigh the benefits to local residents as the yields energy is dumped into the grid and will be resold at market rates or higher.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Edward Velie

Address (Optional)

60 Verano Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

evelie@aol.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This project could be detrimental to both animal and human welfare.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

ELIZABETH Horigan

Address (Optional)

72 CAMINO DIMITRIO

SANTA FE, NM

87508-9123
US

Email
alvie101@hotmail.com

Phone (Optional)
(505) 466-1240

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.
Fear of fire and other hazards. Disruption of wildlife. Why with so much open land do they want to put it in such close proximity to a populated area.
I am a senior and my home is my insurance for the future. I don't want this installation because it could effect property value.

Keep Me Informed
I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Mary McGivern

Address (Optional)
40 Vista Estrella S.
Santa Fe, NM
87540
US

Email
marymcgivern@me.com

Phone (Optional)
(303) 912-8250

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I live close to this project. I am concerned not only about battery fire, but also concerned for the wildlife in our area.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Marlene Barnes

Address (Optional)

45 Camino Costadino

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

mrlnbrns43@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This facility CANNOT be allowed so close to residential communities! The very real possibility of cascading thermal runaway involving the tremendous number and size of the lithium ion batteries proposed not only puts nearby residents at grave risk of wildfires, but it also endangers all of Santa Fe. Any such installation should be placed FAR from communities that stand to lose everything if unanticipated fires or explosions, such as those that occurred in 2 locations in Arizona and several other locations worldwide. Here is an account of one such accident in Australia: "The 10MW Dorman grid storage facility smoldered from 18 April until 21 April and HAZARDOUS gas leaks forced the firefighters to EVACUATE nearby residents, and use a robot to open the building's door before it could be safely brought under control." Another extremely hazardous incident occurred in an Australian hospital which involved fires and toxic smoke. What can our legislators be THINKING to even consider this?

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Holly Barton-Lopez

Address (Optional)

Balsa Rd

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

bartonlopez@hotmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This is a habitat for so much life that you can't possibly choose to destroy as we search for all the ways we need to preserve life on this planet. And think about how that glass would reflect, fire danger, the winds. Put solar panels over large parking lots that already exist.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Ruben Mendoza

Address (Optional)
137 San Marcos Loop
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
rhmendoza40@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

We support alternative energy, including solar. However, a 96MGW solar plant with 39 Lithium-ion battery containers has no place so close to residential areas and schools.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Cindy Hoffman

Address (Optional)
64 San Marcos Loop
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
cindyphoffman@yahoo.com

Phone (Optional)
(505) 670-6708

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I live in a wonderful rural area of Santa Fe County. From my house I can see all of the mountains to the north, west, east and south. We moved here in 1997 because of the views and the wildlife. There are fewer and fewer areas in the Santa Fe Area like Rancho San Marcos where we live. After hearing both sides of this topic, I feel that having this large solar farm will destroy much of the character of Hwy 14. I know the state and the county are pushing for solar, and I understand. I am not against solar but feel strongly this is being forced upon us. This solar farm and others closely located near Santa Fe will destroy what Santa Fe and the county is all about. The electricity from this project will not be used in NM but in other states. Why? PNM wants to sell power to other areas and I am sure nothing will change with our PNM bill. Please consider all options regarding our neighborhood. We love NM and do not wish for things change because of money and greed.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Adam Sklar

Address (Optional)

117 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

adamjsklar@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I am very concerned about the risk of fire and the impact of the panels on the delicate grasslands

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Charles Norman

Address (Optional)

213 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

cenorman@ptiassociates.net

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

It is a fire hazard, it degrades the beauty of nature, and it degrades home values. Solar is fine, but we have lots of wide open space in the state...there is no need to build a power plant adjacent to people's homes.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Chris Waring

Address (Optional)

213 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

chris@vetris.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

We are concerned about the possibility of catastrophic battery fires resulting from this project

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

DEBORA WILLFORD

Address (Optional)

171 SAN MARCOS LOOP

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

debora@wiresolnm.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This solar utility is not viable in the San Marcos corridor the threat of lithium fires is great and not easily defendable. This project would be better placed in another location to keep our residents safe.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Elmer Bustos

Address (Optional)

330 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

jelmer.bustos@outlook.com

Phone (Optional)

(595) 795-3150

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This project is proposed to be built within close proximity to our subdivision which may have an adverse impact on the residents.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Joyce Bustos

Address (Optional)

330 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

joyce.bustos@outlook.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 690-8423

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

We live in the sub-division that is right next to the proposed location for this project.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Name

Rita Cisneros

Address (Optional)

161 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

ritacis825@yahoo.com

Phone (Optional)

(805) 208-1783

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Safety concerns to community.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Joseph Tiano

Address (Optional)

229 Calle Galisteo

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

jct@cnsnp.net

Phone (Optional)

(505) 660-4100

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Very concerned about the Bess units and implications of ground water conamination, fires, the ecosystem.... Not to mention it spoils our views. We are not against solar. We already have it. However, this farm needs to be located in a less residential area.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Paul Fink

Address (Optional)

10 Redondo Ct

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

paulfink01@sbcglobal.net

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

See text above

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Karen Karen Herrera

Address (Optional)

21 Brilliant Sky Dr

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

kherrera9045@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

The decommissioning aspect is critical. Power companies need to incorporate this into their overall plans. Regulations requiring this make sense.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Kay Marshall

Address (Optional)

221 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email
ekaym13@hotmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I own property that is right next to the proposed solar farm, concerned about fire, lithium leeching into ground, long term what happens to panels and batteries how to dispose of. Impact on our wildlife, hunting grounds for raptors, wildlife corridor.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Name
TODD Brown

Address (Optional)
PO Box 131 / 17 Waldo St
Cerrillos, NM
87010
US

Email
brownp52@yahoo.com

Phone (Optional)
(505) 438-3008

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This site of 800 acres is just too large for the area with many residents living around it.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Phyllis Turner

Address (Optional)
214 San Marcos Loop
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
zoeyclue@aol.com

Phone (Optional)
(505) 660-5040

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

This industrial scale solar facility with proposed 415,272 lithium ion batteries, which are at risk of fires and thermal runaway, is way too close to the residential areas of Ranch San Marcos, El Dorado and Ranchi Viejo, as well as the Turquoise Trail Charter School, and Santa Fe Count Adult Dention Facility.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Naomi Harrison

Address (Optional)
15 Ladera Rd
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

ngharrison1@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)
(505) 204-3565

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.
I'm concerned a fires spreading to nearby residential areas and very quickly getting out of control.

Keep Me Informed
I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Janine Lehmann Lehmann

Address (Optional)
17 Ladera Road
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
jdlgraphix@comcast.net

Phone (Optional)
(505) 660-1457

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.
Given the proximity of this facility to residential neighborhoods and the poor track record of AES facilities in Arizona, I am very concerned about the danger of fire.
I am a homeowner in Eldorado. In the event of an explosion and subsequent fire, our volunteer community fire departments would in no way be equipped to handle such an event. The County must hold public hearings regarding this matter.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Lynn Archer

Address (Optional)

79 Encantado Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

four.lynnarcher@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I believe the location of both the sub station and power lines are dangerously close to a residential area that only has a volunteer fire department and is very susceptible to wind-driven wild fires. I also think it will impact the animal life in the area proposed. It will be very close to my home, and will interrupt the wonderful view of the landscape that I deliberately wanted to enjoy when I built my home in 1994. More importantly I know there are other means of employing solar energy that don't interfere with the environment or tear up the earth to get at precious metals and ores.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

John W Bing Bing

Address (Optional)

24 GAVILAN RD

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

johnbing@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 428-0960

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

The greatest danger from this very large industrial solar installation will be fire. A back-of-the-envelope calculation of arrays of this size suggests that there may be two-to-three fires per year in the solar installations alone, not including the BESS installations. With the prevailing western winds, fires will be driven toward Eldorado.

If the installation is to be built, there must be contractual guarantees (not promises) that the following be secured:

--A bond of sufficient size from the builder sufficient to mitigate damage to lives and property from an out-of-control fire. A million-dollar bond would likely be insufficient. The bond (if not used to pay damages) would be repaid to the builder when the facility is closed and inspected by state and local authorities to assure that the land will have been returned to its original state.

--A grant from the builder to local fire departments to purchase additional equipment and train and employ additional personnel. This grant should be renewed every five years for training and equipment, where needed.

--A contractual guarantee that any subsequent owners of this facility be required to meet these and any other safety requirements that Santa Fe County and other regulatory authorities deem necessary.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Richard Eikelenboom

Address (Optional)

227 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

richard@ifscolorado.com

Phone (Optional)

(303) 548-0191

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Who ever thought this was a proper location???

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Selma Eikelenboom-Schieveld MD PhD

Address (Optional)

227 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

selma@ifscolorado.com

Phone (Optional)

(303) 548-5225

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

If the County approves this project, they are putting the lives of residents in Rancho Viejo, Eldorado, Rancho San Marcos, the first responders, the children and staff at de Turquoise Trail Charter School in danger, which is unacceptable.

Relocate to some landfill or abandoned coal power plant, but not near three residential areas.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Name

CARRIE QUADE

Address (Optional)

466 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe NM 87508

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

carriequade@me.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

While I support solar farming, I believe this particular farm is not of appropriate scale to the area.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Ross Lockridge

Address (Optional)

POB 22, Cerrillos, NM 87010

Cerrillos, NM

87010

US

Email

murlock@raintreecounty.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 471-9182

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Although solar is the direction we need to be heading for, but regulation is needed:

--large private commercial facilities must be located with great care because of the potential negative impacts upon NM view sheds, plus the inherent potential of toxic fire & explosions that components of such facilities often have. Documentary evidence displays support of this problem.

--Land along the Turquoise Trail NSB is being targeted.

--The County (& perhaps the State) should enact a MORATORIUM giving time to develop regulations that include location and safety.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Name

Valerie Alarid-Martinez

Address (Optional)

116 Rancho Viejo Blvd

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

valarid007@hotmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

There is a fire hazard concern. The land is dry and arid and the risk of potential fire is great.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Valerie Alarid

Address (Optional)

58 VIA PUNTO NUEVO

SANTA FE, NM

87508

US

Email

valarid007@hotmail.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 757-6209

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Fire in our area is a huge concern.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Carol Sanguinetti

Address (Optional)

1 Domingo PL

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email
csang@mail.com

Phone (Optional)
(928) 300-6013

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I live in Eldorado and what I understand is that Eldorado in particular is most subject to fires if they were to occur with this installation. I have solar on my home, I am not against Solar, it needs to be responsible solar.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
David Tiemeyer

Address (Optional)
35 Tetilla Rd.
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
dtiemeyer@aol.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

While I am pro-renewable energy and walk my talk by having roof mounted solar panels on my home, the scale of this 800 acre array is way beyond what is appropriate for mixing with three adjacent residential communities.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Debra Meyer

Address (Optional)

7 Balsa Rd

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

dmeyerdesign123@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I've lived in New Mexico since 1978 and I currently live in the community of Eldorado at Santa Fe. Our community has been affected by the long drought and we are always concerned about a grass fire or an accident of WIPP shipments on HWY 285. There are many communities along Hwy 285 heading towards Lamy and this highway is our only escape route in an emergency. I'm extremely concerned about this proposed project and how it could have a negative impact on communities close to the proposed site and those that might be in the path of an out of control wildfire.

How will this project impact our wildlife, resources and beautiful sunsets? Santa Fe is very dependent on tourist dollars so how will this impact tourism? How will this project impact our property values? I'm all for solar energy development but there needs to be more research done to understand what the safety issues would be for communities near the proposed project and what would be the result of a possible human error or a wildfire. New Mexico is still suffering from the worst wildfires imaginable so why would we want to allow this project to be placed so close to communities? What is the real reason that these developers have decided on this location?

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Marijane Mercer

Address (Optional)

1867 Camino Lumbre

Santa Fe, NM

87505

US

Email

ashisha1@icloud.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

To summarize, reality is that this proposed large scale Industrial solar project could easily be relocated 20 miles east, where it is hundreds of miles downwind from any major population area. Where the local county would also benefit much more from the taxes the facility would provide. As far as the Industrial scale battery storage facility, let us not contribute to the continued worldwide environmental issues. Let that lithium go into batteries deployed in source that are truly fighting climate change, not merely lining the pockets of individuals and corporations that are already hoarding wealth.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Cynthia DaCosta

Address (Optional)

50 Leaping Powder Road

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email
cynthiasd@nets.com

Phone (Optional)
(505) 501-1859

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Health risks. Fires, degradation of landscape. Destruction of flora and fauna.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name
Matthew Higginbotham

Address (Optional)
5 Carlito Rd
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email
higgiart@hotmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

reflective issues especially at sun up and sun down would be an issue . Fire potential also a concern. I propose moving the facility 20 mi to the east to not impact residents. . i believe in alternative energy just not such a huge facility in my backyard.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Susannah Jackson

Address (Optional)

42 Alondra Road

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

susannaja@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)

(650) 494-6595

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Far too close to residential area and nature preserves. Danger of fire destroying neighborhoods.

Pollution. Light pollution. Endangerment of people and animals. Impact on attractiveness of Santa Fe as a tourist destination.

This is short sighted and irresponsible.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Stewart Breslin

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

spbreslin@comcast.net

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Given the vast amount of open space in this state it seems to me this project would be better if it were located away from residential areas. An industrial scale solar power plant will be an eyesore and a scar on our magnificent landscape. Clean solar power is necessary to combat climate change but this is not the right location!

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Barbara Dossey

Address (Optional)

878 Paseo Del Sur

Santa Fe, NM

US

Email

barbara@dosseydossey.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

The proposed AES Rancho Viejo Solar Project would be high risk for SF residents and also destructive to the environment and quality of the city. Move it somewhere else in the state, not in this sacred area.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Gordon Dveirin

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM

87574

US

Email

potentialgoog@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Policy should balance concern for nature's ecology with care for the social ecology of our communities. Strive for harmony!

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Danette David-Richardson

Address (Optional)

38 Calle Alexia

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

danette.neela@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I am opposed to this size of a solar project so close to Santa Fe. I am deeply concerned with the potential for fire potential with such powerful lithium storage batteries.

As a 45 year resident of Santa Fe County and the Eldorado area , I am also concerned by the visual impact and reflection from the panels.

We believe in solar, we have Solar on our roof but this project is not good so close to town.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Ron Greenberg

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

greeny105@gmail.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

In addition to the above mentioned concerns, there is the issue of this massive solar farm creating a heat island. We have enough environmental issue without adding another one,

What is the impact on the wildlife as well. just look up research on the heat that is generated by the panels....multiply what it says about urban panels by 800 acres.

"While the black surfaces of solar panels absorb most of the sunlight that reaches them, only a fraction (around 15 percent) of that incoming energy gets converted to electricity. The rest is returned to the environment as heat."

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Lisa Burns

Address (Optional)

Santa Fe, NM

US

Email

mulachulasf@aol.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I think more study into the fire dangers of this type of industrial solar should be considered.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

Name

Sue Garfitt

Address (Optional)

4 Abanico Rd

Santa Fe, NM

87508

US

Email

wesellsantafe@comcast.net

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I am a proponent of solar and renewable green energy, but I am also extremely concerned to maintain the habitat and wildlife migration corridors remaining in the lands surrounding Santa Fe and surrounding villages including my own (Eldorado)

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Sent from West Gardner Solar Project - Concerned Citizens for Responsible Solar Energy

I have just become aware of the proposed solar facility proximal to Eldorado. I am concerned that the above ground transmission lines will be directly in the viewshed of our home, looking west.

I do not think it is fair or appropriate that such an industrial installation should foul our views, especially since our community has taken great pains to keep utilities underground and out of sight, where they belong.

Also, the area where the solar facility will be placed has for years been discussed only as an area for residential development with large lot sizes. When did the zoning change?

I received some cryptic information from Eldorado showing only the most primitive outline of what is being proposed, and that is no way adequate to answer questions about spoiling views, producing heat, the fire danger of such an enormous amount of lithium, or any other of a host of questions that should be answered before this project goes forward.

How can I get more information about how far along this whole process is, what the visual impact will be, what risks are posed for neighboring properties, how maintenance will be achieved without impacting wildlife, whether dust will be produced during maintenance, what is the safety record of the company that will develop the project, and many other questions?

Without more information, I am firmly opposed to a potential eyesore that would adversely affect property values, generate fire risk, and waste solar production using centralized production that requires inefficient transmission, rather than deploying much more efficient distributed production.

How can I get more information about this alarming proposal?

Thank you,

David Coulson

David Coulson
dcoulson@cybermesa.com

505.466.1624
505.603.4787

Dear Penny,

I am writing to you concerning the AES Corporation Conditional Use Permit. I feel that this corporation should be granted "Developments of Countywide Impact" status. I feel that this status will allow this project to be considered on it's merits and avoid hyperbolic angst about fantasy issues. This recognized "Not In My Back Yard" tendency to resist change is understandable but misguided.

I personally have installed a photovoltaic array at my home and I feel that it is one of the best investments that I have made for myself and my daughter's generation.

Many people in our extended Eldorado community have environmental values. But when NIMBYism raises it's head it is small minded.

Please feel free to contact me if you like,

Frank Kilmer
Eldorado resident for six years
505 780-1203

Hello Ms. Green, thanks for taking my comments, a couple of them here.

1) I live on the north Encantado Loop in Eldorado which interfaces directly with Rancho Viejo across the street. The lithium battery storage unit(s), one of which is proposed to be situated very close to Encantado Loop is most concerning. Lithium battery storage should be zoned industrial. 1,000ft. is less than 1/5th of a mile- is way too close to a residential area.

2) The huge scale of this project and its environmental impact, so close to residential property is disconcerting. The scale of this project should be smaller.

Thank you Debra Link 52 Encantado loop

Dear Ms. Hansen

My husband and I are writing this joint letter because we vehemently oppose the placement of a utility-scale solar farm in such close proximity to residential communities. The fire danger is very real and very frightening, especially in this extremely dry, windy climate.

Large corporations have a way of emphasizing only the benefits of their proposals while hiding factual dangers to humans, wildlife and the environment.

We certainly do not oppose solar energy, but this huge industrial installation with thousands of highly volatile ion-lithium batteries and the prospect of thermal runaway could turn Eldorado, Rancho Veijo, Rancho San Marcos and possibly all of Santa Fe into a charred ruin like Paradise, CA which was also in a drought-prone, windy landscape. The proposed location for this solar farm could not be more inappropriate.

We oppose this project and feel that the conditional use permit must be denied.

Thank you,
Marlene P. Barnes
William F. Barnes
45 Camino Costadino
Santa Fe, NM 87508

To Whom It May Concern,

I've lived in New Mexico since 1978 and I currently live in the community of Eldorado at Santa Fe. Our community has been affected by the long drought and we are always concerned about a grass fire or an accident of WIPP shipments on HWY 285. There are many communities along Hwy 285 heading towards Lamy and this highway is our only escape route in an emergency. I'm extremely concerned about this proposed project and how it could have a negative impact on communities close to the proposed site and those that might be in the path of an out of control wildfire.

How will this project impact our wildlife, resources and beautiful sunsets? Santa Fe is very dependent on tourist dollars so how will this impact tourism? How will this project impact our property values? I'm all for solar energy development but there needs to be more research done to understand what the safety issues would be for communities near the proposed project and what would be the result of a possible human error or a wildfire. New Mexico is still suffering from the worst wildfires imaginable so why would we want to allow this project to be placed so close to communities? What is the real reason that these developers have decided on this location?

Thank you for listening,
Debra Meyer

Name

Katherine Bilton

Address (Optional)

131 E Chili Line Rd
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

kmbilton@gmail.com

Phone (Optional)

(505) 471-3227

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Concerns for safety and security of desert area and communities surrounding the proposed site. Building an industrial solar farm on the high desert struggling under continuing severe drought conditions is irresponsible. When car manufacturers, airlines and others routinely recall and must mitigate damages from lithium battery fires and risks, it is unconscionable to put profit of over community well being. The technology is not yet safe.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Name

Judy Perkins

Address (Optional)

10 Silver Rock Rd
Santa Fe, NM
87508-1362
US

Email

judithperkins@comcast.net

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

Moving ahead without guidelines and rules that regulate large solar installations is foolhardy and will have unintended consequences. Locating such a large industrial solar commercial plant between three large residential areas is unwise and will also negatively affect wildlife. Locating this huge solar power plant will have negative ramifications for many generations to come.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Name

Patricia Phyfe

Address (Optional)

201 San Marcos Loop
Santa Fe, NM
87508
US

Email

tinktwins@aol.com

Please tell us why this issue is important to you. This explanation will help our elected officials better understand why it is essential that they act.

I've studied this issue and I'm concerned about the safety of the batteries, the upkeep of the area, wildlife, and the fact it is being built so close to homes, mine included.

Keep Me Informed

I would like to be added to the Santa Fe County, New Mexico Citizens for Responsible Solar email list.

Dear Mr Jose Larrasagna.

I saw in the county's website that you are in charge of Community Solar installations.

As noted above I want to address the proposed AES solar installation.

First, I need you to know that when we moved to Eldorado in 2005 the first thing we did is to install solar panels on our roof.

For years I was convinced that solar electric, with or without batteries, was necessary to mitigate Global Warming.

However, the more I learned about it the more my original belief began to change.

It happens that solar electric, more specifically lithium-ion batteries, also constitute an extraction industry system akin to fossil fuels.

Numerous materials need to be mined to build solar panels and batteries.

The following minerals are needed for the production of solar panels:

- Aluminum
- Cadmium
- Copper
- Gallium
- Indium
- Lead
- Molybdenum

- Nickel
- Silicon
- Silver
- Selenium
- Tellurium
- Tin
- Zinc

The following minerals are needed to make lithium-ion batteries:

Cobalt

Chromium

Cobalt

Vanadium

Manganese

We know very well what happens to ground water, to rivers, to the seas, to the air we all need to exist and to our health, when we extract oil and gas, fossil fuels, from the earth.

But we have not been informed what happens to Life on Earth when we extract the 19 minerals above.

We also do not take into account the fact that fossil fuels are used almost at every phase of extraction, production, transportation, installation and maintenance of solar installations and their batteries.

So, it turns out that the green energy produced by solar panels, including the batteries, is not so green.

In fact solar energy is as damaging to Life on Earth as fossil fuel extraction.

Both continue to add CO2 to our atmosphere and both contribute to Global Warming.

In addition, the AES project is not going to provide the so called green energy to county inhabitants but it's energy is going to be sent into the grid and only PNM will know where it will go.

The owner of the land will be making good money and so will the county, on taxes.

And tell me, please, how I and all the inhabitants of the county will benefit from this project?

And, how is this project, taking into account the information above, is helping to reduce, or even mitigate, Global Warming?

I have given above a minimum of information about this extraction industry.

You can do your own research.

You may begin with this video:

https://www.google.com/search?q=videos+of+cobalt+extraction+in+the+democratic+republic+of+congo&client=firefox-b-1-d&sxsrf=AJOqlzVUSDy55SayNIvYqjwcbSRxs4SrdQ%3A1675137984280&ei=wJPYY9jgEPuiqtsPxfaU4Ag&oq=videos+of+cobalt+extraction+in+the+democratic+republic+of+&gs_lcp=C

[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&sclient=gws-wiz-serp#fpstate=ive&vld=cid:63fe4b41,vid:_V3bIzNX4co](https://www.google.com/search?q=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&sclient=gws-wiz-serp#fpstate=ive&vld=cid:63fe4b41,vid:_V3bIzNX4co)

and with this article in published in Harvard International Review

<https://hir.harvard.edu/lithium-triangle/>

Thank you,

Eduardo S. Krasnylovsky

17 Lucero Road

Santa Fe, NM

Cell: 505-3105695

OK -

Be sure to mention that distributed generation is an order of magnitude more efficient, that people who live proximal to the proposed industrial blight, like me, have already invested personal resources into residential PV, and that people like me consider it disturbing that there is no feed-in tariff for individual owners like there will be for the carpet-bagger out of state interests who will be providing passive income that could accrue to local people if our elected representatives were not either cowardly, on the take, or just completely lacking in any kind of imagination.

David Coulson

dcoulson@cybermesa.com

505.466.1624

505.603.4787

Dear Jose:

My husband and I moved to Eldorado in 2006 to enjoy the beautiful vistas, peace and quiet surroundings and the natural wildlife here. We are big proponents of solar power as evidenced by the fact that we installed a solar system more than 14 years ago.

But we have to write today in opposition to the large solar project planned right near us. The lithium-ion batteries to be used are a serious fire risk for a thermal runaway fire which would be disastrous to our community. If it should move down I-25, our only escape route from this community would be blocked potentially leading to an incredible loss of life and property. There have been serious fires already from this battery method in other states like Arizona and there are safer batteries available— the use of the lithium-ion batteries is a non-starter and totally unacceptable.

Also they intend to use a chemical Novec 1230 to suppress any fire which is a “forever chemical” and given the long term PFAS health risk, 3M will no longer manufacture it by the end of 2025 so this is also a non-starter for the planned project.

I have attached an eye opening article from The Guardian just today detailing the extreme problems with the solar arrays in CA that must be read by all involved with this project.

I am going to highlight only a few of the horrible effects mentioned in this article:

‘It has been psychologically grueling,’ says Teresa Pierce who moved to the area of solar arrays in CA six years ago. “From the constant pounding of metal posts to the endless dust storms. I now have allergies that I’d never had before — my arms burn all day long and my nose is always running. I feel like a prisoner in my own home.”

Kevin Emmerich who worked for the National Park Service for over 20 years before setting up Basin and Range Watch in 2008, a non-profit that campaigns to conserve the desert life. He says solar plants create myriad environmental problems, including habitat destruction and “lethal death traps” for birds, which dive at the panels, mistaking them for water.”

Read what Robin Kobaly, a botanist who worked at BLM for over 20 years says in this article. She has founded the Summertree Institute, an environmental education non-profit. Desert plants are some of the oldest carbon-capturers. By digging up these plants, we are removing the most efficient carbon sequestration units on the planet and releasing millennia of stored carbon back into the atmosphere. Meanwhile the solar panels we are replacing them with have a lifespan of around 25 years.

What environmental studies have been done for this project and who did them? This project will come at an enormous and potentially deathly risk, destruction of our pristine wilderness, loss of wildlife and the wildlife corridors, and in the end, most amazingly, may not be at all environmentally logical given the potential release of carbon into the atmosphere.

What amount of water do these plants use? In this article people said they use excessive water that has contributed to the drying up of two local wells which many of us have here in Eldorado. If there is no water and dust filled skies, how is this going to effect our property values?

This project needs to be halted immediately and full disclosure of all potential risks and any environmental studies relayed to all of us in this area. If the environmental studies have not been done or if some have been, they should be reviewed by the experts named in this Guardian article such as Robin Kobaly and Kevin Emmerich to check for accuracy. Lithium-ion batteries and Novec 1230 should not be used under any circumstances.

Please keep me informed of what is happening with this project that most, if not all, oppose in Eldorado.

Thank you for your time.

Best regards,

Kaye and Russell Cooper-Mead
2 Mariposa Road
Santa Fe, NM 87508

<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2023/may/21/solar-farms-energy-power-california-mojave-desert>

To whom it may concern:

I oppose the Rancho Viejo Solar Project proposed by AES Corporation for Santa Fe County.

This project is not as green as it may seem. I oppose the lithium-battery storage proposed because of how prone they are to fires from spontaneous combustion. Other commercial solar facilities using lithium-ion storage have experienced serious fires such as the Arizona Public Service McMicken Energy Storage Facility in 2019. In addition, a fire could be a 'thermal runaway' fire, as it was in Arizona, with extremely hot flames releasing hydrogen fluoride, a poisonous gas. Firefighters in Arizona were injured when the battery array exploded.

The proposal to suppress fires by 3M's Novec 1230 involves health risks of the PFAS class of 'forever chemicals'. I understand that 3M has announced that it will stop manufacturing Novec 1230 by the end of 2025.

As proposed, the project would be devastating particularly with residential areas so nearby. AES should revise its plan to use a safer and cleaner energy storage system. Why not use different types of batteries such as solid-state, aluminum-ion, and zinc alkaline, or use other technologies such as supercapacitors and bulk energy storage using mechanical or thermal approaches?

Without a better plan, this project should not move forward.

Thank you,
Kathy Priola
Eldorado, Santa Fe

The Applied Energy Services (AES) Corporation has filed for a CUP permit regarding an industrial solar power plants in an open space between Rancho-Viejo, Rancho San Marcos and Eldorado.

<https://www.aes.com/rancho-viejo-solar>

This plant will consist of 800 acres, 239,247 solar panels and 39 large containers, stored with 242 lithium-ion batteries (LIB) modules per container, with 44 individual battery cells per module, for a total of 415,272 individual battery cells. It will be a 96 MW PV installation with a 48 MW battery energy storage system (BESS).

We like to state we are not against solar energy, many of us, including ourselves, have panels on our roofs and/or drive electric vehicles. However, we have some serious concerns we would like to share with you.

1. Lithium-ion batteries are prone to a mal function known as thermal runaway. This is a real risk, which can lead to fire and explosion. In the first 10 months of last year worldwide once per month a BESS suffered a thermal runaway or caught fire. The Moss Landing Energy Storage Plant, CA, became operational on December 11, 2020. The first fire was on September 4, 2021, the second fire was on February 13, 2022, and the third fire was on September 21, 2022. In Morris, Illinois, there was a fire on July 17, 2021, which led to days long evacuations due to toxic smoke. AES had two fires in Arizona, one on April 19, 2019, which injured 8 first responders, 4 seriously, and the last fire as recently as April 18, 2022. It only takes 1 battery cell to malfunction to create a potential disaster.
2. Per the scientific literature, one cell has a risk of thermal runaway of about 0.0001%. As a rule of thumb assessment that means 10,000 cells have a risk of about 1%, 100,000 cells have a risk of about 10% and 400,000 cells have a risk of 40%. This explains why lithium-ion batteries tend to overheat and go up in smoke or worse.
3. The solar panels themselves can catch fire as well, as is proven by the fires in the solar panels on top of the buildings of Amazon and Walmart. In case of such fires, given the composition of our environment, which is dry, open prairie, and the distances to our residencies (1000 feet), flames can reach our homes, vehicles (tractors, etc.) and large animals, within minutes.
4. The Volunteer Fire Department will not be able to deal with a brush fire and keep the 39 containers cool at the same time. When a thermal runaway occurs, it cannot be extinguished, but it must run its course, which could take weeks. In a worst-case scenario, it is a choice between houses getting burnt or a BESS fire with a continued risk of explosion.
5. These risks are consequences of the sheer size of this complex. A community solar project on 5 acres with 1 BESS container can be manageable in case of a fire. A project of the proposed magnitude needs considerable more safety measures.
6. AES did not provide an emergency plan consistent with the Federal Emergency Planning & Community Right-to know-Act that prepares and protect communities from chemical accidents. Toxic smoke from solar panels or a BESS on fire have led to days long evacuation. There need to be clear procedures how to evacuate schoolchildren from the Turquoise Trail Charter School, residents and their animals large and small, the inmates in the correction facilities, and the Santa Fe Film Studio's. Where are they all supposed to go?
7. We have video's of antelope running past the fence on our property right where they are planning this industrial solar power plant. That space is an important corridor for wildlife into the Galisteo Basin. They will be driven away. We have prairie dogs which is a key species for

numerous other species. Burrowing owls live there too and nest in the tunnels of the prairie dogs' towns, they attract falcons, hawks. We have the great horned owl; there are badgers, coyotes. Prairie dogs increase the growth of wildflowers, and consequently the populations of bees and butterflies. They help to control weeds, noxious to life stock. This fragile ecosystem will be destroyed.

8. AES is a power utility. It generates, transmits and distributes electricity. The company produces energy burning hydro, pet coke, diesel, biomass, oil, solar, heavy fuel oil, landfill gas, wind, coal, and gas. The power generated will be sold to PNM, which sells electricity to, for instance, Arizona. There will be no benefit to the communities whose environment is invaded by this industrial complex. We are assuming all the risk for zero benefit as AES have admitted at a public meeting.

9. Although AES has finished all the reports necessary for a CUP submission, the company has refused to share them. This will put us in a disadvantage since we will have limited time to study them. The cause of the fire in the AES facility in Chandler last year has still not been made public.

10. AES has shown in the past to be a less than trustworthy when it comes to promises regarding safety. "The local fire and emergency management organizations will be thoroughly informed about the project..." Yet, when the fires in the AES facilities in Surprise (2019) and Chandler (2022) in Arizona broke out, the professional Fire Departments were not informed by AES of the presences of these BESS's.

"...The injection of liquefied C6F120 directly into modules experiencing a thermal runaway.... will both cool the exothermic reaction and suppress any flames". AES fails to mention that this will not stop the thermal runaway. As long as there is a thermal runaway going on, there will be the danger of explosion, even without flames. Neither did AES mention that if the C6F120 escapes out of the containers it is extremely toxic for humans and the environment.

AES refers to applicable (sic) guidelines, but does not mention those guidelines do not demand that a thermal runaway cannot occur. Per the experts investigating the Surprise fire the industry keeps these standards limited on purpose not impose restrictions or extra investments on the manufacturers.

11. AES has a dubious track record with regards to pollution. They are 7th on the list of the biggest polluters of water, 23 in the top 100 of the emission of greenhouse gas and 196 in the top 200 of overall air polluters. AES has paid millions in fines for violation of environmental and work place safety laws. They have received almost two billion in subsidies and loan/bailouts.

<https://grconnect.com/tox100wt/ry2017/index.php?search=yes&company2=165>

<https://grconnect.com/green100/ry2017/index.php?search=yes&company2=26>

<https://www.grconnect.com/tox100/ry2017/index.php?search=comb100>

<https://violationtracker.goodjobsfirst.org/parent/aes-corp>

<https://subsidytracker.goodjobsfirst.org/parent/aes-corp>

12. Solar panel theft and crime are on the rise. In efforts to disconnect panels, short circuits can occur, leading to fire. This facility will be unmanned. How will the residents be protected from this form of vandalism and the increased risks? It took hours before the attack on the solar plant in Las Vegas, NV, was discovered. What happens in case of a failure of the Battery Management System and a thermal runaway occurs without being detected?

13. There will be significant loss of property values, due to loss of view, loss of open space, possible contamination of the aquifer, fire dangers, and looming possibility of uninsurable and unsalable houses.

14. The industry currently lacks a robust framework for evaluating potential health risks to workers, the community, and first responders associated with LIB failure, neither is there a legal framework or regulations by which industrial solar power plants must abide.

15. There are no guarantees who will be responsible in case of loss of life or property. Residents should be spared endless legal battles, especially since a potential disaster is not far-fetched, and both AES and the County will be informed up front of the evidenced-based risks associated with solar panels and battery energy storage systems.

16. If this is really about saving the environment and not just about the money, why destroy the fragile ecosystem the solar plant is planned on? Why not relocate to an already destructed area? The County has the Transferrable Development Rights Program for Conservation. Why not try to find a way to convince the landowner (Warren Thompson) to use that program and provide him with extra credit points for development elsewhere?

In our opinion this project is inconsistent with the Land Use Plan and vision for our rural area. We are working together with the San Marcos Association to convince the County of Santa Fe to put a moratorium in place until our concerns can be addressed in a proper fashion.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Santa Fe,

February 2, 2023

Regards,

Dr. Selma Eikelenboom-Schieveld, MD, PhD Theresa Mendoza, MA, CFRM

227 San Marcos Loop 137 San Marcos Loop

Santa Fe 87508 Santa Fe 87508

303 548 5225 619 820 3770

selma@ifscolorado.com mendoza.theresa1234@gmail.com

To Santa Fe County Officials,

We are not against solar power by any means, but we are asking that you please give great consideration to all the adverse impacts that the AES Solar Farm may have on the communities of Rancho San Marcos, Eldorado, Rancho Viejo, Silverado, etc. Based on research, not only might the local wild life be affected, but perhaps our private wells and property values may be affected as well. We have attached an article on how these solar farms have affected the property values of homes in other states, and it is not positive. There is the possibility of runaway fires that can't be extinguished by the local volunteer fire department in this area. These fires, based on research of other facilities, can burn for days while polluting the atmosphere. Highway 14 has been designated a Scenic Byway where one can spot antelope, hawks, coyotes and other beautiful NM wildlife. This industrial solar farm, which would span hundreds of square acres along Highway 14, would spoil the appearance of this scenic byway and is sure to displace the wildlife of the area. If there were a disaster involving this industry it would cause the evacuation of the residents of these communities as well as the State Penitentiary, the Santa Fe County Detention Facility, and the movie studio employees. Please consider all the pros and cons of this project as you make your decision. Many residents in the Rancho San Marcos subdivision have solar panels on their homes, but this monstrosity being proposed by AES will not be out of sight or of benefit to our community in any obvious way.

Sincerely,

Elmer & Joyce Bustos
Rancho San Marcos, Lot 52

Dear Elected Representatives and Staff:

I am writing with concerns about the Rancho Viejo/AES solar power plant being considered by our elected Santa Fe county Commissioners. This letter may be considered more direct than most you will receive. I say that because I sought advice from past Commissioners about the best way to approach you with my concerns. I was told to be diplomatic; to make sure my commentary is sympathetic to the decisions that you face and present a tone of cooperation and willingness to help in any way possible. I absolutely am empathetic to that approach, as I once worked on Capital Hill and understand that in general the best path forward is compromise. However, I am retired now and feel more at liberty to speak candidly to decision makers. Please indulge me, as this letter is written in the spirit of transparency.

You are all very aware of this proposed project, and the multitude of concerns that are being raised by residents (and your constituents) of south Santa Fe, in the County. I won't waste your time on **all of the technical details** but the list includes, but is not limited to: environmental and wildlife issues; risk of explosion from lithium-ion batteries and with that, potential air and water contamination, noise and light pollution; the complete destruction of the rural and scenic aspects of this historic corridor due to the 800 acres of panels, the energy storage containers (69 of them, each the size of a railroad car,) and a transfer station; the potential increase in insurance rates and decrease in home values, and finally, the impact on our land that is inevitable when a solar installation outlives its utility. Technology and knowledge about disposal of solar panels is in it's infancy.

What is not being discussed publicly is what residents are saying and feeling behind closed doors. Here are just a few.....

This is the largest installation in the middle of a residential area in the country. With the public documents that exist regarding the vision for growth in the county, **why are public officials even entertaining something so contrary to that vision?** It is inconsistent with our trust in what we have been told by elected officials about how growth should be managed. Solar installations of this scale are primarily developed in brown spots and rural areas far away from residential areas because of known risks. **Is the risk/benefit so great that it is worth breaking trust with the people who elected you to represent their interests?**

AES, the developer of the solar power plant, has had significant failures pertaining to health and safety. For each of these failures, they argue that they will be using the latest and greatest technology to mitigate past problems which include explosions, harm to first responders and even a death. **Why are our public officials allowing all of their constituents to be put at risk by being guineapigs for AES's newest endeavor?**

AES has been working all the angles in Santa Fe and the county to portray themselves as good citizens; that they have adjusted their plans to take into consideration the concerns of affected communities. They even have a local green energy "leader" talking about how great this project is and how it will help NM attain our goals for renewable energy. That individual argues in a recent opinion piece that this installation is the equivalent of 11,000 rooftop solar installations. This is a false equivalency. Would 11,000 homeowners be willing to install solar on their roofs if they included a lithium-ion battery system that could explode and endanger not only their cherished home, but parents, grandparents, children and pets? In addition, AES creates an illusion that energy generated will benefit New Mexicans. The truth is that local residents bearing these risks have been told that they will not have access to this energy created; some will be transported to other communities via PNM and some of it will be made available to neighboring states. **Would public officials be willing to put their own homes and families at similar risk for this goal?**

AES is arguing that a significant number of jobs would be created by approving this project. **Do public officials understand that these are not permanent jobs, that they are limited to construction and installation for a bit over a year?**

A final and unsavory perspective [for any politician] from affected residents and constituents is better put, respectfully, in a statement I have heard over and over: ***"It's all about the money. Every palm has been greased, and approval is a forgone conclusion."*** Most citizens believe that is how public policy is made, at the federal and local levels of government. Cynicism about whether government works in the interest of the people, and not just the well-funded big interests, e.g., AES, is real. Those of us that live in the county and have been attempting to educate decision-makers have seen this up close and personal. It's well known that the local private landowner that has provided land for this endeavor has made countless donations of land and money and campaign contributions in the county for years. Residents believe that he is now calling in his chips and that he stands to make tens of millions of dollars through leases over the lifespan of this project **WHEN** it is approved. Statements about the projected, large amounts of tax dollars that will be generated for the county are prolific but are they accurate?

My own personal concern follows. There are no regulations in place that govern solar power plant installations of this type and magnitude. There should be. As the collective "we" look to solar as one method of

reducing our dependence on fossil fuels, the number of “accidents” are increasing at alarming rates nationally and internationally. While the data is not aggregated in one place, it is there.

What is the rush here? Is the State and County willing to push this through “as is” with all the known risks and lack of oversight infrastructure, just to claim our political ambition to be THE LEADER in renewable energy nationwide? Isn’t it possible to generate revenue for the county and move forward with renewable energy without jeopardizing the health and welfare of people and the environment in which we live? One could only say there is no other path forward if they believe that the concerns raised by constituents/residents are deemed invalid or insignificant.

If we do rush this through without such oversight infrastructure in place and the foreseeable does happen, are we willing to become the national standard-bearer for how NOT to do this?

As global citizens, we are willing to do our part for the benefit of Mother Earth. But this project should be reimagined in a way that minimizes or even eliminates the risks presented in significant detail by the residents of the County.

Thank you for considering this point of view.

Stace Williams March 28, 2023 Page 1

DATE: March 28, 2023

FROM: Stace Williams

36 Cerrado Loop

Santa Fe, NM 87508

TO: The Sustainable Land Development Code (SLDC) Hearing Officer

Santa Fe County Planning Commission

Santa Fe County Board of County Commissioners

SUBJECT: OPPOSITION TO THE PROPOSED AES RANCHO VIEJO SOLAR PROJECT

Greetings. I am writing as a private citizen residing in Eldorado at Santa Fe. I hold a degree in Mechanical Engineering (Colorado State University, 1982), and I remain a passionate advocate of renewable or green energy that is both clean **and** safe. AES' proposed Rancho Viejo Solar Project is fundamentally unsafe, and that is why I oppose the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for this project.

My primary concern is with the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). AES plans to use lithium-ion batteries to store energy when demand for power is low, so that it can be converted to electricity when demand for power is high and the sun is not shining. **The risks of lithium-ion storage technology at the**

scale AES proposes are too great to justify the benefits of the project.

Lithium-ion batteries are in wide use in both consumer devices, such as cell phones, laptops, hoverboards, and electric bicycles and vehicles, and in commercial settings for manufacturing facilities and for wind and solar electricity generation. These batteries are prone to fires known as "thermal runaway." Such fires can occur suddenly and without warning. They burn very hot and fast, and large arrays require the use of fire suppressant chemicals to extinguish them because the battery cells continue to combust even while very large amounts of water are used.

There have been several significant fires at commercial electric generation sites that used lithium-ion BESS. Of these, the 2019 at Arizona Public Service's McMicken site near Phoenix is particularly disconcerting. In that fire, AES' system worked as planned, according to their own report. The system detected a voltage decrease and subsequent temperature increase in the BESS and released a fire suppressant chemical within 2 minutes. Despite that, the fire continued for two hours, releasing poisonous hydrogen sulfide gas. When firefighters arrived, they opened the doors to the BESS, and there was an explosion. At least 8 first responders were injured in this incident.

As at their McMicken site, AES plans to use 3M™ Novec™ 1230 as the fire suppressant for Rancho Viejo. Novec 1230 belongs to the PFAS (per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances) class of "forever" chemicals, so-called

because they do not break down, thereby leading to widespread environmental contamination.

Associated health risks prompted the US Environmental Protection Agency in March of this year to issue its first proposal to substantially limit the level of PFAS in drinking water. 3M announced in December 2022 that it will stop manufacturing Novec 1230 by the end of 2025 because of concerns about the rapidly evolving regulatory climate and a desire to eliminate the presence of PFAS in the environment.

Stace Williams March 28, 2023 Page 2

In her February 28, 2023, email response to my question about use of Novec, AES spokesperson Rebecca Halford replied, "The news of Novec 1230 phase-out is recent and AES is watching as the industry reacts to this news. The use of this **clean** agent is common in several industries and AES expects alternatives to

emerge in the near future to capitalize on this growing market." (emphasis mine) As both the manufacturer and the EPA agree, Novec is not "clean," and at present there is no other fire suppressant available that is both effective and environmentally safe.

However, there do exist numerous other safe and clean ways to store energy for utility-scale generation

projects. These include different types of batteries—solid-state, iron flow, and zinc ion batteries, for example—and other technologies, such as supercapacitors and bulk energy storage using mechanical or thermal approaches. Manufacturers here in the US, as well as in Canada, Germany, Israel, and Australia, are providing innovative, safe, and clean energy storage solutions for commercial solar generation facilities. A number of solar generation projects are already operating, or will soon be operational, that employ these superior alternatives.

In short, the BESS proposed by AES poses a real and significant risk of wildfire and environmental damage. Therefore, **Santa Fe County must not approve the CUP for Rancho Viejo**. Instead, I urge you to

require that AES revise its plan to use a cleaner and safer energy storage system at Rancho Viejo. While

we do need renewable electricity generation and the many benefits it provides, we cannot afford these risks. To be aware of them and still approve this project would be irresponsible and, I believe, negligent.

Sincerely,

Stace (Stacey L) Williams

(303) 915-9434

slwilliams@iadllc.com

I am writing again to voice my opposition to the huge AES solar project, only 1 mile west of our home in Eldorado. This proposed industrial facility with over 239,000 solar panels will include a lithium-ion Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) larger than a football field with 69 storage containers, which will be located way too close to numerous residential subdivisions. I am myself the owner of a residential solar RV system on my home, and I am supportive of solar projects in the County, but something of this magnitude..

These BESS facilities are vulnerable to runaway fires, explosions, and gas leaks, which has happened at two AES facilities in Arizona recently (see <https://coaching.typepad.com/files/mcmicken.pdf>).

This is not the right place for this project, and it should not be located in an more rural area of NM, and not close to major subdivisions and thousands of residents.

Most Cordially,

Dear Mr. Larranaga,

I am writing to you about my opposition for the proposed Rancho Viejo Solar Project. Although supporting a solar project is exciting and becoming increasingly necessary in the face of the growing threat of climate change, the Rancho Viejo Solar Project is no as sustainable and climate friendly as it might seem. As State Williams states in her articles in Stroll Magazine and the Santa Fe New Mexican, AES Corporation plans to use lithium-ion batteries as their storage system. While these batteries are common in everyday life, used in cellphones, laptops, and even electric vehicles, these batteries are prone to spontaneously combust, starting fires. Some may say that the potential risk of fires from the lithium-ion batteries outweighs the use of fossil fuels, which can be prone to starting fires as well. However, in this day and age, and with the advanced technology available to corporations such as AES, our community should not have to compromise between two dangerous options. It has been seen that solar facilities using lithium-ion storage have experienced fires. The most notable example was in 2019 at Arizona's Public Service's McMicken Energy Storage Facility. Not only did the batteries start a fire, they released hydrogen fluoride, a known poisonous gas, into the atmosphere, injured four firefighters, and suppressed the fires using chemical Novec 1230. Novec 1230, while AES proposes to use if any fires occur from the Rancho Viejo batteries, is classified as a "forever" chemical, and has presented enough health risks that the manufacturer will stop production by the end of 2025. While solar is a necessary step to take in the coming years to combat climate change, this project is not the way forward. We cannot keep scraping by with the bare minimum and needing to continue to create "solutions" in order to save our planet. There needs to be a fundamental change in the way we view and manufacture energy. There are safer battery storage options that AES can implement instead, for example zinc alkaline or aluminum-ion.

As a 17 year old who is about to be a graduate from Santa Fe High School, I want to leave my community in the hands of people that care about our environment and what happens to it. This has become my home that I have grown to know as my desert oasis. I am urging you to oppose this project, to protect and save the unique Santa Fe environment that people around the world have come to love and cherish.

My name is Mark Young and I live at 47 Camerada Rd. on the west side of Eldorado.

I strongly oppose the huge solar project that is proposed between Eldorado and Rancho Viejo for many reasons, including safety, and the potential for fires. While I am pro solar this is way too large a project to be placed so close to major residential subdivisions. Please oppose this project. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

To: The Sustainable Land Development Code (SLDC) Hearing Officer, the Santa Fe County Planning Commission, and the Santa Fe County Board of County Commissioners

From: Allison Peacock and Adam Skalr at 117 San Marcos Loop, Santa Fe NM 87508

Re: The proposed AES Rancho Viejo Industrial Solar Plant

Date: April 2, 2023

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this letter in opposition of AES building a utility scale solar plant in the currently proposed area between three residential neighborhoods.

I am not opposed to solar and other forms of reusable energy. I believe we need to move away from our dependency on fossil fuels but I do not believe that this solar plant is in a location that actually benefits any residents of the area, human or animal.

My biggest concern for this utility scale solar plant is their use of lithium ion batteries for energy storage. Considering there are so many issues with lithium ion batteries in so many different contexts, it doesn't seem safe to place such a large amount between the three neighborhoods of Rancho San Marcos, El Dorado, and Rancho Viejo.

AES plans to put upwards of 69 shipping container sized storage units in the area to store the lithium ion batteries. This poses a considerable danger to all life around the area considering the dry plains environment they are surrounded by. We who chose to live in these neighborhoods understand that there is a high risk of fire, but adding unnecessarily to that risk for the sake of renewable energy negates any positive benefit to humanity that solar might hope to add.

There are no fire hydrants in my neighborhood of Rancho San Marcos and only one volunteer fire department in the area that has notified us that one of their trucks won't even hold enough water to put out a house on fire in our neighborhood. I'm concerned for the safety of our neighborhoods that surround this solar power plant and the safety of all the wildlife that currently inhabits the area.

I ask, if a solar power plant must be created, please consider another more safe area to build it. Placing that many lithium ion batteries in the middle of three neighborhoods in an area prone to wildfires is a danger to all life here.

AES has had fire issues in other areas they have built these solar plants. They must be held accountable.

Thank you for your consideration,

Allison Peacock and Adam Sklar

Dear Mr. Larranaga and Ms. Green,

Thank you for the work you do to manage the many and varied needs and problems that must land on your desk in regard to land development. I don't pretend to know how complicated it is, but I do hope that voicing my concerns to you about the utility-scale solar plant proposed by AES will at least let you know how some of your fellow Santa Feans regard it. In short, I would urge you to reject the plan, at least until our county and state can develop well-researched, intelligent regulations for the establishment and siting of such massive projects.

My chief concern is wildfire and the immediate threat to lives and property that the plant would pose in such astonishingly close proximity to homes. As you might know, there is a surprising quantity of readily-available evidence that major destructive wildfires, even as recent as last summer, in Arizona and New Mexico were ignited at utility-scale solar facilities and that much-touted claims for containment of lithium-ion batteries have proven catastrophically faulty/untrue.

As I understand it, the proposed location is not zoned for industrial development, **nor should it be** simply because an international corporation can boost its profits by cramming a plant squarely in the middle of residential communities. Perhaps there are industrial or waste spaces far from **any** homes and historic and agricultural sites that would be a better compromise? I welcome an urgent replacement of fossil fuels by cleaner energies, including solar. But urgency does not mean blind haste or short-term thinking that will undermine safety, quality of life for thousands of directly-affected residents, and destroy delicate ecosystems we have a duty to preserve.

The historic character of Santa Fe County resides partly in its natural and rural ruggedness, and its reputation for undisturbed open spaces for outdoor recreation and abundant wildlife drive much of the tourism on which the area thrives. It also attracts permanent residents who sustain the County year-round. I and my Eldorado neighbors purchased our homes precisely for their rural location, not because we wanted to live next-door to a gigantic utility plant.


As custodian of our land, please advocate for us and insist on an alternative to this ill-conceived commercial pitch.

Thanks for reading. Yours respectfully,

Margaret A. Loose, Ph.D.
3 Dulce Rd.
Santa Fe, NM 87508

Jose Larranaga

I am a former FEMA Disaster Inspector. I spent months combing through the burned out community of Paradise, California. I can tell you this AES commercial proposal is wrong in a high elevation, basin with high winds and heavy undergrowth. Please refresh yourself on the below:



At the heart of the matter are the battery cells and thermal heat. Silicon fractures at the microscopic level, creating a short circuit when continuously charged in high thermal ambient temperature. A runaway is inevitable.....

Please don't move forward with this. It is wrong on the technology, wrong on the location, and wrong on the application. This feeds a grid. It can feed that grid at hundreds of locations throughout Santa Fe County or elsewhere where it doesn't threaten us with disaster.



My pic
Joe Kelly Hughes
3 Fortuna Road
Eldorado

Joe Kelly Hughes

The average Walmart is 178,000 square feet, or 4 acres. The Proposed AES Rancho Viejo Solar Project is around 1,000 acres. Or, the equivalent of having 250 Walmart's right next to each other. A nearly constant surface of solar panels - that will be visible throughout Santa Fe.

Santa Fe's own MEGA Walmart of solar panels will be the predominant feature on the horizon for an excessive portion of residents and visitors.

While this industrial facility will be closest to the communities of Eldorado, Rancho San Marcos, and Rancho Viejo. Do keep in mind that a facility of this size will stand out and at times reflect. Especially in morning when the sun rises, and evenings at sun set - the long rays of sunlight at those hours will bounce off the facility. Perhaps even affect local traffic and aviation.

This will be true especially to anyone living at higher elevations looking southward. Anyone residing higher than St. Francis and having a southern view - to anyone in town who can look down on I-25 Including residents of the foothills. Or from any of the mountain trails and peaks such as the Dale Ball trails, Tesuque Peak, Deception, and Santa Fe Baldy. The new predominant feature on your horizon will be this industrial solar plant.

Or when driving north on I-25 and coming over the La Bajada Mesa looking at the expanse of the Santa Fe region. To your right, the predominant feature will be this industrial solar plant. Tourists eyes will not be drawn to the mountains, but to the giant industrial solar plant rivaling the size of a ranch.

I have two major concerns as a resident of Eldorado. Both are related to air quality.

One is dust control during and after construction. As a former civil and environmental contractor we routinely had to monitor dust amount of dust leaving the site to meet local and federal dust control regulations. For those with health issues there is no way to escape the dust entering our homes since all homes must have air-exchange rates or the occupants will use all the available oxygen.

The other concern is potential for evacuation should the batteries ignite. I don't know the radius that will be affected, but I do know the homes within 5 miles of the site are some of the more valuable homes in the county. Should this project be built the value of those homes are likely to decrease due to fact on an required evacuation. These lower values will result in less property tax collected by the County. An additional problem is where will all the affected residents live until they can return to their homes. The population of Eldorado alone will stress the availability of hotels/motels rooms in the City of Santa Fe.

Thank you for considering my objections to the location of this industrial electrical generating facility.

Antone Forneris, Retired Construction Economist and Contractor
18 Mariposa Road
SF, NM 87508

TO: Whom it may concern,
RE: 800 acres of silicon panels
FROM: Elizabeth Simon
34 Camerada Road
Santa Fe, NM 87508

This is a horrid project being proposed and I am against it.

It will totally wreck that area as far as it being any kind of wilderness/retreat area for local residents, not to mention wildlife. This seems to be the vision of Modernity....cover every inch with Turbines or Solar panels. When it's time for me to depart this planet, I think I'll be saying, "Thank God".

And of course, one need only ask, "Where do all these panels come from? What country benefits hugely from this?" I for one know the answer to both.

Dear Jose,

This is a comment regarding the proposed utility-scale 1,000+ acre AES Rancho Viejo Solar Project, with its 239,000 solar panels, for which the AES Conditional Use Permit application is currently under review by Santa Fe County. This industrial facility will include a lithium-ion Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) larger than a football field with 69 storage containers, which will be located only a mile from the community of Eldorado where over 6,500 residents live. As I mentioned in my previous comment regarding this project, I am focused on the danger and broader impact of this BESS battery technology because it is vulnerable to runaway fires, explosions, and gas leaks. This kind of incident has happened at two AES facilities in Arizona recently, which caused serious injuries to firefighters, and if it happened here it threatens not only the safety of firefighters but could also cause a wildfire which could spread into Eldorado and the other surrounding neighborhoods of San Marcos and Rancho Viejo.

Here is a link to the report (too large to attach)--WHICH FIRE MARSHAL JAOME BLAY HAS RECEIVED/REVIEWED, so you and Jeremy will want to be familiar with it--on one of these incidents at an AES facility in Surprise, Arizona, which seriously injured four firefighters, "Technical Support for APS Related to McMicken Thermal Runaway and Explosion, McMicken Battery Energy Storage System Event Technical Analysis and

Recommendations": <https://coaching.typepad.com/files/mcmicken.pdf>. Please also see the attached letter regarding this McMicken incident from Commissioner Kennedy (AZ).

I would also like to add that it should be obvious to Santa Fe County that such a massive industrial solar project, and all utility-scale solar projects, should be included as a Development of Countywide Impact. It can not be justified that wind projects are already included as a DCI, but solar projects are not. These large projects warrant much closer scrutiny, greater transparency, a strategic plan for a more appropriate location in either brownfield sites or industrial areas, and should be subjected to stricter regulations.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to read these important documents, so those responsible for the safety of Santa Fe County residents can better understand the hazards of the proposed Rancho Viejo Solar Project.

Regards,

Carol Beidleman
Eldorado at Santa Fe

Greetings,

I and my wife are new residents and voters in Santa Fe, with our new home in Eldorado. I am a retired electronics engineer, and while my area of expertise is elsewhere, I have some knowledge of solar energy systems.

I will leave it to others to assess and comment on the potential environmental impact of the proposed project, but am strongly in favor of solar and wind power replacing fossil fuel or nuclear energy.

My concern regarding this project is entirely related to the safety of the lithium-ion storage system. I have read some descriptions that suggest some thought has been given to it, but details are very much lacking. The number one question in my mind is what specific type of lithium-ion battery would be used? The volatility of such batteries varies by a factor of roughly 1,000:1 depending on the specific chemistry, so this is a critical question. Next would be details on the isolation of batteries: How much energy (maximum) could be held in each isolated group, and what measures would be taken to isolate them (distance, containment structure, automatic fire suppression, etc.).

As a consumer I also have to ask what effect this project would have on my electricity bill. That is, where will the money come from to pay for building the facility, how long will it take before it is operational, and what will the impact be on our electricity bill once operational?

Regards,
Greg Marshall

I oppose the solar project unless AES revises its plan to use a safer and cleaner energy storage system. I am very concerned about my safety and my community's safety if this project goes forward next door to Eldorado

Freddi Fullington
Eldorado resident

Dear Jose Larranga,

As a 26-year resident of San Sebastian, in the Eldorado area, I am writing to express my opposition to the Rancho Viejo Solar Project, proposed by AES Corporation.

The high fire threat posed by the lithium-ion batteries used in the battery energy storage system makes this project outrageously dangerous to our community and all of its wildlife and wilderness.

The serious fires these batteries have caused in other areas, including the 2019 fire in Surprise, Arizona, make this project absolutely untenable for northern New Mexico. The alarming number of devastating wildfires we've seen in northern New Mexico in recent years, including last year's Hermit's Peak catastrophe, should give every Santa Fe Country official reason enough to pass on this project.

But AES's proposal to use Novec, a toxic chemical, to suppress fires caused by the batteries is equally as dangerous as the fire threat this project carries. Novec is so toxic to the environment and to humans, for instance through entering our drinking water, that the EPA has limited it. Its own manufacturer, 3M, has said it will cease making Novec by 2025.

Knowing that this project has a high fire risk and proposing a poison to put out any fires demonstrates that AES has no concern whatsoever for the community. Clearly, AES knows that the batteries pose a high fire risk. The company must also know about the hazards of Novec. Even with the promise of suppression, there's no guarantee that using this toxic chemical will extinguish a devastating fire.

Why put this project here, knowing all of the risks? How does it help Santa Fe County or improve our lives? Based on all the evidence, Rancho Viejo Solar Project poses huge risks to all of us.

I urge you to not allow this project to proceed. As officials who represent all of us in this community and our well-being, it's incumbent upon Santa County to take the right action and not permit a global energy company—which will sell this energy created in our backyard to companies elsewhere—to recklessly endanger our health and our homes, even our lives.

Please do the right thing for New Mexico and for New Mexicans, many of whom have lived here for generations, and turn down this project.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments.

Lynn Cline

--

Lynn Cline
Author, journalist
KSFR Santa Fe public radio host
Writer's Ink
lynncline.com

As a resident of Eldorado and former heavy/civil and environmental contractor I am concerned about air quality during and after construction for the proposed Rancho Viejo Solar Project. In my past controlling dust on and leaving the site was a major concern and/or a contract requirement. As I understand, this industrial size generation facility calls for grading ~1,000 acres. What dust control measures are going to be required during and after construction? There are a significant of Eldorado residents that will have their breathable air compromised by the dust coming from the site. As you know, this area of New Mexico experiences strong winds in the spring and is generally a windy environment.

All residential properties must have adequate air-exchange rates to continually provide oxygen for humans and pets that live in the homes. While homes can block some of the dusty air, they can't block it all. Please ask the owner what contract requirements will be in place during and after construction. If none exist, please ask the proper authorities to provide the necessary contract language to protect all the citizens surrounding this project.

My company did a project in Conroe, Texas where the contract required perimeter dust monitoring. If the dust exceeded contract values, based on EPA acceptable limits, the job came to a halt, until the dust emissions were back in acceptable limits. This is one example, I've also done civil projects where dust suppressants were used to protect the onsite personnel and surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Antone L. Forneris
18 Mariposa Road
Santa Fe, NM 87508
aforneris@yahoo.com

On Sat, Feb 11, 2023 at 10:05 AM Ruben Mendoza <rhmendoza40@gmail.com> wrote:
This proposed project is seriously flawed and is being designed to be built between three major Santa Fe County residential areas (Ranch Viejo, Rancho San Marcos & El Dorado). AES has historically violated many safety protocols and has been fined tens of millions of dollars for violations. Not a company you want in our beautiful environment.

Their project proposes a Battery Storage System of 39 very large containers full of Lithium batteries. There is a reason you are asked at the US Post Office and at airports whether your packages or luggage contain Lithium batteries.

Lithium is very volatile & flammable. The technology is not yet fully understood or perfected. There is a one minute video on YouTube which illustrates this very well with just a simple AA battery. It's called "Lithium is Dangerous ". It is worth your time to watch it.

If a fire started at their facility, Rancho San Marcos homes would be within 3 minutes of a run away fire event. El Dorado within 9 minutes and Rancho Viejo with 11 minutes. Santa Fe County does not have the Fire Fighting capability to fight a large Lithium fire which cannot be put out with water.

I would strongly recommend that you do some research into Lithium and consider the well being of thousands of County citizens from the above mentioned neighborhoods. We truly could have a major disaster in Santa Fe County if this goes through. There are many alternative sites which are safer & farther away from populated areas.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

--

Ruben Mendoza
(619) 415-9154

--

Ruben Mendoza
(619) 415-9154

Dear Jose Larra and AES Solar Planners,

I am writing this letter as an interested private citizen, but my comments are referenced by my experience as a member of the Santa Fe County Trails and Open Space Committee, as the Wildlife Chair for Indivisible SOS, Santa Fe, and as a New Mexico educator.

I am writing this letter of support and concern regarding AES Solar application in the San Marcos area of Santa Fe County. Let me state up front that I am an advocate for the transition to renewable sources of energy. Solar energy makes great sense for New Mexico.

My concern is for the massive scale of the solar array relative to all the small communities where this will be located. I live in a neighboring community. So do multiple species of wildlife, as the San Marcos area is located in a wildlife corridors zone that connects several mountain ranges. There are also significant Santa Fe county Open Spaces in this area that may be impacted by this massive structure. I suggest that great care be paid to the scale and configuration of these panels so that they are not disruptive to wildlife or an eyesore (or earsore) – or any other downgrade in the quality of life for all the residents. Perhaps if the panels were configured in smaller segments, in a visually pleasing pattern, perhaps in a Zia symbol, or some other friendly shapes it would less objectionable visually, and would not obstruct the activity of wildlife, including disruption watersheds. Please take into consideration these suggestions in order to make a more user-friendly transition to solar energy. Thanks for your time and attention! Jan Cohen, M.Ed email: hh1joylane@yahoo.com

Dear Mr. Griego,

There are alternatives to battery storage for solar farms. Some alternate methods use gravity. Excess electricity generated during daylight is used to lift massive weights, which are allowed to descend at night to generate electricity. It might be valuable for you and your staff to become familiar with these methods. We need not be fooled into believing that batteries are the only way.

Here's an introductory article from a trusted source.

<https://spectrum.ieee.org/gravity-energy-storage-will-show-its-potential-in-2021>

Bob Wartell
Eldorado

Dear Commissioner Hughes,

My wife Dayna Matlin and I recently read in the Santa Fe New Mexican about the proposed AES Solar Farm in District 5 of Santa Fe County located just south of Rancho Viejo and just west of Eldorado where we reside, on the far western edge of the development as it happens.

And while we are generally supportive of sustainable energy projects in the state's ongoing efforts to reduce the use of fossil fuels, we have some questions and concerns regarding the placement of this particular project.

As I'm sure you're aware there have been at least two fires and one explosion in the lithium-ion battery buildings of similar projects in Arizona, one owned and operated by AES and the other by a different entity the former of which required a specialized robot before the building could be entered safely by fire fighters. No doubt you're also aware that the winds out here generally blow from the west and can often be substantial, as was recently demonstrated to disastrous effect in the Hermit's Peak/Calf Canyon fire, which was the result of two supposedly *controlled* burns.

What you may not be aware of—and was not mentioned in the article-- is that, just beyond the western fence line of Eldorado there is a major natural gas line, which rises above ground in a monitoring station beside my property and those of my neighbors. And, by my admittedly coarse calculations, the proposed solar farm is approximately one mile from that gas line. Hence, should the solar farm's battery building catch fire or explode during even moderate wind conditions, it's not hard to imagine a wildfire crossing that distance in under an hour if not less time. And were such a fire to reach and engulf the above ground gas line at the monitoring station, I dare say the results could be catastrophic.

Now, I am not alarmist and tend to view things in simple and practical terms. Indeed, I've copied your fellow commissioner Anna Hansen on this email even though she represents a different district because I had numerous meetings and discussions with her when I served for four years on the Santa Fe Film and Digital Media Commission. And I trust she can vouch for my reasonable and thoughtful approach to both the challenges and opportunities that present themselves to the county.

So, my reason for reaching out to you is to seek your advice as to how we can learn more about this proposed farm and when, how—and to who if not you-- would be the appropriate way to raise some of these concerns as this project works its way through the approval process so that, should the solar farm gain approval, the county and those of us who live in proximity to it can be assured that every possible precaution is taken to prevent such another destructive and costly wildfire. For example, do the Santa Fe Fire or Police Departments even have the sort of robot that was required to quell the fire at the AES Arizona facility? Or is a fire suppression system inside the building adequate to prevent a fire should the batteries explode? Not being an expert in such facilities I can imagine a considerable list of questions along such lines.

Nor am I entirely familiar with all the boards, commissions or planning groups required to approve such a solar farm, so I apologize in advance if these concerns should be directed elsewhere. It simply seemed to me that, as you were mentioned and quoted in the article, that contacting you was at least the best place to start.

Thanks for your time and consideration. And I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Lee Zlotoff

Dear Planning Commissioners,

We join a growing number of Santa Fe County stakeholders that are concerned with the CUP application made by AES to install a utility scale solar and battery energy storage system adjacent three local communities and a national scenic byway.

In particular, we are concerned with Santa Fe County's ability to objectively assess the impacts of large scale developments within an immature regulatory framework. While the Santa Fe County Sustainable Land Development Code (SLDC) provides some guidance and thresholds, the overarching interpretation of how the SLDC applies to utility scale projects has not been established, and possibly not even conceived at the time the SLDC was written.

This proposed project may appear to tick a number of boxes within state and federal environmental and political landscapes, but without significant investment in understanding specific impacts, any decision runs the risk of being ill-informed.

The CUP application process should make it abundantly clear that there is no direct benefit to those local communities that will be adversely impacted.

Namely:

- There is **no** correlation between the proposed site and addressing the power demand by local communities but rather it benefits the PNM managed power grid, including intra and interstate interests, through renewable energy targets.
- The site selection should **not** be the purview of local opportunistic land owners but a state-wide application of adequately considered and coordinated renewable energy planning.
- There will be **no** direct reduction to power utility costs for local users above that of any unlikely reduction born by state-wide PNM cost management.
- This is **not** a community or residential scale installation and drawing comparisons to those photovoltaic applications is misleading.
- Using local areas as a test-bed for emerging technologies such as Battery Energy Storage Systems significantly increases the **risk** (fire, land values, wildlife and aesthetics) to local communities and the environment.
- The proposal does not adequately address SLDC guidelines for environmental impact including dust, noise, water usage and pollutant discharge and spillage.

We appreciate that this CUP application will generate opposing views and we look forward to having the opportunity to provide educated input into a well-balanced discussion and appropriately measured decision.

Yours Sincerely,

Kim and Sandra Nitschke
17 Serena Road

Santa Fe, NM 87508

PS - The recent events in East Palestine, OH point to a pattern of neglect and abuse with regard to relations between large industrial corporations and the unfortunate individuals who stand in the way of corporate profit at any cost.

The aftermath of the train derailment in Ohio is a very strong cautionary tale about collusion between corporations and government and the ability of corporations to evade responsibility for the destruction of lives, property, and the environment. Therefore, the best and safest thing to do is to disallow industrial activities proximal to residential neighborhoods.

We built our house here because of the clean air and beautiful environment, we love living here, and we will organize to defend our home against encroachment by predatory industrial development.

David Coulson
dcoulson@cybermesa.com

505.466.1624
505.603.4787

Begin forwarded message:

From: David Coulson <dcoulson@cybermesa.com>
Subject: Solar Project
Date: March 30, 2023 at 9:49:19 AM MDT
To: orromo@santafecountynm.gov

Hello -

I'm looking for information about the proposed solar generation facility proximal to Eldorado. As you might imagine, we are very concerned about visual blight from power lines, risk of fire and explosion from an immense li-ion storage facility that has the potential to destroy the environment for miles around, etc.

The proposed facility has the potential to destroy real estate values in our neighborhood, and we feel that there should be a way to find out detailed information about the proposal.

There is a meeting scheduled for April 13 at 4:00pm for public comment, so already alarm bells are going off, because meetings that are designed to discourage public participation usually occur when people who have to work cannot attend.

When did the zoning for this land change????!!!! It was always considered residential, not industrial?

Centralized production of power is always less efficient than distributed production, especially with solar energy. Why will residents proximal to this project pay for the privilege of inefficient production that profits a few at the expense of the environment?

How can residents get information about this project?

Thank you in advance for any help you can offer.

David Coulson
dcoulson@cybermesa.com

505.466.1624
505.603.4787

Greetings.

I am an Eldorado homeowner and resident. While I am a proponent of renewable energy, and don't want to be a NIMBY-ist, I have deep concerns regarding the fire hazards of the proposed AES Rancho Viejo Solar Project.

I'm understanding that it's a utility-scale solar project, nestled in close proximity to two housing developments and a school.

I am protesting this permit, and would like the parties to research a new site for this project.

Sincerely,

Dianne Duenzl

Dianne Duenzl
62 Avenida de Compadres
Santa Fe, NM 87508
505-920-0564



A Registered Organization

County

in Santa Fe

PO Box 29900
Santa Fe, NM 87592
kmbilton@gmail.com

March 27, 2023

Santa Fe Board of County Commissioners
c/o Mr. Jose Larranaga, via email
Building and Development Manager
Santa Fe County Growth Management/Land Use Dept.

RE Request that Proposed AES Rancho Viejo Solar be Designated as a Development of Countywide Impact (DCI)

Dear Commissioners,

This letter requests Santa Fe County to designate the proposed AES Rancho Viejo Solar facility as a Development of Countywide Impact (DCI) per Santa Fe County Sustainable Land Development Code (SLDC) Chapter 11. (Ordinance 2019-2 adopted 8/27/19)

The designation is warranted given the solar farm's size, duration and location in a desert challenged by severe drought conditions, with limited water availability and sparse emergency services nearby. The long-term threats such a solar farm pose to local inhabitants and the environment, should the lithium-ion batteries (LIB) fail causing a 'thermal runaway event', should alone qualify this project as a DCI. This facility will more than meet the following DCI criteria set forth in the SLDC (concerning factors underlined):

... “potential for far-reaching effects on the community, place major demands on public facilities and the County’s capital improvement plan and budget, and have the potential to affect the environment and public health, safety, and welfare beyond the impacts on immediately neighboring properties, including adverse noise, light, odor and vibration; explosive hazards; traffic congestion; and burdens on County emergency response services.”

The following research findings, while by no means exhaustive, provide a rationale for DCI-designation of Rancho Viejo Solar.

1. Ongoing, severe drought in Northern New Mexico has created desert conditions inhospitable to lithium-ion batteries. These conditions can be understood as 'abusive conditions described by Quang et al below:

- Ouang et al (2019) conducted an international review of the "Thermal Hazards of the Lithium-Ion Battery and the Corresponding Countermeasures", finding that "As a result of the high energy density of LIBs, they are sensitive to abusive conditions such as high temperature, crashing, overcharge, over-discharge and short-circuit. Moreover, the typical components of a battery, e.g., plastic packing, separator and electrolyte are combustible. Thereby, the accidents induced by LIBs are frequently reported and can occur in a range of applications." <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/9/12/2483>

New Mexico's drought is likely to worsen, not improve, over the life of the Rancho Viejo Solar facility, creating climate stress on aging LIB as well as the facility infrastructure.

2. This facility will require consistent, special oversight and monitoring. Most academics and industry experts agree that LIB fires require use of chemical suppressants. AES contends that 'no special materials' are needed. Only water. What they omit is that research shows that it takes up to 10 times the amount of water to extinguish a LIB fire than normal, and chemicals are also required.

- Bennett et al (2020) studied high desert water availability in Northern New Mexico through 2050, predicting decreasing levels of surface water. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214581819303027>
- Santa Fe Basin Study (2015) explored effects of climate change, drought and increasing temperatures on water supply and potential adaptations to increasing scarcity. <https://www.usbr.gov/watersmart/bsp/docs/finalreport/SantaFe/Santa-Fe-Basin-Final.pdf>

3. The AES 'Fire Protection Plan' describes automated fire suppression mechanisms that will spew chemicals onto storage units "if heat is detected". NOVEC 1230 or similar, which are being phased out re toxicity of PFAs.

- In December 2022, IBM announced it will exit per- and polyfluoroalkyl substance (PFAS) manufacturing and work to discontinue the use of PFAS across its product portfolio by the end of 2025. <https://news.3m.com/2022-12-20-3M-to-Exit-PFAS-Manufacturing-by-the-End-of-2025>

This 3M action was taken to comply with environmental laws because PFA-based fire suppressants are 'forever chemicals' that damage human and animal health.

4. The rural character of the Rancho Viejo Solar facility location impedes quick, 24/7 professional emergency response in the case of explosions or desert wildfires. The fire services of surrounding communities are volunteer services who work from unstaffed fire stations. This is not a criticism of rural, residents who donate their time and effort to support public safety in their towns. But, while AES promises to provide responder training, and to donate scholarships to train future responders, these corporate intentions don't create the necessary safety net of 24/7 immediate response services. This services scarcity will place additional demand on Santa Fe County services. <https://www.santafecountynm.gov/fire/volunteer-fire-districts/turquoise-trail>
<https://www.santafecountynm.gov/fire/volunteer-fire-districts/madrid>

5. Site contamination will occur. Despite AES assurances, who will be responsible for ongoing, physical monitoring of the site – other than tracking the site operations remotely via computers?
 - Sun et al (2016) performed toxicity analyses of combustion products from commercialized Li-ion batteries. “More than 100 emitted gaseous products are identified, most of which are hazardous to human beings and trigger negative impact on the environment.”
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2211285516302130>

6. Disposal of spent LIB and environmental problems of lithium (Li) waste are growing international concerns. What is the plan for Rancho Viejo Solar facility waste disposal over operational decades? When the facility’s life cycle is spent, what can Santa Fe County expect from AES so that the site is not environmentally unsafe?
 - Shakoor et al (2023) explain that globally, Li production reached 100,000 metric tons in 2021, a 256% increase from 2010 (USGS 2012–2022). 74% of Li supplies go into rechargeable Li-ion batteries powering electronic products and electric vehicles. On the one hand, the soaring demand for Li has led to an exponential increase in its supply; on the other hand, electronic waste is increasingly contributing to soil contamination with Li + ions or Li₂O. Lubricating grease accounts for 4% of total Li industrial applications and enters the environment through road runoff. Another 14% is used for ceramics and glass production and ends up in municipal waste/landfills. Even Li ingested by humans is excreted through the kidneys within 24 h and is discharged into sewage. Highly variable concentrations of Li in the environment and food products have deleterious effects on animal and human health and represent a growing challenge for regulators.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666498423000170>
 - Yanamandra et al (2022) highlight the urgent need to develop disposal and recycling processes for LIB as at present less than 1% are recycled or used in other applications.
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s41745-021-00269-7>
 - Mrozik et al (2021), addressing the growing problem of LIB disposal note that recent global surge in demand for LIBs “requires a concomitant increase in production and, down the line, leads to large numbers of spent LIBs. The ever-increasing battery waste needs to be managed accordingly. Currently, there are no universal or unified standards for waste disposal of LIBs around the globe. Each country uses one or a combination of practices such as landfilling, incineration and full or partial recycling depending on the number of batteries leaving the market, current legislation and infrastructures. Informal disposal or reprocessing is not a rare activity.”
<https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2021/ee/d1ee00691f>

While solar energy is arguably the wave of the future, it does not come without its own set of problems and risks. Lithium-ion batteries (LIB) are basically still experimental and their use in a growing array of products and processes, as including solar energy generation, create real dangers of thermal runaway events. Such an event on the dry desert south of Santa Fe could be catastrophic.

Academic and industry researchers agree that when batteries fail or overheat, they release flammable, toxic gasses that can spark fast-spreading fire that is extremely difficult to extinguish. Recent lithium battery testing by the Fire Safety Research Institute showed it took only 15 seconds from the first sign of smoke to the windows being blown out in a house. In a traditional fire, it typically takes about three minutes for a room to be engulfed.

We strongly urge Santa Fe County decisionmakers to look beyond the immediate project enticements offered by AES – millions in tax revenues, hundreds of jobs, job training and education for local youth – and act prudently in recognition of long terms risks to the inhabitants and environment at the gateway. Long after the initial windfalls promised by AES and PNM, there will be 800+acres of lithium-ion batteries baking in the sun on a desert only becoming drier as the decades go by. One spark, one overheated LIB overlooked by mechanical suppression failure not seen during a shift change at some distant computer operations room, and disaster strikes our friends and neighbors to the south. We have seen it happen, last year, when we watched in horror as our neighbors to the north lost homes as more than a million acres burned. Thank you for your consideration and choosing to designate the Rancho Viejo Solar project a Development of Countywide Impact.

Katherine Bilton, President

Lisa Burns, Past President

Patty Montes-Burks, Vice President

Judy Reinhartz, Vice President

Kirk Delaplaine, Community Relations

Jaclyn Hollabaugh, Member at Large

Judy Perkins, Member at Large

Santa Fe Gateway Alliance (SFGA) is a Registered Organization with the mission of preserving of the southern gateway to Santa Fe for residents and visitors. Since 2017, SFGA's initiatives have been supported by concerned residents of communities located at the 'top' of the Turquoise Trail National Scenic Byway (Churchill Estates; El Dorado; La Cienega; La Pradera; Village of Madrid; Oshara Village; Rancho San Marcos; Rancho Viejo; Turquoise Trail; Turquoise Trail Business Park (Bisbee Court), Valle Lindo; Valle Vista; Vista Ocaso).

*President – Dennis Kurtz Page | 1 Treasurer – Gail Buono Vice-President – Janet McVickar Secretary
– Laird Graeser*

THE SAN MARCOS ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 722

Cerrillos, NM 87010

<https://thesanmarcosassociation.org/>

March 20, 2023

To: Santa Fe County SLDC Hearing Officer

In care of Jose Larrañaga, Building and Development Supervisor – Santa Fe County Growth Management Department

Re: AES – Rancho Viejo Solar Facility Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application Hearing

The San Marcos Association (SMA) (<https://thesanmarcosassociation.org/>) is a non-profit community service organization (IRS Code 501(c)(4)), and a Registered Organization under Chapter 2 of the Sustainable Land Development Code (SLDC) of Santa Fe County. Our goals are to protect the rural, residential character of the area for which we advocate; **to monitor development to see that it is consistent with that character and with applicable plans and ordinances of Santa Fe County** (specifically the SLDC in this case); and to advocate on behalf of property owners/residents of the area in matters of public service, utilities, and the general welfare of people. SMA's area of advocacy includes the parcel where the proposed Rancho Viejo Solar Facility would be located.

AES has submitted a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application to construct the Rancho Viejo Solar Facility, a solar power plant that would generate some 96MW of electricity and transmit it over 2 miles using 115KV high voltage power lines to a PNM substation where it would enter the power grid. This facility would be located on approximately 800 acres of land zoned Rural Fringe. By any engineering, planning, or governmental definition, the Rancho Viejo Solar Facility is a 'utility-scale solar' facility. See for example the Solar@Scale Government Guidebook (p. 14)

[<https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?tab=rm&ogbl&zx=9x4f32kome8i#sent?projector=1>].

The SMA Board of Directors, while supporting responsible development and sustainable energy production, including Community Solar, believes this development is not eligible for a CUP under the SLDC for the reasons elaborated below. We respectfully request that the Hearing Officer **Deny** this application.

First, this facility is a "Gas or electric power generation facility" as listed on 150A Attachment 3.11 (Appendix B: Use Matrix) [<https://ecode360.com/attachment/SA6524/SA6524-150Ac%20Appendix%20B.pdf>] of the SLDC (Structure Code 6400) and is **prohibited (X)** in districts zoned Rural Fringe. The Rancho Viejo Solar Facility will produce electricity to be sold to PNM and no other customer. Structure Code 6400, from the Land-Based Classification Standards (LBCS) of the American Planning Association (APA), the basis for the SLDC Use Matrix (Appendix B 150A Attachment 3.1), is the code for "Gas or electric power generation facility" and contains within it Code 6460 - "Solar and other forms of energy facility." Such facilities include "*windmills, solar panel farms, etc.*" The proposed solar facility is clearly an electric power generation facility according to the LBCS; being a solar facility in no way excludes it from consideration as such.

[<https://www.planning.org/lbcs/standards/structure/>] Should the applicant assert for any reason that this proposed *President – Dennis Kurtz Page | 2 Treasurer – Gail Buono Vice-President – Janet McVickar Secretary – Laird Graeser*

facility is Not a “Gas or electric power generation facility” as listed on 150A Attachment 3.11, SMA respectfully requests that such a characterization be factually substantiated before the Hearing Officer.

Second, should the applicant assert that the Rancho Viejo Solar Facility is a “Commercial solar energy production facility” (150A Attachment 3.11) (a characterization found nowhere in the CUP application or on the applicant’s website [<https://www.aes.com/rancho-viejo-solar>]), and is therefore eligible for a CUP, SMA respectfully requests that such a characterization be factually substantiated before the Hearing Officer.

The SLDC definition of “Commercial solar energy production facility” is “*a renewable energy production facility that uses sunlight to generate, and may store, energy for sale or profit.*” (Appendix B 150A Attachment 2.14) [<https://ecode360.com/attachment/SA6524/SA6524-150Ab%20Appendix%20A.pdf>] This definition is redundant (defining “Commercial” as “for sale or profit”), and so broad that it includes virtually any solar facility that generates electricity, except a residential installation. That the SLDC distinguishes between the aforementioned “Gas or electric power generation facility” (prohibited in Rural Fringe) and the broadly defined “Commercial solar energy production facility” (eligible for a CUP) indicates a considered distinction. In this context, the word ‘commercial’ is used in contrast to a ‘residential’ installation where electricity generated is not for sale or profit; it is not intended to include any for sale or profit solar energy facility.

An additional distinction is scale. Utility-scale facilities are prohibited in the Rural Fringe zoning district while smaller solar facilities may be permitted. In further support of this assertion, Santa Fe County seems to regard the CUP-eligible “Commercial solar energy production” facilities noted in Appendix B 150A Attachment 3.11 to be of “Neighborhood-Scale.” The proposed 800+ acre AES Rancho Viejo Solar Facility would not be a neighborhood-scale development. SMA understands this from the following information. Figure 1 shows an image of portions of a worksheet used in discussions led by County staff in revising the San Marcos Planning District Use Matrix, commonly call the “overlay.” Community members used this worksheet (some 9 pages long), under the guidance of County staff, to determine if and/or how to modify the overlay – to create the legal restrictions on development in that Planning District. This process, paused in 2020, involved a three-way comparison of *existing* San Marcos Planning District uses for each zoning district (labelled “2016 SMD” in the header), *existing* SLDC uses (“SLDC”), and uses *proposed* by County staff for the revised Planning District overlay (“2020 SMD”). We realize that the proposed Rancho Viejo Solar Facility does not lie within the San Marcos Planning District; but that is not the purpose of this argument. On Figure 1, the row pertaining to “Commercial solar energy production facility” contains, on the far right, the following note provided by County staff: “*Create development standards for the siting and installation of Neighborhood-Scale renewable energy production facilities.*” That note, intended to guide discussion regarding legal restrictions of commercial solar energy facilities in Rural-Fringe districts, clearly indicates that the County believes that “Commercial solar energy production” facilities should be of “Neighborhood-Scale” – something the Rancho Viejo facility would not be. If the applicant asserts that the Rancho Viejo facility should be considered as a “Commercial solar energy production facility” for the purposes of the SLDC, SMA respectfully requests that the applicant factually substantiate this assertion before the Hearing Officer. *President – Dennis Kurtz Page | 3 Treasurer – Gail Buono Vice-President – Janet McVickar Secretary – Laird Graeser*

In summary, The San Marcos Association respectfully requests that the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Facility CUP application be **Denied**, on the grounds that it is not eligible for a CUP. It is not eligible because, pursuant to definitions contained within the SLDC and its supporting documents:

- 1) It **would** be a Gas or electric power generation facility and thus prohibited according to the SLDC in Rural-Fringe zoning districts; and
- 2) It would **not** be a “Commercial solar energy production facility” and so would not be eligible for a CUP on that basis.

Thank you for your consideration. SMA awaits your reasoning and decision concerning the points we have raised in this case.

Sincerely,

Dennis D. Kurtz, President

Cc: Jose Larrañaga via email - joselarra@santafecountynm.gov

Penny Ellis-Green via email - pengreen@santafecountynm.gov

Robert Griego via email - rgriego@santafecountynm.gov

Figure 1: Sections of Worksheet provided by County staff to guide discussion when revising the San Marcos Planning District Use Matrix in 2020

Portions of page 1 (to show header) and page 8 (containing the Commercial solar energy production facility line)

are combined.

Please do not approve of the permit for the Rancho Viejo solar project as it is a potential fire and environmental hazard and not safe and I do not want a large commercial solar farm a short distance from our home in Eldorado. Thanks

Most Cordially,

Mary Young
47 Camerada Road
Santa Fe, NM 87508

While I am in favor of alternative energy sources, such as wind and solar, I would like to voice my opposition to the proposed Rancho Viejo Solar Project on three grounds:

1) The proposed facility has too close a downwind proximity to a major populated area.

The greater Eldorado area of Santa Fe County is well known for its wind storms, especially in the spring.

- Having a 240,000 Industrial solar installation a mere mile downwind from a population density in the tens of thousands is not a sound public policy. Solar panels in the desert environment of Santa Fe will foster major growth under the structures. Which, as we all know, dries to become major fuel sources. Ignition of this, which could be as simple as an AES company truck parking on top of dry vegetation. Easily igniting the type of fast moving wind firestorm that Boulder, Colorado suffered from two years ago. Having the potential to impact thousands of homes.

2) Installing a Large Scale Industrial Lithium-Ion Battery Energy Storage System on a scale not seen in North America, is not in the interest of the Earth's environment or the local community.

- It is well documented that lithium is environmentally destructive in its mining operations and the world has a finite amount that can be extracted. An Industrial storage system of this magnitude would be much more effectively deployed in other areas of the green economy, such as in individual electric vehicles.

- The deployment of a battery storage facility at the Rancho Viejo Solar Project is only to further enrich AES and its corporate stock holders and officers. Enabling them to sell electricity at peak demand times, thus maximizing their profits at the expense of the larger society that is forced into paying exuberant prices.

- If this Project was to proceed, there is plenty of electrical demand right here in New Mexico that will utilize the 240,000 solar panel output. Which could also start to offset PNM's antiquated reliance on coal fired power plants serving New Mexico. There thus is no need for this proposed massive Industrial Battery Energy Storage System.

- Furthermore, large scale Industrial Battery Energy Storage System's are not prone to failure. The larger the facility is, combined with the 30+ years of deployment, you get a larger the risk. At the moment, local Santa Fe County emergency response agencies - nor the State of New Mexico - have clear guidance on how to fight such a potential fire. Evacuation and letting the Industrial fire burn out is the prescribed method. As witnessed two years ago in Australia. Thousands of local residents will enjoy spending a week or two living in emergency shelters or hotels while watching the calamity of a large scale lithium fire burn itself out over a few weeks.

3) The projected \$30 million tax benefit to Santa Fe County is deceptive - as this is over the entire lifespan of the project.

- As the Industrial solar facility ages, it can only be expected that its owners will follow countless other corporations in seeking to renegotiate and reduce their tax liability. Be that as it may, the other question is if Santa Fe County "needs" or is dependent upon this revenue source.

Many in Santa Fe mistakenly believe this city and county is a tourist economy. While, tourism does drive some revenue, the real driver of the local economy is the billions in annual retirement payouts and deposits that are made to the local population. Retirees spending on homeownership

and local amenities. Underpinning a robust economy. A much more prudent approach for the City of Santa Fe and Santa Fe County would be to look beyond get-rich-quick schemes at the expense of the local population, and instead look at how to invest in the quality of life of the existing local population. Things such as improved recreational facilities and infrastructure, an improved health care industry, attracting top talent to the local workforce. Not to mention, insuring Santa Fe is an affordable place for the workforce to live. A city and county full of well off retirees, all looking at a giant industrial solar project enriching the few, is not in anyone's interest.

To summarize, reality is that this proposed large scale Industrial solar project could easily be relocated 20 miles east, where it is hundreds of miles downwind from any major population area.

Where the local county would also benefit much more from the taxes the facility would provide. As far as the Industrial scale battery storage facility, let us not contribute to the continued worldwide environmental issues. Let that lithium go into batteries deployed in source that are truly fighting climate change, not merely lining the pockets of individuals and corporations that are already hoarding wealth.

From: Carole Wendler <cascadedesertrat@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 8:56 AM

To: Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Opposition to Rancho Viejo Solar Batter project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I am unable to attend the hearing on this project in person so wish to provide comment via email. I am opposed to the Rancho Viejo Solar Battery project. I am strongly in favor of renewable energy and want to see solar placed on existing buildings and infrastructure, rather than using open space which is critical for wildlife, dark skies, quiet and more. I am very concerned about the amount of water this project is proposing to use. We live in a high desert environment that has been experiencing drought for decades now. There is no end date for that drought. Water will continue to be a more and more precious resource that we need to use wisely. This project does not feel like a wise use of water. Possibly a different battery type with less risk of fire and less need for water would be acceptable but the current plan is not.

Carole Wendler, Santa Fe, NM

From: Freddi Martinez <freddimartinez6@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 6:46 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I've been a resident in Eldorado since 1990, and strongly object to this unsafe project bring on my doorstep.

Freddi Fullington

2 Fortuna Rd.

FW: AES Proposed Lithium Battery Facility in Santa Fe

From: Janis Luedke <jalartsluedke326@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 12:43 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>; Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>

Cc: info@cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org

Subject: AES Proposed Lithium Battery Facility in Santa Fe

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sirs,

I oppose the AES lithium battery facility, proposed to be built at 221 Twilight Way, Santa Fe, 4,000 feet from the community of Eldorado.

This project would pose a significant risk of fire and toxic chemicals, threatening our air, water and our homes. According to Utilitydrive.com, "more than a quarter of energy storage systems have fire detection and suppression defects."

The fire at the AES battery energy storage facility in Escondido, CA on September 5, 2024, which resulted in the evacuation of residents, businesses and schools in the local area, has led to the passing of an "interim urgency ordinance in Escondido that prohibits new commercial battery energy storage system (BESS) developments within the city". There have apparently been 45 fires in BESS facilities since 2021. (City News Service)

For this reason alone, AES should consider building their proposed solar battery facility somewhere more distant from residential developments, so that potential disasters such as fire could be handled without endangering the health and wellbeing of local residential and commercial neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Janis Luedke
4 Ocotillo Place
Santa Fe, NM 87508
774-286-6065

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

From: Jennifer Warren <jenbwarren@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 4:35 PM

To: Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Rancho Viejo Solar Battery project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Just letting you know our strong opposition to this project!!!!!!

J and C Warren

21 Vaquero Trl

SF, NM 87508

FW: Opposition to the proposed Rancho Viejo BESS project

From: Joseph Pringle <joseph.pringle@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 6:27 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Opposition to the proposed Rancho Viejo BESS project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Ladd,

I am writing to you to express my concerns about the proposed AES solar project. I am a resident of Eldorado, and live on the western end of Camerada Road. Therefore, my home is one of the closest to the proposed development, and potentially one of the most impacted.

While I support the goal of transitioning to renewable energy, my concern about this project relates to the inappropriate location of it, wedged in closely to homes, schools and prisons. There are vast open spaces in New Mexico that could accommodate such a development that would not have the same potential negative impacts on thousands of people. I believe that this proposed location puts the financial interest of Warren Thompson and AES above the interests of the community. This is not the only place AES can build this facility, maybe just the cheapest.

If this Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is approved, then many Santa Fe county residents could see diminished home values, increased insurance costs (if it's even available at all), increased fire risks and health risks (due to noise pollution and possible exposure to toxins through air and groundwater exposure). And if any or all of that happens, it will be too late to put the Genie back in the bottle.

Please take the concerns of your broad constituency into consideration above the narrow interests of a real estate developer and an out of state multinational corporation.

Yours truly,

Joseph Pringle
678-595-6717

FW: Against the Rancho V commercial solar project

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

From: Louis Hine <sjklkh@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 4:32 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Against the Rancho V commercial solar project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms Ladd

I live in the Eldorado community and I write in opposition to the commercial solar project as planned.

- There is no need for massive battery storage as that only maximizes corporate profits while increasing community risk.
- We are already fire prone and do not need another risk point.
- The overhead transmission lines are unsightly and also increase fire risk and should be placed underground, just like ours are.
- This company is not a good citizen-neighbor and should not be trusted, based on lack of transparency and problems at other sites.
- We do not have the water to spare to support their massive request.
- Benefit will go out of area. We incur all costs without any meaningful benefit.
- And now they want to move it still closer to this community of 6000 souls.

Just say no.

Respectfully,
LKHine
25 Chusco Rd 87508

Sent from my iPhone

From: Mark Young <myoungeld@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 5:35 PM
To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: Opposition to propose a ES solar project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I am a Eldorado resident on the west side of town in very close to the proposed AES solar project. I strongly oppose this project for many reasons and urge you to vote no on this plan. Thanks

Mark young
47 Camarata Rd.
Santa Fe, New Mexico

From: Mary Beckner <marybeckner@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 7:50 AM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES facility

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioner,

I am strongly OPPOSED TO allowing the AES facility to be located in Santa Fe county near Eldorado.

Respectfully,

Mary Beckner
1 Glorieta Road
Santa Fe, NM 87508

From: Michael Knarr <outlook_9179D8E75D8FCBA8@outlook.com> **On Behalf Of** Michael Knarr

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 11:19 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Solar Project

Dear Alexandra,

AES provided project boundaries have been publicly posted numerous times and have had shown boundaries changing many times.

The latest plat publicly posted shows the east boundary lines moving from 1.3 miles to Eldorado's western boundary to now being a distance of 4000Ft.

It seems that this is a trend by AES to move as far east as possible to close in on the Eldorado neighborhood. When will a final project plat plan be provided and to whom? Having 600 hundred plus individual Lithium Ion batteries ever moving closer to my property in Eldorado is trouble to me to say the least, given the AES record for fires in the last two years. I have knowledge of three fire at least. To my knowledge no county agency has seen independent proof of AES's container safety claims. Only Container data provided by AES has been submitted or reviewed by the county. Such a review process does not breed confidence.

Respectfully,

Michael Knarr

47 Encantado Loop

Santa Fe (Eldorado), New Mexico.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: Molly Chirillo <mcchirillo@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 3:10 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Project

Dear Ms. Ladd,

I am writing to express my grave concern regarding the proposed AES Solar and Battery facility project. Like many others, I am astounded that this can even be considered. Our beautiful open space being taken over by a dangerous facility so close to neighborhoods is an appalling thought. The risk of fire in our hot, dry and windy area is already present, without having a known fire danger being installed. The environmental damage, and wildlife loss of space also cannot be ignored.

There are hundreds and hundreds of families here. What will happen to our property values? We have striven to maintain a pristine environment; that will be lost with this horror nearby. Our fire insurance will surely increase exponentially.

Does every decision have to come down to money? Can this decision be made by what is RIGHT, for people, the environment, and wildlife, instead of the biggest dollar sign?

I implore common sense to prevail. Please deny the continuation of this proposed facility by AES.

Molly Chirillo
9 Buffalo Draw
Santa Fe, NM 87508

From: Naomi Harrison <ngharrison1@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 4:44 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Rancho Viejo Solar

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I'm writing to strongly oppose the approval of the Ranch Viejo Solar installation as proposed.

I've read the application. attended numerous meetings with County Staff and AES Representatives both in person and virtually. I have also more than once written to staff begging for a moratorium on utility scaled solar until adequate regulations were passed. This obviously didn't happen. I consider myself fairly well informed of what's being proposed.

The type and number of BESS containers DO NOT BELONG 550' and under a mile from two residential areas, Eldorado being quite large. It's also close to the Rancho Viejo residential community, a school, the State Penitentiary and the Community College area.

In just a couple of years, very superior batteries will be widely available for wind and solar energy storage, which will cause no fire risk, and require no lithium mining which degrades our environment.

A 20' wide gravel barrier surrounding the facility is narrower than my residential driveway, and it is a totally inadequate fire-wall given the extremely dry and windy conditions at the proposed site and its proximity to residential areas.

I, and I believe most of the people opposed to this project are not at all opposed to solar energy, or even the solar arrays proposed, but the BESS component is too great a risk and hazzard for the proposed location.

Sincerely,

NaomG. Harrison
15 Ladera Rd
Santa Fe, NM 87508
505-204-3565

From: Naima <naima9alma@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 5:42 PM
To: jsisneros@santafecountynm.gov
Cc: Naima Shea <naima9alma@gmail.com>
Subject: AES proposal

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

>

>

> I am writing to once again express my concerns about the proposed utility scale lithium battery storage facility.

>

> For many months I have followed developments and written many different people, never receiving either acknowledgement of my letters nor receiving a response. As a Santa Fe County resident and tax paying citizen, I have felt disregarded in the process since the beginning.

>

> We deserve to have our voices heard and seriously addressed. A Conditional Use Permit was granted early on without consideration of the input of thousands of residents, which seems wrong and a disservice to us all. Apparently AES felt a tiny notice ages ago in the local newspaper was sufficient due diligence, but it was far from it since only a fraction of the community reads the paper. They should have invited us into the conversation transparently and in an inclusive manner. They seem more invested in redacting information than inclusion.

>

> At the very least, a Moratorium on the permitting process should be put in place and the correct permitting process for this type of facility should be researched and developed. We expect and deserve transparency . Our homes are much too close to the site AES wants to use to develop this huge and potentially dangerous facility.

>

> Additionally, AES facilities, as well as others that use lithium ion batteries, have had issues with fires and injuries. As you know, lithium fires are very difficult to extinguish. I am concerned for our first responders. And thousands of gallons of water must be used to cool down the many containers of batteries in order to prevent a massive thermal runaway which could literally threaten thousands of homes and businesses.

>

> I am VERY concerned about the different figures that I have seen from AES regarding how much water they intend to use both during construction and in case of fire. New Mexico simply

cannot afford to sell our limited water or compromise our precious aquifers for such a risky venture. Also, in the event of a battery fire, cooled by water (yet not extinguished by water) hydro fluoride is released from the mitigation process and disperses sometimes for long distances. It is carcinogenic and dangerous to breathe. It also sinks into the soil and can enter aquifers, potentially contaminating further the water sources we ALL depend upon.

>

> These are just a few of the issues that make so many residents fearful and disturbed.

>

> It has taken a very long time to even propose a Public Hearing, whereas the public and residential stakeholders (residents of San Marcos, Rancho Viejo and Eldorado, although a massive accident could also affect areas further into the City) have not felt included or supported in feeling that the County is looking after us. This is disappointing.

>

> I have reviewed some of the MANY documents that were just posted for the Board Agenda for Dec. 4, 2024, and very few people will have the time or bandwidth to take all those technical details, hundreds of pages, into account and comment or question—and most certainly not in a TWO MINUTE comment, which is all we are being allowed.

>

> Many of us are older and not physically able to sit all day in the hall. There is also concern from vulnerable residents that RSV and Covid are both circulating in the area now. This is why I am choosing to write to you so my concerns may become part of the record. I am almost 80 years old and do not have the stamina to sit through all-day meetings, and this is true of many others. I find it unacceptable that the New Mexico government offices cannot manage to upgrade their internet/tech facilities to allow public input without the caveat that the “tech may not” even work. I will attempt to listen and/or watch though. But much more needs to be done to improve community/government relations and better communications.

>

> We ARE in this together.

>

> Given how large and (relatively) sparsely populated our State is, there are many, many suitable locations for these industrial, utility scale and risky battery storage facilities to be placed AWAY FROM RESIDENTIAL areas. Please do not compromise our safety and peace because the Corporation is trying to save money on infrastructure (such as transmission lines). Naturally they are motivated by profit but they are a multimillion dollar outfit and can afford to do this right. We cannot afford to lose our homes, our health and our peace of mind by having such a facility so close to our wonderful Capitol.

>

> I hope you will take my concerns to heart. The safety of all County citizens should hold weight with our government and I hope a Moratorium will be a FIRST STEP in demonstrating your commitment to our safety and health concerns.

>

> Thank you,
>
> Naima Shea
> 4 Baya Ct.
> Santa Fe, NM 87508
> 505-670-5749
>
> Sent from my iPad

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

From: Pat Weaver <weaverp@me.com>

Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 8:09 AM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I am totally opposed to this facility being built so close to inhabited land. It will be dangerous and a blight on the landscape.

Sent from my iPad

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

From: Patricia Born <wisdomwave@icloud.com>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 1:54 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Protesting AES PROJECT

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Living in Santa Fe County as I do, it is a matter of great concern that the AES reconfigured project to use lithium ion batteries in a large solar energy generation project should NOT continue in any form. The company's batteries have had a serious and well-documented track record of intractable fires, as well as leakage of forever chemicals. Such events would be financial responsibility of the county to repair and intervene to avoid further catastrophic consequences. These issues have not been thoroughly vetted by expertise. Thus, the community residents have to speak up any so-called renewable project which needs to be thoroughly vetted. Such projects need to go through a proper procedure which includes generating multiple bids in an appropriate government process. AES APPARENTLY HAS SLIPPED IN THROUGH A LOOP POLE IN THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, and their questionable legal tactics further discredit this effort.

There are numerous repositories of expertise in science and engineering in the community which have thoroughly studied the problem. The County as a protective and governmental body should make sure that it serves the needs of the population and furthermore, the county needs to avail itself of all expertise and create a cooperative plan acceptable to all the residents.

Patricia Brown

2420 Calle contessa, SF NM 87505

Sent from my iPad

From: Stephen Inoue <golferdudestephen@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 1:05 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Solar project safety

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Please require a much more comprehensive fire suppression strategy than the currently proposed 5,000 and 30,000 gallon tanks. Extinguishing 1-100 kwh EV car battery averages over 20,000 gallons. One storage pod with 100 or more batteries inside could result in a catastrophic fire for the whole Santa Fe area.

I am a big fan of solar power and clean energy, but want to make sure that if this project moves forward, it is done in a safe manner without jeopardizing the lives and natural beauty of the Santa Fe area.

Stephen Inoue

Subject: FW: AES project

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

From: Stewart Breslin <spbreslin@comcast.net>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 9:19 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>

Cc: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mrs. Sisneros, Ladd and Yutzy:

I am emailing you to register my strong opposition to the AES project. I am an Eldorado resident and my concerns are :

1. This project will have a negative impact on property values in Eldorado.
2. Due to the demonstrated propensity of Lithium ion batteries to explode, the project will likely result in an increase in my fire insurance rates.
3. There is no plan that I am aware of to have in-person on site monitoring, which increases the risk that a fire at the facility will quickly spread and could get out of control before the fire department can respond.
4. There is a huge amount of empty land in this state so I can see no logical reason why this facility has to be located so close to residential areas.

I am all for green energy to help combat climate change but in my view this project in its current location makes no sense. Please vote to deny approval for this projects permit.

Sincerely,
Stewart Breslin
5 Montana Ct.
Santa Fe NM 87508

Sent from my iPad

From: Susan Gordon <susangordon@earthlink.net>

Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 11:06 AM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Strong Support for the AES Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Commissioner Ladd,

I write to express my strong SUPPORT for the proposed Rancho Viejo Solar Project. I attended a recent meeting in person at the Community College and listened to a webcast of a second meeting by the fire department. I believe that this is a very good project for Santa Fe. AES has listened to the community concerns with regards to the roads at the site, the spacing and height of the panels, and is providing on site staffing.

A few vocal opponents have made it difficult for some of us to even speak during meetings due to their aggressive and hostile behavior toward AES.

I live in the Rancho Viejo neighborhood and have no concerns about the safety of this solar installation. I have solar on my roof.

Please do what you can to support this project for Santa Fe and New Mexico.

Thank you,

Susan Gordon

Susan Gordon

susangordon@earthlink.net

FW: Please oppose the AES Project

From: T Biggs <t_biggs@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 1:24 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Please oppose the AES Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dominic Sisneros, Alexandra Ladd and Jordan Yutzy:

County representative, I am requesting that you oppose the AES project. I am unable to attend the in person meeting and thus wanted to go on the record with my strong opposition to the AES project. I am an Eldorado home owner.

If this project were just solar panels I would not object. The battery storage is the problem and the fire risk. AES facilities have had multiple fires at other facilities. A battery fire is not a matter of if but when it will occur. The area has a high percentage of retired and elderly residents which makes dealing with fire and toxic fumes more problematic. We already live in a high fire risk area do to the limited rainfall and vegetation. In addition to the fire risk this project may increase our home owners insurance or make our homes uninsurable as is happening in California due to frequent forest fires. There is so much undeveloped land it baffles me why this project is being placed where it is surrounded by residential homes. I don't understand how the zoning is allowing this project as it seems incompatible with residential houses.

- Why would the county want to pursue a project that is likely to reduce the property values of home and thus reduce the tax base for revenue?
- Please explain how the county zoning works and why this project is being considered. As I understand the zoning has to be changed to allow the project.
- Please deny this project.

Sincerely,

T Biggs
101 Monte Alto Road

FW: opposition to the CES project on Highway 14 in SF county

From: veronica o'halloran <nyninos3@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 10:01 AM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; jyutz@santafecountynm.gov

Subject: opposition to the CES project on Highway 14 in SF county

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

SF county officials

As a long-time resident and taxpayer of Eldorado and Santa Fe County, I strongly oppose the CES project, especially to the most current changes in the Solar Battery boundary portion of this project. There is evidence that companies such as those in the CES project have had extreme fire hazards associated with them.

To make these changes during the Thanksgiving break lends to deep suspicion that our county officials do not have the residents affected by this best interest at hand.

There is so much open land in our beautiful state, so having this CES development project nestled between two very populated communities does not consider the county residents' overall health, well-being, and environmental impact!

I also foresee how this project is allowed to continue, and will diminish the real estate values or the residents near the CES project, especially with potential fire hazards and poor environmental impact!

Please do the right and just actions to protect the residents of the two communities near the proposed project whose welfare you have been entrusted with!!!

Veronica O'Halloran MSN
Residents of Eldorado

FW: Please protect Eldorado Residents

From: Barbara Castleman <barbaracastleman@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 4:30 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Please protect Eldorado Residents

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Ladd,

We are writing to voice our strong objection to the proposed AES solar array farm and lithium battery storage project.

With so much open space available in New Mexico, there is simply no justification for locating this high-risk environmentally hazardous facility so close to thousands of homes.

We are most concerned about the possibility of a fire and the lack of preparedness for dealing with both a fire and the related evacuation of thousands of Eldorado residents including hundreds of schoolchildren. Plans call for 30,000 gallons of water to be stored at the facility. While not enough water to put out a lithium battery fire, it is a fraction of the water that will be required to build and maintain this facility. Where will this water come from?

Additional concerns are related to the environmental damage that will be caused in the name of producing "clean" solar energy. This includes damage caused by heavy machinery and toxic materials that will be transported to and stored at the site; the displacement and death of wildlife; noise (a constant hum), and light pollution.

AES as a corporation does not have a good track record of protecting the environment. On the contrary, they have proven to be more concerned with profit than people and animals.

We are senior citizens who have invested our life savings in our Eldorado home. If this facility is allowed to be built within 4,000 feet of our community, it will affect our ability to someday sell our home, as most people will not want to purchase a home so close to the massive AES facility. It may also impact our ability to obtain homeowners' insurance in the future.

We strongly urge Santa Fe County to reject locating this facility so close to a residential area where the lives and well-being of thousands of people would be at risk.

Please put the valid concerns of people who live close to the proposed facility ahead of AES' corporate profit. At the very least, the project must be delayed until appropriate plans for effectively dealing with a potential fire and evacuation, as well as an environmental impact study, can be made

Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, *Barbara & Craig Castleman, 10 Moya Loop, Santa Fe, NM 87508* barbaracastleman@gmail.com

FW: Opposition to the proposed AES Solar/BESS facility project

EXTERNAL EMAIL: DO NOT CLICK any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

To:
Dominic Sisneros - AES Case Manager
Alexandra Ladd - Growth Management Director/Land Use Admin
Jordan Yutzky - Building Manager (Planning Commission Liaison)

In the Matter of the AES Rancho Viejo Solar/BESS project

County representatives:

I am writing to go on record as expressing my opposition to the proposed AES Rancho Viejo Solar/BESS (lithium-ion battery storage system) project. County authorities should deny the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for this project. I am an Eldorado homeowner and resident.

While I generally support renewable energy projects such as solar farms, this AES Rancho Viejo project will also include a BESS system. The BESS poses a significant fire risk. A BESS system or component failure can result in an increased safety risk to residents of the area. For lithium-ion BESS, this is typically a thermal event such as fire or explosion. The County should be concerned that AES has had multiple fires at other facilities, a matter of public record. A BESS fire or other event is not a matter of if, but when, it will occur. The area around the proposed project site has a high percentage of retired and elderly residents as well as abundant wildlife which makes dealing with fire and toxic fumes problematic. We already live in a high fire risk area due to the limited rainfall and vegetation in our very arid climate. In addition to the fire risk, this project likely will increase our homeowner's insurance or even make our homes uninsurable as is happening in California due to frequent forest fires.

AES did have a report done that analyzed the risk to property values and concluded that there would be little effect. However, I would point out that their report looked ONLY at Solar Farms, and did not examine the issue of property values in regard to a BESS. This omission is telling. The county should be greatly concerned that homeowner's values would be negatively affected and thus reduce the County tax base for revenue.

It does not appear that AES looked at any alternative sites. Their choice of this site looks like a backroom deal with a single landowner. There is so much undeveloped land in New Mexico that could be utilized and is not near residences, schools, and other sensitive areas. For example, along the Highway 285 corridor that runs between Lamy and Galisteo to Clines Corners and I-40, there is open land as well as energy transmission infrastructure. It defies understanding why this project is being placed where it is surrounded by residential homes when there are viable alternatives.

A new concern has recently arisen in that AES has now increased the footprint of the project and moved it *even closer* to the western border of Eldorado, only 4,000 feet! 1.3 miles was already too close. This is a major concern and certainly points to AES' failure to be transparent and honest with the community it will be affecting.

Please deny the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for this project and deny any zoning change that would allow this project to be built where it is proposed. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Barbara J. Aldridge
3 Avila Ct
Santa Fe NM 87508

FW: Rancho Viejo Solar, LLC Conditional Use Permit (CUP)

From: Alexandra Ladd

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 9:27 AM

To: 'Barry Goldberg' <barry@hwgoldberg.com>; Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: RE: Rancho Viejo Solar, LLC Conditional Use Permit (CUP)

Thanks for your email.

The developers are not changing the location of anything. On their application, they showed only the parts of the site where development will occur. The confusion was caused by the staff report which shows the entire site, including the open space and undisturbed areas. The parcel boundary has not changed and the developed area is not getting moved closer to El Dorado. In fact, the area closest to your neighborhood is reserved as open space and will never be developed. Before the application is presented to the Planning Commission, the applicant will be required to update their site plan to show the undeveloped areas on their site plan, in addition to the developed areas.

Let me know if you have any other questions.

Thanks!

-Alexandra

From: Barry Goldberg <barry@hwgoldberg.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 8:43 AM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Rancho Viejo Solar, LLC Conditional Use Permit (CUP)

Hello,

We are new residents of El Dorado and are learning about this project. We have mixed feeling about the merits of this project. However we just learned that the developers have changed the location and are requesting to build it closer to El Dorado and our home. This makes no sense! With all the concerns and opposition to the project, why are they proposing to move it closer to El Dorado?

Please deny this request from AES. They need to move it further away from our development, not closer. Then maybe we can support it.

Barry Goldberg

99 Encantado Loop

Santa FE, NM 87508

970-749-1808

From: diana ford <dianart777@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 3:27 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES facility

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I am a taxpayer and resident of New Mexico since 1959. I completely **oppose** the Solar field/lithium battery storage facility project being discussed for any piece of. Land in NM.

It is for profit and does not benefit Local New Mexicans. Very neglectful of the impact on the residents within close proximity to this facility.

Diana Ford

Fw: AES Solar Project

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 10:47:31 AM

To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>; Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioner Hughes and Planning Staff Members,

We are writing to share our concerns and opposition to the proposed AES solar facility. Our home is located at 85 Encantado Loop and we look out across part of the impacted Rancho Viejo lands to our North.

Our concerns and objections concern three primary areas:

1. Outdated Zoning - We do not believe the Santa Fe County Zoning rules ever envisioned an industrial scale solar facility and, as such, you are now applying outdated criteria. Chapter 7 of the SGMP (2010) is primarily platitudes about the benefits of sustainable energy and does not address the reality of such a facility. The staff appear to apply the seven criteria as if this is a request for a 400 gsf casita as opposed to asking the bigger questions of where these types of facilities would be best located for the long-term good of the city, county and state. If asking these questions is not the purview of the Planning Commission or staff then where are our elected officials?

2. Fire Protection - The Atar Fire Review lists 93 open comments that Must be addressed prior to commissioning. Yet there is no mention of this in the "Conditions of Approval". In addition, it is unclear to what extent the local codes, the County or AES have considered the potential impact of winds carrying a spark from a fire to adjacent grasslands and homes. This is a major concern of the homeowners in Eldorado and it has not been specifically addressed. It seems possible that our home insurance rates will go up due to the location of this facility?

3. Visual Impact - In essence staff is saying, "people will get used to it". Does a 70' monopole have less of an impact than a 50' H frame? Much of the land to the north of Encantado Loop drops off and then rises to the ridge on which these power poles will run. What is the spacing between poles? What is better, fewer poles or less height? Should this be approved then AES should be required to place a 70' monopole and 50' H frame on the site and let the community decide which they prefer.

We support sustainable energy. We understand the complexity in getting energy infrastructure permitted and built. At the same time it appears we are rushing to accommodate AES without thinking long term about the best location for such facilities. Santa Fe county is huge as is the state of New Mexico. There are areas in both that are better suited for such facilities.

Diane Del Rosso
Anne Stewart
85 Encantado Loop

From: Jean Crawford <jeanneewmexico@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 10:38:39 AM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; jyuttz@santafecountynm.gov <jyuttz@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Solar project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr Sisneros, Ms Ladd and Jordan Yutzy,

As you review the AES Project, please include questions about noise levels of the INVERTERS and how that SOUND does amplify. Construction noise is presented in the plan, but addressing noise produced by continuous flipping of DC to AC was not apparent to me. I hope AES is using the latest technology choices for all parts and minimize landscape damage in their footprint.

Regards,
Jean Crawford
Eldorado

FW: Comments Regarding the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Lithium-ion Battery Project (and/or Eldorado)

From: laura detert <lbdetert@yahoo.com>

Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 8:55 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Cc: Laura Detert <lbdetert@yahoo.com>; Cleanenergycoalitionsfc Info <info@cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org>

Subject: Comments Regarding the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Lithium-ion Battery Project (and/or Eldorado)

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Ladd,

I understand there is a County Hearing this Wednesday, December 4th, 2024.

Though I am unable to attend, I would like to share my thought with you and have my comments become part of the formal record on this matter.

As a citizen of Santa Fe County, I am opposed to this Solar Lithium-ion Battery Project for the following reasons:

1. **Water and Air Contamination:** Toxic PFAS (forever chemicals) contained in batteries, and the herbicides used to reduce vegetation, will be released and will seep into our ground water and aquifers. **This is poisonous and will undoubtedly lead to all manner of health problems--including cancer.**
2. **Increased Fire Risk:** Lithium-ion battery storage facilities are known to pose fire hazards that can cause evacuations and sheltering-in-place orders, and potential for panic. (There have been 3 documented fires at AES battery facilities in the last 5 years).
3. **Lack of Comprehensive Evaluation:** The AES APPLICATION DOES NOT MEET THE CRITERIA FOR A CUP (Conditional Use Permit) application, per the SLDC (Sustainable Land Use Development Code) 4.9.64. **A 100% DESIGN APPROVAL SHOULD BE REQUIRED to assure the health and safety of residents and the environment--30% is NOT enough.**
4. **Due Process Rights:** While AES has been consulting with the County for a number of years, community groups have often been denied the privilege of access, leading to a disenfranchisement of Santa Fe citizens and a growing concern that our voice is less important than that of a multinational corporation. **OUR VOICES SHOULD BE MORE IMPORTANT; WE LIVE HERE.**

In closing, the above reason #1 should be enough, in itself, to abandon this project forever. Please ask yourself, would you want this Lithium-ion Battery Project next door to you and your family? I am sure your answer would be NO. I know that I would not want it. I do not want any family's health to be sacrificed for the sake of a Solar Lithium-ion Battery Project.

Thank-you for considering my comments and making them part of the written record.

Sincerely,
Laura Detert

From: Lisa Smith <lisasmithsantafe@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 3:02 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

All - Please register my opposition to the AES project. As a long-time resident of Eldorado and a Realtor, this poses just too much danger to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Thank you.

Best,

Lisa Smith

Sotheby's International Realty

Top Producers

505-570-5770 - cell

santaferealestatenow.com

eldoradoinsantafe.com

[Client Reviews](#)

FW: Reject AES/Rancho Viejo Conditional Use Permit

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Ms. Ladd,

The Rancho Viejo/AES Solar project should not be approved: it is a dangerously wrong project for Santa Fe County in bringing needed solar energy to New Mexico and beyond.

The project is one of convenient enrichment for AES and the property owner at the expense of our neighborhoods, with little to no benefit for the County, or the State.

The AES project presents a severe danger to multiple communities in the county (including the city), would be a blight on the environment that makes Santa Fe a world-class destination, and there would be little, short-lived economic benefit from the project.

The evolving addition of the battery storage facility is an obvious reason to reject this project.

AES has had numerous battery fires as has been documented, despite fire suppression systems, fire training etc. in its facilities. The similar systems proposed in the latest AES plan set battery storage in the middle of dry, wind-swept plains, with inadequate resources described to fight a likely uncontrolled fire. This is as dangerous as it is ludicrous.

The increased fire threat will absolutely lead to insurance companies cancelling home policies and or raising rates, another hit to homeowners already struggling with these issues, as well as losses in property values because of the fire threat.

Fifty foot towers, at a minimum, carrying electric transmission lines will not only spoil views in multiple directions (damaging property values again), views that attract so many to our area, but pose another fire danger for us all. California's disastrous fires alone show the folly of above ground lines. We must move in the future to requiring utility lines be buried, despite above ground lines being cheaper for the companies involved.

Lighting the project, despite downward facing lighting, will further destroy the withering "Dark Skies" designation we are supposed to hold – lighting an area that large will make it stand out, no matter what, as much as the prison lights.

As everyone knows, any jobs from the construction of the project will disappear once built and we will be left with an eyesore project, with little local or state benefit for decades to come.

AES's intent is clearly to produce and store energy to sell on the open market, with profits going to the company and its shareholders, not local entities or necessarily our state.

So why support this unsupportable project that puts our citizens in obvious danger of losing their homes, businesses and lives? Why despoil our environment for the benefit of an out of state corporate entity that cares only about the cheapest, inadequate plan to gain quick profit?

There are no good reasons. Reject this project.

Thank you,

Matthew Wood
501 Rio Grande Ave., D-8
Santa Fe, NM 87501

From: Patricia Dobrin <patdobrin@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 10:39:33 AM
To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: AES PROJECT

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

As an Eldorado resident, I am completely opposed to the building of the AES facility..

It is a danger to our community:

1. Fire hazard
2. Toxicity: pollution of air and ground
3. No benefit to local community

Patricia Dobrin
8 Isidro Road, Santa Fe NM 87508

To:
Dominic Sisneros - AES Case Manager
Alexandra Ladd - Growth Management Director/Land Use Admin
Jordan Yutzy - Building Manager (Planning Commission Liaison)

In the Matter of the AES Rancho Viejo Solar/BESS project

County representatives:

I am writing to go on record as expressing my opposition to the proposed AES Rancho Viejo Solar/BESS (lithium-ion battery storage system) project. I am an Eldorado resident. County authorities should deny the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for this project.

While I generally support renewable energy projects such as solar farms, this AES Rancho Viejo project will also include a BESS system. The BESS poses a significant fire risk. A BESS system or component failure can result in an increased safety risk to residents of the area. For lithium-ion BESS, this is typically a thermal event such as fire or explosion. The County should be concerned that AES has had multiple fires at other facilities, a matter of public record. A BESS fire or other event is not a matter of if, but when, it will occur. The area around the proposed project site has a high percentage of retired and elderly residents as well as abundant wildlife which makes dealing with fire and toxic fumes problematic. We already live in a high fire risk area due to the limited rainfall and vegetation in our very arid climate. In addition to the fire risk, this project likely will increase our homeowner's insurance or even make our homes uninsurable as is happening in California due to frequent forest fires.

AES did have a report done that analyzed the risk to property values and concluded that there would be little effect. However, I would point out that their report looked ONLY at Solar Farms, and did not examine the issue of property values in regard to a BESS. This omission is telling. The county should be greatly concerned that homeowner's values would be negatively affected and thus reduce the County tax base for revenue.

It does not appear that AES looked at any alternative sites. Their choice of this site looks like a backroom deal with a single landowner. There is so much undeveloped land in New Mexico that could be utilized and is not near residences, schools, and other sensitive areas. For example, along the Highway 285 corridor that runs between Lamy and Galisteo to Clines Corners and I-40, there is open land as well as energy transmission infrastructure. It defies understanding why this project is being placed where it is surrounded by residential homes when there are viable alternatives.

A new concern has recently arisen in that AES has now increased the footprint of the project and moved it *even closer* to the western border of Eldorado, only 4,000 feet! 1.3 miles was already too close. This is a major concern and certainly points to AES' failure to be transparent and honest with the community it will be affecting.

Please deny the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for this project and deny any zoning change that would allow this project to be built where it is proposed. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Wayne S. Baldan
3 Avila Ct
Santa Fe NM 87508

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

From: Alison Q <alison.v.quaglia@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 10:32 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Oppose the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Battery Project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear decision makers,

Our family and fellow neighbors/ tax payers are extremely opposed to the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Battery project. We live in Eldorado, dangerously close to the proposed site, and find this project ludicrous in placement so close to residential homes. There are many valid reasons why we are opposed to this potential disaster including the great risk of wildfires as seen from numerous past cases, pollution, noise, disturbance of our beloved dark skies, destruction of natural spaces, loss in property value, loss of scenic views and the cost to our local wildlife. We are appalled that Santa Fe has allowed this proposal to come this far at great risk to our community. Please put the safety of your residents ahead of profit and reject AES immediately.

Sincerely,
Alison Quaglia

From: Belinda Berse <belindaberse@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 3:38 PM
To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: Re: AES Solar Project
Importance: High

December 3, 2024

Dear Ms. Ladd,

Thank you for reading this email.

I very much want to participate but am unable to attend the very important County hearing scheduled for Wednesday, December 4th in regard to the AES Solar Project .

Please note for your records that I am strongly opposed to the AES Project.

I live in Eldorado and believe that this project is a serious danger to this whole community and the outlying areas surrounding it. I have been reading and following this project and am appalled at the disregard for not only to the human community but to the environment and our natural wildlife.

This WILL NOT be something that benefits our lives, it will only put us and our beautiful New Mexico in danger of destruction. This project will jeopardize the sale of our houses, it will not enhance our lives and the danger of wildfire is terrifying to even think about.

I STAND IN OPPOSITION TO THE AES SOLAR PROJECT.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Belinda Berse

14 Quedo Rd., Santa Fe, NM 87508

From: Beverly Squaglia <1967chico@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 11:39 AM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

We are in favor of clean renewable energy. We have solar panels on our home and a water collection system to irrigate our yard.

The proposed AES battery storage facility is NOT a suitable use for the intended site.

Considering AES's dreadful battery safety record, the threat of fire, and of water / air contamination from toxic chemicals to the surrounding communities, is too high to allow this project to go forward at this site.

Beverly Squaglia
30 Fonda Road
Santa Fe, NM
87508

From: Brenda Matea <bmatea@icloud.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 12:21 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: OPPOSE - AES Rancho Viejo Solar Battery project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I am writing as a concerned citizen who lives in Eldorado at Santa Fe.

I OPPOSE the proposed location of the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Battery project moving near the Eldorado community.

Thank you.

Brenda Matea
116 Verano Loop
Santa Fe, NM 87508

From: Charlotte <squarehalt@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 6:12 AM
To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: I Oppose the Lithium battery Storage Facility

Rancho Viejo Lithium-Ion Battery Storage Facility: I Oppose the Lithium battery Storage Facility for the following reasons:

This project has twice been rejected by the County, but a permit is currently being considered for land just north of El Dorado and south of the greater Arroyo Hondo neighborhoods. This project is promoted as an “environmental solar project”, but the solar array planned is FAR smaller than the huge quantity of batteries they are planning, and is just for show. It’s really a facility to very temporarily store energy, much of it purchased at low cost from PNM and then sold back at a higher cost when demand is up. The facility is a huge fire risk, and an environmental polluter, as large quantities of herbicides will be necessary to reduce fire risks, herbicides which will leach into our ground water. The facility off-loads PFA’s (forever chemicals) on a regular basis, and should it catch on fire (25% of this company’s storage facilities have burned) residents for miles around would have to be evacuated or told to shelter in place with windows closed and AC turned off, due to the toxic chemicals released. Please help us fight this project and encourage a healthier solution for energy storage in our area.

Charlotte Sandelin
25 Hondo Trail
Santa Fe, NM 87508
505-501-3915

From: Christy Burke <clburke@me.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 4:03 PM

To: disisneros@santafecountynm.gov; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: WE OPPOSE Rancho Viejo Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

To Whom It May Concern,

We would like to express our *strong opposition* to the Rancho Viejo Solar Project being considered for Santa Fe County.

This project in itself is something which would be extremely undesirable for our county due to the negative effects on wildlife and the environment, but the potential for disastrous damage to land, air and water supplies in the event of fire, regardless of the cause, should remove it from ANY CONSIDERATION.

We are lifelong residents of this beautiful part of the world and we are sure, on consideration, you will help us preserve our sacred trust for the future by denying this project further consideration, in any form, going forward.

Thank you.

Respectfully and gratefully,

Christy & Randy Burke

37 Media Luna

Santa Fe, NM 87508

505-679-9682

From: Dana Killen <danakillen@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 7:09 PM

To: disisneros@santafecountynm.gov; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Rancho Viejo Solar Installation Proposal

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Dominic Sisneros, Santa Fe County AES Case Manager

Alexandra Ladd, Growth Management Director/Land Use Administrator

Jordan Yutzy, Building and Development Manager/Planning Commission Liason

I am a resident of Eldorado at Santa Fe and am 100 percent opposed to the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Installation. The proposed site is right in the middle of three residential communities affecting the lives and homes of thousands of people. The land itself is dry grassland plagued by drought, hot temperatures, high winds and low humidity making it already subject to risk of fire. The proposed lithium-ion battery storage system has the highest potential for sparking fires of all the available energy storage systems. The certainties of more costly home owner insurance coverage (if available at all), declining property values and the strain on our water supply incurred as a result of this proposed installation added to the noise pollution created and the threats of air and water contamination and potential fire risk make this the wrong plan in the wrong place. The record of lawsuits against AES and fires at other AES installations, together with their redacting of critical information on their fire testing results in previous applications makes AES the wrong company to be involved with in any business venture.

Please protect your neighbors by taking the necessary steps to end this threat.

Thank you,
Dana Killen

Dear Alexandra,

Alexandra Ladd, Growth Management Director/Land Use Administrator:

Thank you for being available to help resolve concerns about this AES solar project and the lithium-ion battery facility.

Thank you for your time and dedication to benefit Santa Fe residents.

We can make this project work. With proper safeguards and oversight the cleaner energy source can be truly provided in a cleaner manner. Make it happen. Make AES build a safe, clean project. Make them reach into their pockets and lower their profits a little bit to install more safeguards.

We need energy, certainly. But we also need cleaner, greener energy sources and infrastructure. And this can happen. Let's make sure it happens appropriately and with the highest degree of safety.

Today, we have the knowledge and scientific expertise to provide energy so that the short term gains (measured either in energy or profits) do not outweigh the longer term benefits. And always consider the long-term consequences of projects like these that usually manifest health hazards, environmental messes, and community disturbance). As a society we are advanced enough to be able to provide services in the best way possible, with the fewest problems. But we need to make sure this happens. We often don't do the right thing, because profits and greed and short-sightedness take over ultimate control, rather than civic aesthetics, or benefits, clean energy, or beauty, or environmental health and ecological protection.

We can make sure that what is proposed and what will be built is the best solution for our future energy needs, for our community, not just what lines the pocketbook of CEO's, or not just what benefits outsiders who will not be living next to this facility and whose families will not be in danger or impacted in the future b/c they do not live nearby.

Let's make sure this facility does get built with the best infrastructure and safest technology available.

NIMBY issue:

If this project was being proposed for the community where the CEOs and top level advisors of AES, or even the workers and hired laborers of AES lived, then they would be rightfully concerned and on the other side of the fence, as we are today. They would be angry and concerned and wanting improvements to the project.

It should not be a case of "build and walk away." Please think about what will happen to this facility in 5 years, or 10 ? or 50 years ?

We have to be smarter about the profound decisions we make today, b/c they will most impact those living nearby and in SF County in the future.

This is our home, and most of the citizens who are concerned about this project want to continue living here. We do not want to move, nor be forced to move b/c we are now in danger from this facility.

This project should not develop into a situation of citizens not wanting energy production. NIMBY again. Not In My Back Yard situations arise because there are legitimate concerns or hazards not being addressed or resolved or fixed, or there is misinformation, or misunderstanding. Please require AES to improve and protect the community in which it will be built. AES can do this; they will build a better facility if they are told to do so. Please require them build a safe, good facility.

Energy production should ultimately benefit communities, not harm them. If the majority of the energy produced by this AES project is not being consumed locally, then have them build it closer to where it will be used. Make local projects local. This way the local safety and concerns are internalized and real, and usually addressed. Outsiders are usually removed and impersonal. AES wants profits, not clean energy production.

Having projects that are distanced and removed from the source causes problems with NIMBY (usually the big companies and CEO's don't give a damn).

I understand that sometimes there are benefits to building some facility far away from where the products are being consumed, but in this case it seems to indicate that this location is the cheapest and easiest. This does not mean, then, that it will be built in the safest way, or that it is being done in the most environmentally strict manner. Again, this is probably a situation of hast and profits and of cutting corners.

Why not put some of the people who live nearby and who are emotionally invested in the area into the groups/panels/boards in charge of oversight or authority to help address these concerns and safety issues? Don't let the big company simply reply with rhetoric and disingenuous proposals.

Are all the necessary and possible EIS Environmental Impact Statements being fully done ?!

Economies of Scale benefits and dilemma:

I understand that often bigger companies can more easily provide the infrastructure to projects like these or they have the deep pockets to address more of the social and health concerns. Big companies can often provide services better and cheaper. Sometimes. And only if they are forced to comply with safety and environmental concerns. And only if their bottom line or company ethos is to do good things for a community, not just squeeze out profits. Unless they live locally and truly care about the area will they genuinely care about more than profits. Beware, money clouds human thinking.

There are always pros and cons of most decisions of this scale to build a large industry or facility. Let's make sure it is built properly, with the best knowledge and technology available, and with the highest safeguards possible.

This company, and all the people involved in making the decisions for this project, must be sincere. They must make decisions based on honesty, and they must genuinely care for the community in which it is being built and which it is impacting. People need to think and feel as if they actually live nearby and care, now and in the future, not short-term gains, but long-term gains and benefits. Not estranged outsiders. Not CEO's wanting profits over the concerns of neighbors and people.

Scared, angry, concerned citizens should not be here today. We should be doing other things / roles / jobs going about our day, confident that those involved in this project are doing the right thing by making sure the facility is built properly and safely. The fact that there are still concerns and subterfuge means bad things. Fix this. Make AES fully address the many concerns, legitimately and honestly. (Not behind-closed-door thinking by big corporate CEO's whose bottom line is probably money, short term profits, and returns. They should be more concerned and driven by long-term social benefits, long-term energy needs, long-term ecological gain, and long-term local community well being. We all want and need healthy air to breath, clean ground water to tap, and healthy soils.

This project can happen. It probably should. So let's make sure it is built and done in the best and safest way possible. Make the company address and resolve the concerns. Make them responsible for addressing all safety issues. And don't let them simply respond with rhetoric or talk and speculation; make them commit and provide remedy. Make them install what should be installed to assure all possible outcomes and dangers are minimized. Make them act like they care about the community, like they actually live here. I am sure there will still be plenty of profits to be made (and probably big profits for that matter).

Decisions about this project need to involve **ALL** the possible problems foreseen now and in the future. Anticipate the consequences. Think up scenarios to address any future issues now. This is possible. Make it happen.

Like with the WIPP project. Like with Pit production and nuclear production in Los Alamos. Like building any nuclear facility. Like any waste water project. Do the research ! Anticipate disasters ! Prepare for any possible disaster ! Address all environmental hazards. Avoid the long-term environmental and public health problems that always seem to plague big, hasty, projects built by un-connected corporations made up of people not living in the area who will not care about the future of this area. In hindsight, we always wish we could go back to avoid the fires, the leaks, the contaminations (like the PFAS in Cienega and Cieneguilla). Don't regret ! Be proactive.

Please do not let this happen as it is currently proposed !

Please make this company build a safe, properly tested facility that we all can be reasonably proud of both now and in the future.

Thank you for doing the right thing.

Robinson Kurth

SF County resident for 50+ years
132 Arroyo Hondo Trail, SF, NM

From: dan y dena ross warner <danydena@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 5:03 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; disisneros@santafecountynm.gov; jyutz@santafecountynm.gov

Subject: Rancho Viejo Lithium-Ion Battery Storage Facility

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I live in the vicinity of this proposed facility and I am very concerned about all the risks and liabilities associated with it.

There are issues with the possibility of fire, which will put huge amounts of PFAs into the environment, in addition to the smaller amounts it will shed continuously.

Also, herbicides will certainly be used to control vegetation, with the result of chemicals leaching into the ground water.

We do not want this facility which will enrich the solar company and do nothing but degrade our local environment. There are much safer and more ecological solutions. This one may well be a future disaster.

Please vote against it.

Dena Ross

16 vista del cerro, Santa Fe, NM 87508

Dear Mr. Sisneros, Ms. Ladd and Mr. Yutzy,

As a resident of Eldorado, I am opposed to the AES storage system being proposed to be built near my home.

Fire worries are real. AES storage systems have caught fire in the past. In 2010, in Surprise, AZ, a "cascading thermal runaway event" began with the failure of a single battery which led to an explosion that sent 8 firefighters to the hospital, four in serious condition. Another AES-owned project caught fire and burned for more than 10 days in Chandler, AZ in 2022. Nearby residents and businesses were forced to evacuate several times during those 10 days in case toxic gasses from the site spread. There are other examples you will find if you research the issue. Even AES acknowledges that battery storage systems have inherent risks.

There is also the issue of trust. AES has a history of not respecting communities in which they operate. At an AES coal-fired power plant in Puerto Rico, improperly disposed toxic coal ash has contaminated the water, soil and air. A study by the University of Puerto Rico School of Public Health found that nearby communities have unusually high rates of respiratory, cardiovascular and skin diseases, as well as cancer. Local environmentalists there have criticized AES's remediation plan as woefully insufficient.

Here in the U.S., an AES-owned plant in Indiana has reportedly dumped over a million gallons of untreated water, contaminated with coal ash, into the White River on a daily basis. The water has been stored for decades in unlined containment ponds that leach into the groundwater. In response to critics, a spokesperson told the Indianapolis Business Journal that the health and safety of residents is the company's priority.

If the company's past behavior is any indication, we shouldn't believe that their behavior in our community will be different. And if AES was truthfully concerned about the people in the areas in which they want to build, they would make sure to send out letters about upcoming meetings to all residents who might be affected. They don't.

AES sued Santa Fe County this past September, asking for a restraining order to prevent the county from publicly disclosing certain technical specs about the project, claiming they are trade secrets. As a result, those of us who live near the proposed project have been unable to access complete information about the battery storage system, which we believe is crucial to understanding potential risks. AES is hiding something. What?

There is also concern and confusion about who will actually benefit from this energy storage. A PNM spokesperson has assured the public that the energy will be used locally and only surplus energy would be sold out of state. Frankly, after PNM's desperate plan to be bought out by Avangrid, a company with a history of poor service and regulatory misconduct, I don't trust PNM.

In addition, it is difficult for people to take a full day off to appear in person at the meeting tomorrow to ask questions. I think you do a disservice to the community when you only allow the public to listen in to this meeting and not to participate. I hope you will reconsider.

I am not against solar projects per se, just ones that could impact the safety and health of an entire community.

Respectfully,
Diana Ayers

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

From: Douglas Gruenau <bwr54dtg44@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 9:01 AM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Opposition to Rancho Viejo Solar Battery Project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Ladd,

I want to indicate my opposition to the Rancho Viejo Solar Battery Project. The record of dangerous fires from this type of battery is alarming and represents a serious threat to the surrounding communities. I think this project should not go forward. I understand that storing solar energy is important to the success of reducing the use of fossil fuels, but safer means to store that energy have to be found and used before projects like this are located near residential areas.

Sincerely,
Douglas Gruenau

23 Chapala Road
Santa Fe, NM. 87508

From: Ilan Gitter <ilan.gitter@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 10:02 AM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Opposition to AES solar project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear decision makers,

I am extremely opposed to the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Battery project. We live in Eldorado, closest to the proposed site, and find this project disturbing in placement so close to residential homes. There are many valid reasons why we are opposed to this potential disaster including the great risk of wildfires as seen from numerous past cases, noise, disturbance of our beloved dark skies, destruction of natural spaces, loss in property value, loss of scenic views and the cost to our local wildlife. We are appalled that Santa Fe has allowed this proposal to come this far at great risk to our community. Please put the safety of your residents ahead of profit and reject AES immediately.

Sincerely,

Ilan

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 8:16 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: I oppose the AES project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Alexandra Ladd,

I, Jack Lehman, a resident of Seton Village, want to express to you my total **OPPOSITION TO THE AES PROJECT.**

The facility off-loads PFA's (forever chemicals) on a regular basis, and should it catch on fire (25% of this company's storage facilities have burned) residents for miles around would have to be evacuated or told to shelter in place with windows closed and AC turned off, due to the toxic chemicals released.

Please do all you can to defeat this project.

Sincerely, Jack Lehman

Jack Lehman, MA, MA, LPCC

Certified Trainer - Center for Nonviolent Communication

Equine Assisted Psychotherapy

CEU'S approved by the NM Counseling & Therapy Practice Board

505-988-5464

<https://JackLehman.org>

www.cnvc.org

<https://www.buzzsprout.com/1554039/8691095> - **"Dao of Domination" Audio**

"So when we use the word 'meditation' we do not mean something that is practiced. We have no method. Meditation means awareness: to be aware of what you are doing, what you are thinking, what you are feeling, aware without any choice, to observe, to learn. Meditation is to be aware of one's conditioning....Out of this awareness comes attention, the capacity to be completely attentive. Then there is freedom to see things as they actually are, without distortion. The mind becomes unconfused, clear, sensitive."

J. Krishnamurti "Beyond Violence", 80

From: Jenn Cohen <zenkoan7@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 6:19 PM

To: disisneros@santafecountynm.gov

Cc: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Objection against Battery storage

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello I am writing to submit my complete objection to the Rancho Viejo Lithium-Ion Battery Storage Facility. This puts everyone and the land at high risk and I demand a healthier solution for energy storage in our area.

Thank you,
Jenn

From: Jerri Katzerman <jerriarizona@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 7:31 AM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Opposition to AES Project

Dear Ms. Ladd,

My name is Jerri Katzerman and I live in Eldorado. I am writing to register my opposition to the AES Project. I am concerned about potential fire danger, noise pollution, and declining home values. While I support alternative energy, the AES project is too close to multiple residential communities. Please vote against this project.

Thank you,

Jerri Katzerman
6 Alcalde Loop
Santa Fe, NM

From: John Coats <johnrcoats@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 4:20 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Concerns and Opposition to the Proposed AES Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Ladd: We live at 28 Encantado Loop in Eldorado and are writing to express our concerns and opposition to the proposed AES solar facility.

We are VERY concerned about the potential fire hazards associated with this type of facility as clearly stated in the 93 open comments made by the Atar Fire Review. After living in Eldorado for 5 years, we are acutely aware of the impact the frequent high winds and sudden, unpredictable gusts of wind would be in disastrously spreading a life threatening fire to the residents and homes of Eldorado. It is a risk that we are strongly hoping that you are not willing to take with our lives and property.

We understand the importance of and support the creation of clean energy resources, but believe that there are far safer, less populated areas in Santa Fe County and the state of New Mexico where a facility like this could be safely constructed.

It is our hope that you will take our concerns and the concerns of our neighbors into consideration and protect us from the potential dangers of this type of facility to our community.

Thank you,

John and Pam Coats

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

From: Kathleen Koltes <skinner914@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 12:29 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Proposed Battery Project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms Ladd,

I strongly oppose the AES lithium-ion battery project being built in the proposed area.

It would be too close to schools, and to the surrounding communities.

The potential for fire, and air and water contamination makes it amazing that it is even being considered for an area so close to human populations.

I'm all for renewable energy, but this is simply not an appropriate place.

Please don't allow this to happen here.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Koltes

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

From: K Sandelin <sandelins@msn.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 7:47 AM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: SOLAR/BATTERY STORAGE FACILITY - SAY NO!

PLEASE REJECT THE PROPOSED BATTERY/SOLAR FACILITY

his project has twice been rejected by the County, but a permit is currently being considered for land just north of El Dorado and south of the greater Arroyo Hondo neighborhoods. This project is promoted as an "environmental solar project", but the solar array planned is FAR smaller than the huge quantity of batteries they are planning, and is just for show. It's really a facility to very temporarily store energy, much of it purchased at low cost from PNM and then sold back at a higher cost when demand is up. The facility is a huge fire risk, and an environmental polluter, as large quantities of herbicides will be necessary to reduce fire risks, herbicides which will leach into our ground water. The facility off-loads PFA's (forever chemicals) on a regular basis, and should it catch on fire (25% of this company's storage facilities have burned) residents for miles around would have to be evacuated or told to shelter in place with windows closed and AC turned off, due to the toxic chemicals released. Please help us fight this project and encourage a healthier solution for energy storage in our area.

Ken Sandelin
25 Hondo Trail
Santa Fe, NM 87508

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

From: Kim Day <kimday126@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 12:14 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Rancho Viejo Solar Lithium-ion Battery Project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Afternoon Alexandra,

I am not able to attend the meeting today but strongly OPPOSE the AES Battery project on Rancho Viejo land .

We have the opportunity now to make smart, well informed decisions regarding " Green Energy " . Please consider projects that will benefit OUR citizens, land and wildlife . Not an out of state billion dollar corporation .

Check out the microgrids that Kit Carson Electric Coop in Taos, NM is developing !!

Thank You , Kim Day

We live near the rail trail in Sunlit Hills , County Commission district 4

From: Kimberly Victoria <kimberly7179@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 6:31 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Opposed to AES storage facility

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Alexandra,

I'm a community member, Kimberly Seftel, and oppose the battery storage facility in a residential area. Residents (people and children) should not be put at risk for the profit of a large company. There are other options for energy for Santa Fe county. I'm sure you will hear all about it tomorrow at your meeting.

Best, Kimberly Seftel
Santa Fe County Resident

RE: Laura Birrell - SF county #3157317

Hello,

\Our office received the following constituent comments. Would your office be able to assist this constituent?

Please see the following inquiry for your office's review and assistance. A confirmation of receipt is most appreciated.

The contact information and information about their concern is listed below.

Laura T Birrell

colgorlowo@gmail.com

+18052643022

11 Running Horse Trail

Santa Fe NM 87508-9509

From: Laura T Birrell <colgorlowo@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Dec 4, 2024 at 9:16 am

Good Morning,

I am Laura Birrell and live in Arroyo Hondo on the Southside of Santa Fe. I am very concerned about the environmental impact and real estate value impact the AES Rancho Viejo Project would have for the area around this project not to mention its close proximity to greater Santa Fe. Please stop this Project.

I have attached link from the Clean Energy Coalition for Santa Fe County about all the negative potentials of this type of installation so close to my home and the corridor along Old Las Vega Highway, I 25 down through Eldorado. I am able and happy to pay exorbitant taxes on my home which has a private well as its only source of water. This proposed facility threatens all aspects of my home's value and its safety.

<https://cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org/aes-proposed-project/>

I have signed The Clean Energy Commission for Santa Fe County's Petition against this proposal and I have and will continue to donate to their ongoing efforts to block this stupendously dangerous project. If this project goes through, the property values at this end of the County will drop considerably and the resulting impact on collectible real estate tax revenue will be a blow to the already fragile County and State coffers.

Please stop the AES Rancho Viejo Project.

Sincerely,

Laura T Birrell

Laura T. Birrell

11 Running Horse Trail

Santa Fe, New Mexico 87508

colgorlowo@gmail.com

805.264.3022

Would You Like A Response: Yes, please contact me

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

From: Leslie Green <leslieandbill@me.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 8:23 AM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Lithium Battery Project in Rancho Viejo

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

To, Dominic Sisneros, Alexandra Ladd and Jordan Yutzy, My husband and I live in Sunlit Hills and want to express our Strong Opposition to the Lithium Battery Project that is being considered in Rancho Viejo. Lithium Ion Batteries on a small scale are fairly safe....If you study the research increasing size and density has been proven to increase the risks of a failure exponentially, which puts everyone in this area in danger and we would be forced to live with.

Our concerns are Fire, exposure to Chemicals in our air water and land, and concern for the wildlife. We have spoken to a lot of people here who moved here to enjoy life. This project puts a major worry for all of us. My husband and I are horrified this is even being considered.

Also, although obviously not as important as life and health this project will cause our property values to decrease and insurance to go up....

All of the above,... and we are considering allowing an out of state company to economically benefit!?!?.....when we read the reports they obviously do not have our interests. Why are we not talking with local solar companies, and take our time making a solar project that benefits and works for solely the local economy and is safe.

Thank you, Leslie Green, Bill Flusche

Sent from my iPad

My husband and I respectfully beseech you to vehemently oppose the location of the AES project for the following reasons:

- The high number and concentration of lithium-ion batteries in a BESS facility poses an entirely unacceptable danger to the surrounding residential neighborhoods and beyond.
- There are over 10,000 homes and 25,000 residents in these communities - almost one-third of Santa Fe City's and County's entire population of nearly 90,000. We are all tax payers and it has been established that a very high percentage of us are also voters. We feel that your most important and gravest responsibility is owed to the citizens of Santa Fe. We are depending on you to protect the safety of our families and our communities.
- The AES representatives who have presented the information on this project and it's "high level" of "mitigating safety precautions" to Santa Fe are nothing more than hired lobbyists who know how to make anything they present sound like it's a tremendous benefit to the city, the state, and the planet. In reality they are hiding their failures and the millions of dollars in fines that they have received after doing harm to other communities and the environment. There have been dangerous runaway thermal fires that fire officials have admitted cannot be put out, but simply have to, "burn themselves out". There have been evacuations due to the off-gassing of dangerous and deadly chemicals and multiple firefighter injuries to name just a few of the harmful effects to humans and their surroundings.
- The families that would be in close proximity to this project have to depend on volunteer fire fighters who may not have enough personnel or the proper equipment/training to contain a fast-moving fire wildfire. Such a fire would quickly consume dry desert grasses and vegetation that is fueled and accelerated by high winds – exactly the circumstances that describe this location. It has been determined by the *Wildfire Chief's Association (WFCA)* that a wildfire can spread as fast as 14.27 miles per hour, destroying everything in its' path. In July of 2024, the wildfire in California spread 5,000 acres/hour – the equivalent of one football field/second. Even the term *wildfire* makes the point that they are nearly impossible to contain. While these fires were not caused by a BESS facility, our question is, "Why is Santa Fe even **considering** placing a fire hazard of any sort so close to homes?"
- Our communities of Eldorado and Dos Griegos have only three access/escape routes for thousands of residents, some of whom are elderly with mobility problems. Runaway thermal fires are extremely fast-moving and our entire environment is the perfect tinder for such a wildfire.
- Would you not agree that if someone were to try to board an airplane with a suitcase full of ion-lithium batteries that this person must be stopped and should be arrested? Yet, Santa Fe is actually considering the placement of a much greater and larger-scaled hazard that would jeopardize not hundreds but thousands of people squarely in the center of thousands of homes?
- Please don't be swayed by those who make the case that this is our only path to sustainable energy for the future. Everyone who opposes this project unequivocally states that they are in **favor** of solar projects. It is the location – the **LOCATION** - that is entirely unsuitable for a utility-scaled BESS facility that has been proven to be unstable in multiple other locations. Please do not ask us to quietly accept such a danger unless you are willing to accept the consequences of being wrong.

Thank you,
Marlene and William Barnes
45 Camino Costadino
Santa Fe, NM 87508

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

From: Mary Young <mcyoungeld@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 7:21 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: I oppose the AES solar project.

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

My name is Mary Young and I live in Eldorado on the West End and I'm very concerned about this proposed AES solar array, which is a potential fire hazard and not appropriate to be located so close to numerous large residential communities. Would you like this in your own backyard?

While we are in favor of solar energy, the battery backup system in these plans has the potential for fire is way too large larger risk for this area, especially since the county does not have the skills to fight such a fire.

Additionally, the county does not even have an emergency response plan for such a fire or other catastrophe that could result from this commercial array. How can you consider approving such a plan without such an important emergency response plan in place?

Further more the energy produced is not going to benefit Santa Fe, but strictly AES and PNM.

We strongly oppose this project and urge you to do the same.

Mary young

47 Camerada rd

Santa Fe nm.

FW: Opposition to Ranch Viejo Solar Storage Project

AL

Alexandra Ladd

To: Lisaida M. Archuleta



Reply



Reply all



Forward



Tue 12/3/2024 4:05 PM

Start reply with:

Received, thank you.

Thank you!

Got it, thanks!

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

From: Megan <megargo@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 2:44 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Opposition to Ranch Viejo Solar Storage Project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

We are new residents of Eldorado and want to put on record our opposition to the solar/storage project that AES is seeking to get a CUP to build.

The water the project will use (presumably brought in from local or regional sources), the proximity to Eldorado and other residential communities, and the fires that have occurred at other AES storage sites are our main reasons for concern. It is such a big project and contemplated in a windy area with high fire risk that is close to many homes. We'd rather this project not get approved, and that this land be preserved open space for wildlife and protecting the natural surroundings into the future. If such a project is approved for this area, we'd rather see something much smaller, with less risk and resource needs, and preferable built by a local company.

Thank you,

Megan and Chris Argo

From: Michael Nieto <nieto2309@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 4:52 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Cc: Maya Keane <maya.keane@gmail.com>

Subject: Fwd: Reminder - Tomorrow County Hearing!

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Dominik, Alexandra, and Jordan,

My wife Maya and I live in Eldorado and we are obviously vehemently opposed to the AES Rancho Viejo Solar Lithium-ion battery project, and we're surprised that the project has gotten as far as it has. I will be attending the hearing tomorrow morning, but I also wanted to add a record of my opposition via email as well. I hope that you all consider the residents in the area and that the project is eventually denied.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Michael Nieto

FW: AES Project

From: NELSON MCCARTY <nmccarty2002@comcast.net>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 3:35 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I am strongly opposed to the AES project. My home of 30 years is in the western portion of El Dorado and would be severely impacted by any disruption in the operation of the solar farm.

The possibilities of loss of property value, higher insurance costs, etc; not to mention safety concerns, noise and light pollution make the decision to NOT approve this project a high priority to deny.

Sincerely,

*Nelson McCarty
8 Cerrado Road
Santa Fe, NM 87508*

From: Perry Tongate <perry@perry.net>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 4:06 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: OPPOSITION to the Rancho Viejo Lithium-Ion Battery Storage Facility

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Alexandra,

I am writing to express my opposition to the Lithium Ion Battery Storage Facility being proposed in the Rancho Viejo area which is a short distance from our property at 29 Leaping Powder Rd in Arroyo Hondo.

We are concerned about the overall environmental impact the facility will have on the surrounding environment not the least of which is the potential for massive amounts of herbicides for weed and underbrush management leaching into our drinking water as well as the potential for fire such as the [Chandler Fire in Arizona](#) that happened at a similar facility built by AES Corp back in April of 2022. Should such an event transpire the El Dorado, Seton Village and our home and neighbors in and around the Arroyo Hondo area would be at substantial risk and peril.

Please do note my opposition to this project.

Sincerely,

Perry D. Tongate

29 Leaping Powder

Santa Fe, NM 87508

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

From: Peter Appolonia <peterapp1@yahoo.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 3:36 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Opposed to the AES Solar Project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Please accept this as formal notification of our opposition to this needless, disruptive and intrusive project in close proximity to our residence.

Peter and Paulette Appolonia

22 Bonito Road

Santa Fe

Thank you for your attention to our concerns and our quality of life in Eldorado. to AES Solar Project.

Sent from my iPad

From: Philip Musser <pmusser306@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 7:19 AM
To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>
Subject: AES Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Ms. Ladd

I am a resident of El Dorado and am wondering why an industrial project that includes the storage of hundreds of lithium ion batteries to be located in close proximity to three residential communities is even being considered.

AES has had battery fires in some of their other solar projects and one at this site would be a serious health and safety threat to all three residential communities.

There are alternative sites that would be much more appropriate and safer.

I am a supporter of solar energy but am opposed to this project due to its plans to have dangerous battery storage on site.

Philip Musser
10 Recado Rd
El Dorado Community

From: Rochelle Gerratt <rgerratt@comcast.net>

Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2024 10:35 AM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Opposed to the AES Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Greetings,

I live in Eldorado and I am opposed to the AES Project. I am concerned about this project being built so close to my community.

Thank you,
Rochelle Gerratt
1 Esquila Rd.
Santa Fe, NM 87508

 Reply

 Forward

From: Roxana <roxana@roxanavilla.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 3:51 PM

To: Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Rancho Viejo Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Alexandra Ladd,

I have recently been informed about the Rancho Viejo Lithium-Ion Battery Storage Facility, and that this project has twice been rejected by the County. It appears that now a permit is being considered for land just north of El Dorado and south of the greater Arroyo Hondo neighborhoods.

Although this project is promoted as an “environmental solar project”, the solar array planned is FAR smaller than the huge quantity of batteries that are being proposed. This indicates that the solar array aspect is just for show. It’s really a facility to very temporarily store energy, much of it purchased at low cost from PNM and then sold back at a higher cost when demand is up.

This proposed facility is a huge fire risk, and an environmental polluter, as large quantities of herbicides will be necessary to reduce fire risks, herbicides which will leach into our ground water. The facility off-loads PFA’s (forever chemicals) on a regular basis, and should it catch on fire (25% of this company’s storage facilities have burned) residents for miles around would have to be evacuated or told to shelter in place with windows closed and AC turned off, due to the toxic chemicals released. Please help us fight this project and encourage a healthier solution for energy storage in our area.

Please listen to the people who live in the area.

Fondly,

Roxana Villa

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

From: Sheree Dittmer <shereedittmer@mac.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 10:20 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: County Hearing for the proposed Rancho Viejo Solar Battery Project, December 4, 2024

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I am unable to attend tomorrow's public meeting due to a medical appointment in Albuquerque which was difficult to book. However, I would like to go on record as being in opposition to this project as proposed. I feel the approval process has not been transparent and the project, as proposed, would present a fire hazard and many risks to the environment. The potential for introducing toxic chemicals into our groundwater and eventually the underground aquifer from which we all source our water presents a danger to all residents in the Santa Fe area.

Sincerely,

Sheree Dittmer, AIA, LEED-AP

111 Colinas Del Sol

Lamy, NM 875

Cell: 847-922-08926

From: Tor Travis <tor.travis@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 3:43 PM

To: disisneros@santafecountynm.gov; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: I'm against the Rancho Viejo Lithium-Ion Battery Storage Facility

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi there,

I'm a resident of Arroyo Hondo (132 Arroyo Hondo Rd), and find the information about the new Rancho Viejo Lithium-Ion Battery Storage Facility is disturbing. I am against the project and hope that the county will find better, safer, more productive uses for the land, if it needs to be developed at all.

Thank you,

Tor

Joel Yelich & Valerie Nye
71 San Marcos Loop
Santa Fe, NM 87508

November 8, 2024

Hearing Officer Hebert
Marilyn S Hebert
100 Catron St. & 102 Grant Ave.
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Dear Hearing Officer Hebert:

My wife and I live at 71 San Marcos Loop, Santa Fe, NM 87508 and directly share a border with the land to the north where the AES industrial energy project and road are being proposed. This property border is also the boundary of the San Marcos Community District. We are requesting to be an interested party with standing on any and all proceedings concerning this project. If this isn't the correct avenue for our views, please let us know.

Our position can be summarized with the fact that this effort goes beyond a simple solar installation and crosses the line into an industrial energy project. The 30 plus cargo containers with batteries should be located within industrial or similarly zoned property. These energy storage systems are designed to be located at a grid-tied site. Many industrial sites exist with grid ties under the correct and appropriate zoning. The SLDC states with regard to Rural Fringe where the proposal exists, "This zone also serves to protect agricultural and environmental areas that are inappropriate for more intense development due to their sensitivity." The size of this project is clearly inconsistent with the property's zoning classification along with its complexity, hazards and potential harm to the welfare of the area.

In addition to the zoning requirements, the project's construction period will cause a significant increase in particulate matter in the air regardless of mitigation efforts. The potential fire and water pollution risks are also serious concerns during such construction with or without the energy storage proposed and will continue once the project is complete.

Please deny this conditional use permit and let the parties find land with the appropriate zoning. AES Corporation is a Fortune 500 power generator with the experience and resources to find such property.

Thank you for your consideration,

Joel Yelich & Valerie Nye
home office 505-474-6680
mobile 505-490-3868

Joel Yelich & Valerie Nye
71 San Marcos Loop
Santa Fe, NM 87508

November 8, 2024

Hearing Officer Hebert
Marilyn S Hebert
100 Catron St. & 102 Grant Ave.
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Dear Hearing Officer Hebert:


My wife and I live at 71 San Marcos Loop, Santa Fe, NM 87508 and directly share a border with the land to the north where the AES industrial energy project and road are being proposed. This property border is also the boundary of the San Marcos Community District. We are requesting to be an interested party with standing on any and all proceedings concerning this project. If this isn't the correct avenue for our views, please let us know.

Our position can be summarized with the fact that this effort goes beyond a simple solar installation and crosses the line into an industrial energy project. The 30 plus cargo containers with batteries should be located within industrial or similarly zoned property. These energy storage systems are designed to be located at a grid-tied site. Many industrial sites exist with grid ties under the correct and appropriate zoning. The SLDC states with regard to Rural Fringe where the proposal exists, "This zone also serves to protect agricultural and environmental areas that are inappropriate for more intense development due to their sensitivity." The size of this project is clearly inconsistent with the property's zoning classification along with its complexity, hazards and potential harm to the welfare of the area.

In addition to the zoning requirements, the project's construction period will cause a significant increase in particulate matter in the air regardless of mitigation efforts. The potential fire and water pollution risks are also serious concerns during such construction with or without the energy storage proposed and will continue once the project is complete.

Please deny this conditional use permit and let the parties find land with the appropriate zoning. AES Corporation is a Fortune 500 power generator with the experience and resources to find such property.

Thank you for your consideration,



Joel Yelich & Valerie Nye
home office 505-474-6680
mobile 505-490-3868

From: Ann Maes <amaesnm@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2024 4:43 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I am vehemently against this project being built with 100 miles of a residential community!

Ann Maes

From: debra link <deboolink@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, December 6, 2024 12:55 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Sisneros,

I am a long time resident of New Mexico with my only home being one of the closest to the Eldorado and ranch intersection, the closest to the project's battery storage area. I'm an older single woman and have been a Neighborhood Watch captain for Encantado Loop for 17 yrs. We are in the far NW corner of Eldorado and there is very limited egress out of here if there was to be an emergency evacuation. There is only Vista Grande Av. going in one direction. I hear from my neighbors, being a "neighborhood person", that everyone out here feels trapped.

An emergency would produce panic and an immediate road bottleneck.

We do not understand why a project of this utility scale isn't designated to an industrial zone. It is irresponsible to locate it so close to a residential area that has no way of a realistic escape.

Sincerely, Debra Link

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

From: mail helenkgarber.com <mail@helenkgarber.com>

Sent: Friday, December 6, 2024 9:11 AM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Against AES: Fire Danger

I just received an email from Amazon recalling my 9" Bluetooth speaker because the lithium battery inside has set itself on fire in many units.

One small battery can set a house on fire and 69,000 were recalled because of numerous instances.

How could you even consider approving placing hundreds of acres of a proven fire hazard in the windiest area just South of Santa Fe?

Helen K Garber

Helen K Garber Studio

Rancho de Sueños

28 Likely Road

Santa Fe, New Mexico. 87508

310 344 7883

www.helenkgarber.com

From: Nancy Peterson <neen_11475@msn.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2024 7:06 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Proposed AES BESS

Dear Dominic Sisneros,

Will the proposed AES BESS, with over half a million lithium-ion batteries, have detrimental consequences for the surrounding properties? Of course it will. The location has a HIGH wildfire risk. Property values will decrease significantly and insurance will be unaffordable or homes may become uninsurable because of escalating risks caused by these dangerous, definitely NOT “green” batteries (fires, explosions, smoke, forever chemicals, constant noise, etc.) located next to residential areas.

These are peoples’ homes that are being put at risk with this project. For many, it is their largest investment. Residents will have a difficult time trying to sell their property. No insurance = no mortgage. Our county leaders seem to think it is immaterial to allow a project that will decrease home values and therefore peoples’ financial security, as well as jeopardizing thousands of residents’ health, welfare and the environment. Have our county leaders made any plans to assist homeowners when they cannot get insurance and their property values decrease because of their decision? These are very serious consequences that **must be addressed**. Have our leaders even thought about the fact that decreased property values **will also decrease the property taxes** the county will be able to collect? There are many very valuable properties in the area...

Lithium-ion batteries already have many known dangers. Add to that the forever chemicals they spew into the air, land and water, and our county government is telling us residents “your lives, health, welfare and property don’t matter to us.” I am utterly astounded that our leaders are even considering the possibility of locating any utility-scale facility, with extremely dangerous chemicals, anywhere near residential areas. This plan is a catastrophe waiting to happen and our County Commissioners are responsible for this decision. Think about the consequences to **all of your fellow citizens**, current and future alike. Do our leaders have the right, and more importantly, **do they really think it is right to endanger the lives, health and welfare of thousands of residents of this county?**

Attempting to save Earth from climate change while simultaneously polluting the environment and endangering lives is **idiotic**.

Nancy Peterson, Eldorado resident

From: Nancy Peterson <neen_11475@msn.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2024 7:04 PM

To: Greg Shaffer <gshaffer@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Proposed AES BESS

Dear Gregory Shaffer,

Will the proposed AES BESS, with over half a million lithium-ion batteries, have detrimental consequences for the surrounding properties? Of course it will. The location has a HIGH wildfire risk. Property values will decrease significantly and insurance will be unaffordable or homes may become uninsurable because of escalating risks caused by these dangerous, definitely NOT "green" batteries (fires, explosions, smoke, forever chemicals, constant noise, etc.) located next to residential areas.

These are peoples' homes that are being put at risk with this project. For many, it is their largest investment. Residents will have a difficult time trying to sell their property. No insurance = no mortgage. Our county leaders seem to think it is immaterial to allow a project that will decrease home values and therefore peoples' financial security, as well as jeopardizing thousands of residents' health, welfare and the environment. Have our county leaders made any plans to assist homeowners when they cannot get insurance and their property values decrease because of their decision? These are very serious consequences that **must be addressed**. Have our leaders even thought about the fact that decreased property values **will also decrease the property taxes** the county will be able to collect? There are many very valuable properties in the area...

Lithium-ion batteries already have many known dangers. Add to that the forever chemicals they spew into the air, land and water, and our county government is telling us residents "your lives, health, welfare and property don't matter to us." I am utterly astounded that our leaders are even considering the possibility of locating any utility-scale facility, with extremely dangerous chemicals, anywhere near residential areas. This plan is a catastrophe waiting to happen and our County Commissioners are responsible for this decision. Think about the consequences to **all of your fellow citizens**, current and future alike. Do our leaders have the right, and more importantly, **do they really think it is right to endanger the lives, health and welfare of thousands of residents of this county?**

Attempting to save Earth from climate change while simultaneously polluting the environment and endangering lives is **idiotic**.

Nancy Peterson, Eldorado resident

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

From: Tambi Greer <pgreer369@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2024 4:19 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Alexandra Ladd <aladd@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Project

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear County Staff Members,

I would like to go on record with my strong OPPOSITION to the AES project projected to be built not far from our beloved Eldorado community.

Sincerely,

Patricia Greer
3 Melado Drive
Eldorado
Santa Fe, NM 87508

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Sisneros, I attended the AES project review meeting on Wednesday, 12/4/2024 via Webex while my husband, Jack Lee, was there in person. After listening to the AES presenters and those from the Clean Energy Coalition SF County and others, we are strongly opposed to the solar development, Rancho Viejo. My husband and I own a home in Eldorado and live only 1.4 miles downwind from this project. It is obvious that the danger from potential fire, the inevitable release of toxic gases and the impacts from noise would all be unacceptable impacts of this solar development. The decision to site this project in close proximity to not only Eldorado but all the surrounding communities is extremely short sighted. The local fire departments are not capable of dealing with an emergency triggered by a BESS malfunction/explosion, especially if an incident were to occur during a high wind event or during the weekend or night. Eldorado would be engulfed in fire within minutes during a high westerly wind event. There wouldn't be time to evacuate. People and animals would die, and homes would go up in flames. There would be legal consequences for AES and the county for negligence in placing this project amongst so many homes.

Air quality for those of us who have asthma and other breathing difficulties, is a serious concern when living downwind of a potential source of toxic gases. With 38 BESS containers and over half a million batteries, the likelihood of releases over time seems inevitable, but especially during a worse-case scenario. One should always consider such an event when people's lives may be in jeopardy. There is no remediation that will contain such a release or protect against public exposure.

Ambient noise is also a serious concern for those of us who live in the rural communities surrounding the project site. The quiet is one of the reasons we chose to live here. No fireworks, no ATV's, no gun target practicing. According to the county presentation, there's been an inadequate measurement of the current ambient noise levels at the project site and in the surrounding communities. A third party should be hired to get an actual 24-hour measurement during several days. An assessment based on an hour of monitoring is totally inadequate. And there should be a decibel comparison made using a comparable site with similar industrial noise at varying distances from the source.

We hope you and anyone else involved in determining the outcome of the project permits will take our concerns to heart. We obviously are not alone in our opposition and are committed to doing whatever will bring awareness of the shortcomings of this project, as currently planned, to the community and the courts. We support solar development, but only in an appropriate setting that doesn't put hundreds of people in jeopardy. The liability, in the case of Rancho Viejo, should be obvious and unacceptable.

Thank you,

Sue Forker
Jack Lee

12 Camerada Rd.
Santa Fe, NM 87508

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Gabriel Bustos and Hank Hughes

We have met personally, years ago I took some pictures of you and your wife, so I know you are the Santa Fe County Commissioner for our district, Eldorado.

I am writing to you today as a concerned citizen regarding the proposed Ranch Viejo Solar Project.

I agree with Marilyn Herbert, the Santa Fe County hearing officer, that the project "... creates an unreasonable risk to the safety and welfare of the communities".

The reason I agree is based on the risk of wildfires from a runaway battery storage fire. (This project has 3 acres of batteries to store the solar power generated on the 800 acre site)

The current tragic wildfires in Los Angeles have taught us that wind conditions can fling burning embers 3-5 miles. The Ranch Viejo Solar Project is 3 miles from Santa Fe! Some of the surrounding homes are a mere 500 ft from the project boundary! (My home on Encantado Loop, in Eldorado is about 1 mile from the project boundary)

Please deny the building permit for this project on the grounds that it is too close to current residences and businesses. Furthermore please suggest that this industrial size solar power plant be built at least 5 miles away from any kind of buildings. Thank you for your time.

Most Cordially ~ ~ ~ Barney Magrath ~ ~

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ Santa Fe, NM ~ ~ ~ ~ ~

~ ~ ~ ~ ~ USA ~ ~

<https://barneymagrath.wixsite.com/magrathphotography/>

(This message made up of 100% recycled electrons)

Hi Dominic and Gabe,

[I trust you saw the news about the battery facility fire in California which started while we were in the Commission meeting yesterday, and is still burning, at Moss Landing, which is owned by Vistra Energy and for which AES is a parent company of Fluence which was the engineering contractor for this facility. This is the second recent fire at that facility.]

I have some basic questions about the Planning Commission, after listening to their meeting last night. I can only find information in Ordinance 2015-11 about the duties and powers of the Commission.

- 1) Who selects the Commission members?
- 2) What are the criteria for their selection, including expertise?
- 3) Were the Commission members allowed to attend or listen to the recording of the 12/4 AES hearing, or was there a prohibition on that (they were guessing how many of the public would attend, clearly not having been there 12/4)?
- 4) Have the Commission members been provided with all the AES CUP documents, including all public comments submitted to the county regarding the CUP application?
- 5) Why were the Commission members not seemingly aware of anything related to this AES application, and completely unprepared?
- 6) Why were the Commission members not aware of any of the county's procedures for public hearings, including what "standing" means and regarding public speaking?
- 7) Why did the Commission members not know how to handle what they should have at last night's meeting in an efficient and knowledgeable way? Were they not briefed by the county staff on procedures, or is this their first rodeo?

Last night's Commission performance was an embarrassment, a great disservice to the county's and our area's residents, and a great concern to those of us who have spent years diligently researching all the details of this AES CUP application and familiarizing ourselves with the SLDC and SGMP, attending meetings and being fully prepared. With all due respect to the current members of this Commission, it seemed like amateur hour last night. This is NOT what we need and deserve for making a critically important decision on a major industrial facility application that threatens the safety of our neighborhoods and the environment.

Carol

From: jal@jalarts.com <jal@jalarts.com>

Sent: Friday, January 17, 2025 10:07 AM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; aladd@santafecountynm.org; jyutzy@santafecountynm.org

Cc: Dayna, Lee, & CEC Team <info@cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org>

Subject: Fw: BREAKING: Massive fire erupts at one of the world's largest battery plants in California | Video shows intense flames

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

Here is another example of why AES should not be allowed to build its solar lithium battery facility near our homes.

To paraphrase, the local county supervisor of Moss Landing, CA said that as a result of this disaster, the whole planning process of these facilities needs to go back to the drawing board.

I urge you to reject AES' plan to build this facility in our town.

Sincerely,

Janis

Homer & Debra Martin
85 Alteza
Santa Fe, NM 87508

20 Avenida Azul
Santa Fe, NM 87508

Wednesday, January 15, 2025

Jordan Yutzy,

My wife and I own two properties close to the proposed AES project, the dangers of which you are no doubt aware. We have watched the Los Angeles fires rage on, as we have relatives who just lost their home in Pacific Palisades. We are all too aware that a wind-fueled fire event could happen here - and that it could happen to us.

As in other areas, our insurance rates continue to increase, and some people have been denied renewal because of fire threat. A large scale facility such as AES could cause more insurance companies to increasingly cancel coverage.

Years ago, our Arizona desert community had to deal with a nearby concentrating solar proposal that planned on using water from the aquifer to cool the turbines that generate electricity, instead of using newer air cooling technology. The project was rejected on the basis of old technology. With regards to AES, according to an article in "New Scientist," a whole range of newer, safer, and less expensive heat storage technologies are emerging, known collectively as Thermal Energy Storage (TES).

We, along with our neighbors, worry about the potential for accidents. We are concerned about losing affordable insurance, and the inevitable depreciation of our property values.

Sincerely yours,

Homer Martin

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Gabriel and Hank -

I am a resident of Eldorado in Santa Fe County and am writing to express my concern and opposition to the AES effort to exempt itself from current zoning regulations in order to build a massive battery storage facility in what is essentially a residential area surrounded by Eldorado, Rancho Viejo, and San Marcos, as well as the County jail and state prison. As I am sure you realize, that facility is currently prohibited in the location proposed by AES, and those regulations should not be changed to accommodate such a dangerous facility.

There are many, many reasons to deny this proposal. One that concerns me in particular is the possibility of the release of toxic fumes in the event of a fire (which itself is another grave concern, considering that fire suppression systems in these type of storage plants have a greater than 25% failure rate). Such a release would likely require a mass evacuation of residents. In Eldorado, that would be difficult if not impossible given that there are only two roads out of the development. Moreover, our purely volunteer fire department is not equipped nor trained to handle this type of emergency.

While I am strongly in favor of efforts to move to sustainable sources of energy, this plan is wrong-headed and should be shelved.

Thanks for your time,

John Wylie

14 Vista Grande Circle

Santa Fe, NM 87508

847-894-0840

johnwyliephotography@gmail.com

johnwyliephotography.com

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning:

Please put this article and email into the Planning Commission packet and the Board of County Commissioners packet for the Rancho Viejo Solar Project upcoming hearings.

I am passing on this article because it has two engineering professors weighing in at the end of the article after the fire three days ago in Moss Landing.

“Jodie Lutkenhaus, professor of chemical engineering at Texas A&M University, said safer batteries must be found that can be used on the grid. Some improvements, such as more fire prevention measures, can be made to reduce fire risks with lithium batteries but the only way to really address the problem is to use safer technology.”

Water-based and redox flow batteries are being developed by scientists but have not yet scaled commercially.

“Lithium iron phosphate batteries are a possible alternative because they are highly stable, but they still carry some risk.”

“No matter what kind of lithium battery you use, when you reach a certain size, it is inherently very dangerous and easy to catch fire,” said Yiguang Ju, engineering professor at Princeton University.”

These are experts confirming the dangers of lithium-ion batteries in large facilities.

Thank you for reading.

Kaye

Kaye Cooper-Mead

<https://www.scrippsnews.com/us-news/fire-breaks-out-at-worlds-largest-battery-storage-plant>

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Case Manager Sisneros:

While the Vistra Moss Landing Battery Fire is burning people are experiencing headaches and sore throats due to the toxic fumes. Your decision literally affects our lives. The technology for the Rancho Viejo AES project is not substantially more modern or advanced than what's at this facility. I'm asking the Commissioners to please protect the people you were elected to serve.

Sincerely,
Linda Barlow

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hopefully, you're already aware that there was another fire at a lithium ion battery storage area just like the one proposed for the AES project at Santa Fe if you haven't already heard here are the details

1. Another HUGE Lithium-Ion BESS Thermal Runaway Fire

One of the world's largest Lithium-Ion BESS Storage Facilities is on Fire in Moss Landing California. This is the 4th Lithium-Ion BESS Fire at Moss Landing. Fluence Energy (which was formed by AES and Siemens in 2018) was the engineering contractor for this section of the facility (which is still on fire as of tonight). This same section of the facility also caught fire back in September 2021 (before it even went online).

We urge you to vote no in this dangerous project. Our home is located on the Westin Eldorado and just a mile from potential fires, I am not opposed to Solar as I have it on my roof as well, but strongly opposed to the lithium ion battery storage systems like the AES project uses.

Please vote no to the project.

Thank you. Mark and Mary Young 47 Camarata Rd., Santa Fe.

Dear Mr. Hughes,

January 9, 2025

I am very concerned about the potential fire and chemical hazards that will come from the lithium-ion battery energy storage system (BESS) proposed by AES. AES claims that worries by its opponents are unsubstantiated misinformation, but consider this evidence from its own energy storage industry experts:

Li-ion batteries have the potential for serious explosion and fire hazards due to the ability of the batteries to experience thermal runaway reactions that can continue without supplemental oxygen.

It is clear that the risks associated with BESS are here to stay and with the increasing number of installations, there will be more incidents.

Baker Engineering and Risk Consultants, September 2023

(Risk management consulting firm)

The biggest misconception in BESS safety is that all fires start in the batteries. A fire originating in an overlooked hazard such as a control cabinet or PCS (Power Conversion Systems) can quickly spread to the batteries and cause thermal runaway. Only 11% of fires and explosions are linked to battery module failures. 43% stem from failures in electrical equipment and 46% are due to control equipment malfunctions. These components can catch on fire...and quickly spread to adjacent battery racks, rendering the extensive safety mechanisms designed to prevent thermal runaway ineffective.

Firetrace International, January 2025

(Manufacturer of fire suppression systems)

This type of energy storage system is not safe for our adjacent neighborhoods—please REJECT this permit application!

Sincerely,

Nina Rebstock

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Dominic Sisneros, Santa Fe County AES Case Manager,

I am writing to express my concern about how the AES application process is being communicated to the Santa Fe City Team. I wrote a Letter to the Editor of the Santa Fe New Mexican to recommend city involvement and city/county engagement especially regarding decisions on the AES project . It was posted on Friday, January 17, 2025:

City Involvement?

The AES application to develop the Rancho Viejo Solar project (which includes a utility-scale lithium battery facility) is more than a county issue. The project site is three miles south of Santa Fe. It involves many services. The Santa Fe City Team provides: Public Utilities, Public Works, Community Health, and Safety and Community Development. The City Manager coordinates the implementation of governing body policy decisions; and is responsible for directing these departments and providing guidance. Critical areas like water, environmental management, traffic, evacuations, fire, emergency management, and community development fall within the manager's responsibility. Who is educating "The City Team" and how are their concerns considered in the evaluation process of AES' application? If approved, AES' proposal for a dangerous lithium-ion battery storage facility could have serious consequences for the City. All parties need to be aware and engaged in reviewing this proposal.

Please know that many city and county residents want open and regular communications between all parties. Thank you for your review and consideration,

Pat Czeto

Dear Mr. Sisneros:

As residents of Eldorado, we are deeply concerned about the proposed lithium battery storage facility. The fire danger is too great a risk, with the facility proposed so close to Eldorado and Rancho San Marcos. This is unacceptable!

The Moss Landing facility fire brings this danger home to us, as former CA Central coast residents. While we are in favor of green energy solutions, we are NOT in favor of endangering people and property.

Here is just one link to coverage of Moss Landing: <https://www.npr.org/2025/01/17/g-s1-43268/fire-battery-storage-plant-california-moss-landing>

Please do not allow this project in this location to proceed.

Thank you,
Brian Gross and Dana Stone

510-406-8110

Good morning:

Would like this map, visuals and email to be added to all packets for the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners concerning the Rancho Viejo Solar Project. This link to the map shows the extent of the mandatory evacuation put in place for an **eight mile** section of Monterey County with the Moss Landing lithium-ion battery fire for the initial fire event as well as re-ignition of the same fire less than 24 hours later. This evacuation zone would cover all of Santa Fe including Presbyterian Hospital which is only three miles away from the proposed AES site as the toxic plume drifts. How would the Presbyterian Hospital evacuate all their patients? Even if only a shelter in place order instead of evacuation, how does a hospital shut off all their ventilation systems required to maintain sensitive equipment?

Also attached below is the report of the wind speeds at that time in the area which had very low wind speeds (under 10 mph) and a second visual that shows very high humidity rates (74%) in the area at the time. The plume extends for miles in these conditions so think about our winds that are regularly 25-35 mph? We would have much higher wind speeds here and much lower humidity rates to complicate the extent of the fire plume/toxic smoke spread.

We cannot ignore the dangers of these facilities and turn a blind eye to what this type of incident would mean for the health and safety of our community.

Please oppose the siting of this facility near our communities. The state of New Mexico's land office has identified 9 million acres of land available right now for solar development and the Bureau of Land Management's Western Solar Plan has identified 3 million acres of land in New Mexico within ten miles of existing or planned transmission lines available for solar applications right now.

Please tell AES to find another location away from neighborhoods, schools and hospitals to site their project. We cannot allow a big energy company to endanger our lives for the sake of making a profit.

Thank you for reading.

Kaye

Kaye Cooper-Mead

<https://www.mercurynews.com/2025/01/17/map-moss-landing-fire-evacuation/>

From: abhaya barbara aldridge <abhaya108@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Tuesday, January 21, 2025 4:11 PM

To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES project opposition - A Wake Up Call

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mr. Hughes,

We want to go on record that we oppose the proposed AES Rancho Viejo BESS project. As I am sure you have heard, the Moss Landing, California fire has County Supervisor Glenn Church of District 2 in Monterey California, in response to the 4th battery fire in 5 years at Moss Landing, on 01/16/25, stating his grave concerns about that facility going forward. ("With this being the fourth fire incident in a little over five years in Moss Landing, it is obvious that this technology is ahead of both government's ability to regulate it and private industry's ability to control it.") Santa Fe County should absolutely NOT follow in the footsteps of Moss Landing and allow such a facility to be built here, when there are alternate locations in the state that would have less impact on the neighboring community.

Thank you,
Barbara Aldridge
Wayne Baldan
3 Avila Ct
Santa Fe NM 87508

Dear Mr Bustos,

I am reaching out to you about a proposed *solar project* adjacent to my community of Eldorado. AES, a utility and power-generating company based in Arlington, Virginia, has applied to Santa Fe County for a permit to build this project in our area, with only a 30% business plan. AES is a global Fortune 500 power company with nefarious business practices. This project has the potential to adversely and permanently affect not only Eldorado but all of Santa Fe.

Clean Energy Coalition (CEC) non-profit organization was formed in 2023 to educate the community and Santa Fe County about the AES Corporation's plan to develop this *solar project* using over half a million lithium-ion batteries. These batteries contain "forever chemicals" that pose fire hazards. Three documented fires have occurred at AES battery facilities in the last five years. Battery fires contaminate the ground, air, and water, adversely affecting Santa Fe's permanent residents, institutions, industry, and tourism.

In September 2023, AES filed a Temporary Restraining Order to prevent the County from sharing complete details in its application to develop a utility-scale battery storage project adjacent to Eldorado, Rancho San Marcos, and Rancho Viejo. Thanks to CEC intervening in January 2024, AES lost in the District Court and was required to share the project's hazards with the public.

AES has since submitted a second application to the County for this project, and there was a second District Court hearing on December 11, 2024, regarding their attempts to refer to hazards as trade secrets again. Thanks to CEC and the community, AES lost again. We are waiting to hear if AES will appeal or once again share with the public the risks and hazards of locating such a facility, which encompasses more than 600 football fields, near 25,000 residents, and the city of Santa Fe.

The CEC advocates for renewable energy, and its members have proposed safer and more equitable solar energy alternatives for Santa Fe County that are already being used in other communities. I ask that you consider signing the online petition to stop the AES Solar Lithium-ion Battery Project:

WATCH VIDEO

<https://www.cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org>

SIGN PETITION

<https://cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org/petition/>

Lee Zlotoff, President of CEC, would be happy to meet with leadership and present an overview of the project, the committee's progress, and ongoing concerns. He and the Community Liaison, Dayna Matlin, can be reached at

info@cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org.

Thank you for your attention and advocacy. If you have any questions, please contact me or the CEC.

With respect,

Tamara Ann Burgh

tburgh65@gmail.com

From: Stone, Rebecca R. <rrstone@emory.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, January 22, 2025 8:38 AM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>; Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>; Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>; Adam Fulton Johnson <afjohnson@santafecountynm.gov>; Camilla M. Bustamante <cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov>; Lisa Cacari Stone <cacaristone@santafecountynm.gov>; Justin S. Greene <jsgreene@santafecountynm.gov>; Stone, Rebecca R. <rrstone@emory.edu>

Subject: California fire bodes ill for Santa Fe Solar project with AES

Please let the problems help this community avoid the fire danger that is already so bad out here.

Dr. Rebecca R. Stone

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Hank –

I am a resident of Eldorado. I have had a home here for over 20 years and am recently retired. I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to the solar farm that AES Corporation has proposed to be located in Rancho Viejo west of our community. I frankly have multiple concerns including:

- **Safety** – Probably the biggest issue is safety related to the BESS battery storage system. I imagine you are familiar with the recent catastrophe at the Moss Landing created by a large battery facility in California. I don't think most people would want such a thing to happen near their home. That system was created by a subsidiary of AES. Although proponents of the Rancho Viejo project may claim that new safety measures have been incorporated here, the real question is do we want to take a chance, since it's not imperative to build this in this location? I, for one, don't think it's worth it.
- **PFA's** – Some of my neighbors have commented on how the battery system can result in PFA's getting into the water system. This is likewise something I think we should avoid.
- **Aesthetics and Property Values** – Many of us in Eldorado purchased our homes in part because of the wonderful views of the mountains and intervening open or ranchland. I am certain that my wife and I would have looked elsewhere if our property had a massive solar farm next door. I am sure that many prospective buyers would have a similar other reaction and at least not expect to pay as much.
- **Impact on PNM bills** – I am not unequivocally opposed to solar facilities, but they do require a lot of space. It's true that larger facilities are more cost-effective. Because this facility is limited to about 680 acres (which is a lot) because of its location, it can only provide 96 MW of power, and its cost per MW will be higher than a larger facility located in more space that could provide maybe 200-300 MW. This will result in more costly PNM charges than an alternative location.

Overall, I think the best solution is a larger facility located elsewhere in private or public open land not surrounded closely by residential areas. Not only would this result in lower costs per unit of power but it would effectively minimize the other concerns.

You are probably aware that there is a similar proposal to construct a solar facility in the Northeast corner of Sandoval County, designated the Diamond Tail Project, right across the border from Santa Fe. I know there is some controversy about that proposal as well, but I haven't seen the same concerns expressed. I have seen that the necessary zoning regulations have been accepted by the Planning Commission, and a final vote looks like it is supposed to happen this month.

One nice thing about the Sandoval proposal is that it is for a 220 MW facility that is intended to provide sufficient power to supply the needs of both Sandoval and Santa Fe counties. If that project goes through, I don't see any need for the Rancho Viejo project at all. Even if it doesn't, it seems that we could collaborate with our counterparts in Sandoval County to find an alternative location, not very close to residential areas, where a similar single facility could be built to serve us all.

So, I don't think we should approve the Rancho Viejo proposal at all. We should wait and see what happens in Sandoval first. If that goes forward, we don't need to do anything. If not, we should collaborate with them as suggested.

Thanks,

Jeff Forsman

From: John W. Bing <johnbing@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, January 26, 2025 12:33:04 PM

To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>; Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Please vote to keep the industrial size fire hazard solar and BESS battery systems out of our area (El Dorado). The risk of fire is just too great. Unless AES agrees to use a safer battery than lithium.

Thanks,

John W Bing
24 Gavilan Road
Eldorado

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commisioner Hughes,

Please do all you can to block the proposed AES Rancho Viejo Solar + Battery Storage Industrial project here. I live in Eldorado and while I support solar energy I do not support this facility being placed where proposed. It is very dangerous to put so close to Eldorado and other residential areas.

As I'm sure you know, there have been several other fires at their facilities, including the current on in CA. With our winds and extraordinarily dry landscape this is a grave concern, not to mention our already skyrocketing home insurance premiums.

I'm sure you've heard detailed concerns from other residents so I won't go into all of them here.

Sincerely,
Linda Grace & David Leach
5 Abanico Road
Santa Fe, NM 87508

Dear Commissioner Hughes,

I'm writing to you to urge you to please help disapprove the AES plan for a solar farm and lithium-ion battery storage facility in our neighborhood.

This facility would be a utility-scale battery storage facility placed in the middle of three residential communities, and with Santa Fe County unprepared for dealing with a lithium-ion battery fire should one occur; the Moss Landing fire last week in Monterey County California burned for three days, destroyed over 75% of the facility while releasing toxins into the soil and air, caused a major highway to be closed for days and the evacuation of over a thousand people, and disruption to local business that is still ongoing. Monterey County has approved a local state of emergency for the County. A fire at the proposed AES facility would be catastrophic here.

The three communities here are opposed to the building of this facility. Please consider not allowing the AES project to be approved.

Best regards,

Lorin Spaulding
Eldorado at Santa Fe
10 Chapala Rd.
Santa Fe, NM 87508

Monterey County California battery facility fire links:

[Moss Landing battery fire: Newsom calls for investigation](#)

[Fire reignites at Moss Landing Power Plant, world's largest ...](#)

[Monterey County unanimously approves state of emergency](#)

[Fire out at Moss Landing battery storage facility: investigation begins](#)

Sent: Sunday, January 26, 2025 5:50 AM

To: Jordan A. Yutzy <jyutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Please deny the AES Solar Farm/Lithium-ion Battery Storage Facility

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I'm writing to you to urge you to please help disapprove the AES plan for a solar farm and lithium-ion battery storage facility in our neighborhood.

This facility would be a utility-scale battery storage facility placed in the middle of three residential communities, and with Santa Fe County unprepared for dealing with a lithium-ion battery fire should one occur; the Moss Landing fire last week in Monterey County California burned for three days, destroyed over 75% of the facility while releasing toxins into the soil and air, caused a major highway to be closed for days and the evacuation of over a thousand people, and disruption to local business that is still ongoing. Monterey County has approved a local state of emergency for the County. A fire at the proposed AES facility would be catastrophic here.

The three communities here are opposed to the building of this facility. Please consider not allowing the AES project to be approved.

Best regards,

Lorin Spaulding
Eldorado at Santa Fe
10 Chapala Rd.
Santa Fe, NM 87508

Monterey County California battery facility fire links:

[Moss Landing battery fire: Newsom calls for investigation](#)

[Fire reignites at Moss Landing Power Plant, world's largest ...](#)

[Monterey County unanimously approves state of emergency](#)

[Fire out at Moss Landing battery storage facility; investigation begins](#)

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Greetings Commissioner Hughes:

After due consideration regarding the proposed AES project in our area, I would like to voice OPPOSITION and ask you to vote against this idea moving forward.

We moved to the Lamy area last year and have been following the debate with interest. The Moss Landing fire in Monterey, California is the event that cemented our viewpoint that a large battery storage facility should not be built in a residential area.

Several years ago, we were vacationing along the Central Coast of California and noticed some of the dated infrastructure from past power plants, that have been mothballed. Moro Bay has a large plant with tall smokestacks that are idle, and an eyesore. The Moss Landing battery storage plant near Salinas appears to have built inside an old brick and mortar power plant structure. I have read the news accounts of the combustion events there.

That is why a new facility should not be built here in the high desert close to a residential area. Proximity to the existing power lines running through Eldorado seems to be the main justification for project placement. It appears to me that the risks greatly exceed the benefit, and this project should not be supported by local government.

Thank you for your attention.

Michael W Miller MD (ret).
Lamy, NM.

From: Nancy Peterson <neen_11475@msn.com>

Sent: Friday, January 24, 2025 5:31 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Unanswered questions regarding the proposed AES battery plant

Dear Mr. Sisneros,

Here are a few of the many questions related to the proposed AES battery/solar farm:

Why has my County Commissioner stated that he is “not allowed” to discuss this dangerous project with his constituents? Who made that decision and why? Is it appropriate that those of us who are most at risk from this proposed facility are being denied participation in discussions by the people we elected to represent and protect all of us residents, not a large out of state corporation and one landowner?

What toxic chemicals will be released from the vents on the battery containers and how much pollution will be released if they all open at once?

Where is the “reclaimed” water AES says it will use to clean solar panels, etc. being sourced from and what is in that water? Will every truckload be tested for all known toxins, including “forever chemicals,” by an independent company?

Are any plans being made to assist the residents of the surrounding areas from financial harm when their property values see a huge decrease and their insurance premiums skyrocket or insurance is no longer available due to the increased risks? Do our leaders even understand many of us are retired and on fixed incomes, and would not be able to afford higher insurance premiums than we are already faced with?

Have the County Commissioners thought about the fact that decreased property values in this area of approximately 10,000 homes will also decrease the amount of property taxes they will be able to collect?

Who will pay the doctor and hospital bills for the approximately 25,000 residents who could be made sick by these explosive batteries and the horrid chemicals they release? Will there be any reparations made to families who lose loved ones or their homes due to this project?

Why would any intelligent person think that this is a proper location for any kind of utility-scale industrial facility in the middle of residences? Do you know we already live in a HIGH wildfire risk area and these batteries do catch fire and explode and must be left to burn themselves out for days or even weeks?

Why does anyone think this is “green” or “clean” energy when lithium-ion batteries are **known to be neither** and there will be more than 500,000 of them close together? Have you ever heard the term “greenwashing?” Are you well educated on how dangerous these batteries are? Do you realize these dangers can be carried to any location by wind and rain?

Have any preparations been made to protect the location from vandalism and/or terrorism, including drone attacks?

Are you concerned about AES’s safety record? Do you know they have had three battery fires at their facilities in the last five years and that they have been fined \$40 million for environmental and work-related incidents?

If one of these industrial-sized, utility-scale, dangerous and polluting battery farms is built next to residences, how many more will be allowed in our county? Will the next one be located next to your home? Do you want to have to spend your time and money to fight for your rights against the people elected to protect you?

Do you know that Santa Fe County has a shortage of firefighters and would have to “borrow” a hazmat team from the city, not located anywhere near this facility? With a limited number of firefighters, would they fight fires at the battery site or protect people and homes, and who would make that decision?

Have you thought about what impact an incident at this facility would have on tourism?

Does it make any sense at all to try and prevent climate change while simultaneously polluting the environment?

Do you know that there will be industrial revenue bonds issued to help pay for this project and that will increase every county resident’s property tax by unknown amounts?

Do you know the hearing officer at the December 4, 2024 hearing regarding this facility recommended AGAINST this project going forward because it has so many conflicts with the Sustainable Land Development Code?

Allowing this facility near residential areas is unfair and **unethical** given the dangers posed and the **unconscionable** burden placed on the residents. As you may have seen or heard on the news, on January 16th a massive battery fire broke out at the Moss Landing Battery Plant in California. Do you know that AES was also involved with that project? Once again, this should teach us all that this kind of facility is extremely dangerous and is not suitable for a location so close to residential areas. Is this what we really want our beautiful Santa Fe County to become? Lithium-ion battery storage is NOT a safe nor “clean/green” way to store energy and the only way to prevent this from destroying our community is to not permit it in the first place. Please put the safety of the people who live here and the environment FIRST!

We must have statewide regulations in place to prevent this kind of dangerous facility being located in any residential area BEFORE any approval is allowed by local officials without due consideration of the serious impacts on the environment and people of this state.

Will any of us be able to sell our homes for what they are currently worth to escape from this “HELL HOLE” that will be created if this project is approved by our county government? How can you possibly justify approving this location?

Nancy Peterson

Eldorado resident

www.CleanEnergyCoalitionSFC.org

January 24, 2025

To Gabriel Bustos:

As a resident of Santa Fe County, I am writing to state my objection to the proposed plan to build a utility-scale lithium-ion battery facility just outside the city of Santa Fe in the center of three residential communities. This facility would pose a significant risk of fire and toxic chemicals, threatening our air, water, and homes. Please be aware that there is no current means of extinguishing the type of thermal runaway fire produced by a Lithium-Ion Battery Energy Storage System (*BESS*). With persistent and ever-increasing high winds and high wildfire risk, no west-end exit in Eldorado and more than 20 minutes from adequate fire response and Haz mat personnel, the concept of locating a utility-scale battery facility here is simply unacceptable.

Considering what has happened in the Los Angeles area in recent times and Lahaina in 2023, we must be vigilant in appreciating the ever-increasing threats from climate change. The Hermits Peak and Calf Canyon (341,735 acres) and Black Fire (325,136 acres) wildfires have demonstrated that New Mexico is especially vulnerable with great consequences to humans, structures, vegetation and wildlife.

I believe a better, more thoughtful way forward is to explore the possibilities of providing renewable solar energy to the county through a decentralized micro-grid system. This would use current New Mexico companies and local resources to build a safer, sustainable and more reliable energy system whose benefits would go to residents and local businesses.

Please take the time and diligence required to fully understand the threats. It is all of our responsibility to understand what is at stake and prioritize the protection of our valued and treasured communities.

Robyn Johnson
Long Term Eldorado Resident

Dear Mr Bustos,

I am reaching out to you about a proposed *solar project* adjacent to my community of Eldorado. AES, a utility and power-generating company based in Arlington, Virginia, has applied to Santa Fe County for a permit to build this project in our area, with only a 30% business plan. AES is a global Fortune 500 power company with nefarious business practices. This project has the potential to adversely and permanently affect not only Eldorado but all of Santa Fe.

Clean Energy Coalition (CEC) non-profit organization was formed in 2023 to educate the community and Santa Fe County about the AES Corporation's plan to develop this *solar project* using over half a million lithium-ion batteries. These batteries contain "forever chemicals" that pose fire hazards. Three documented fires have occurred at AES battery facilities in the last five years. Battery fires contaminate the ground, air, and water, adversely affecting Santa Fe's permanent residents, institutions, industry, and tourism.

In September 2023, AES filed a Temporary Restraining Order to prevent the County from sharing complete details in its application to develop a utility-scale battery storage project adjacent to Eldorado, Rancho San Marcos, and Rancho Viejo. Thanks to CEC intervening in January 2024, AES lost in the District Court and was required to share the project's hazards with the public.

AES has since submitted a second application to the County for this project, and there was a second District Court hearing on December 11, 2024, regarding their attempts to refer to hazards as trade secrets again. Thanks to CEC and the community, AES lost again. We are waiting to hear if AES will appeal or once again share with the public the risks and hazards of locating such a facility, which encompasses more than 600 football fields, near 25,000 residents, and the city of Santa Fe.

The CEC advocates for renewable energy, and its members have proposed safer and more equitable solar energy alternatives for Santa Fe County that are already being used in other communities. I ask that you consider signing the online petition to stop the AES Solar Lithium-ion Battery Project:

WATCH VIDEO

<https://www.cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org>

SIGN PETITION

<https://cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org/petition/>

Lee Zlotoff, President of CEC, would be happy to meet with leadership and present an overview of the project, the committee's progress, and ongoing concerns. He and the Community Liaison, Dayna Matlin, can be reached at

info@cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org.

Thank you for your attention and advocacy. If you have any questions, please contact me or the CEC.

With respect,

Tamara Ann Burgh

tburgh65@gmail.com

This is important data to consider when evaluating the AES Rancho Viejo project. Adding in the fire danger, this is too great a risk to build this kind of facility so close to Rancho San Marcos and Eldorado!

AES has \$40MIL in regulatory fines. \$26 MIL are environmental violations. In 2024 alone, AES had \$3.5 MILLION in fines for WATER POLLUTION, AIR POLLUTION and HAZARDOUS WASTE VIOLATIONS. Who is AES? the energy company who has applied to the Santa Fe County for a permit to build & operate the Rancho Viejo Solar & Lithium Battery Storage (BESS) Industrial Project. Data doesn't lie. Here are the sources. Feel free to use this information and images for distribution as you see fit. https://violationtracker.goodjobsfirst.org/?parent=aes-corp&order=pen_year&sort=

[Basic Search](#) | [Summaries](#) | [Advanced Search](#)

Violation Tracker Current Parent Company Summary

Current Parent Company Name: AES Corp.**Ownership Structure:** publicly traded (ticker symbol AES)**Headquartered in:** Virginia**Major Industry:** utilities and power generation**Specific Industry:** utilities**Penalty total since 2000:** \$40,195,210**Number of records:** 56

TOP 5 OFFENSE GROUPS (GROUPS DEFINED)	PENALTY TOTAL	NUMBER OF RECORDS
environment-related offenses	\$26,674,880	40
employment-related offenses	\$6,800,000	1
competition-related offenses	\$6,333,500	2
safety-related offenses	\$386,830	13

TOP 5 PRIMARY OFFENSE TYPES	PENALTY TOTAL	NUMBER OF RECORDS
air pollution violation	\$19,505,345	21
environmental violation	\$6,944,340	15
labor relations violation	\$6,800,000	1
energy market violation	\$6,333,500	2
workplace safety or health violation	\$386,830	13

Notes: Parent-subsidiary linkages are based on relationships current as of the latest revision listed in the [Update Log](#), which may vary from what was the case when a violation occurred. The penalty totals are adjusted to account for the fact that the individual entries below may include both agency records and settlement announcements for the same case; or else a penalty covering multiple locations may be listed in the individual records for each of the facilities. The totals are also adjusted to reflect cases in which federal and state or local agencies cooperated and issued separate announcements of the outcome. Duplicate or overlapping penalty amounts are marked with an asterisk in the list below.



COMPANY	PRIMARY OFFENSE TYPE	YEAR	AGENCY	PENALTY AMOUNT
AES Alamitos, LLC	air pollution violation	2024	CA-ARB	\$195,000
Indianapolis Power & Light Company	hazardous waste violation	2024	IN-ENV	\$6,600
AES Puerto Rico, L.P.	water pollution violation	2024	EPA	\$1,845
AES Puerto Rico, L.P.	environmental violation	2024	EPA	\$3,125,000
AES Puerto Rico, L.P.	environmental violation	2024	EPA	\$1,845
AES Alamitos, LLC and AES Redondo Beach, LLC	energy market violation	2023	FERC	\$6,000,000
DAYTON POWER & LIGHT	workplace safety or health violation	2023	OSHA	\$8,125
AES Hawaii, LLC	air pollution violation	2021	EPA	\$199,725
INDIANAPOLIS POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY (AES INDIANA)	environmental violation	2021	EPA	\$1,525,000
Indianapolis Power & Light Company	air pollution violation	2020	EPA	\$25,000
Indianapolis Power & Light	air pollution violation	2020	IN-AG	\$600,000
AES Alamitos, LLC	air pollution violation	2020	CA-SCAQMD	\$10,000
AES Huntington Beach, LLC	air pollution violation	2020	CA-SCAQMD	\$10,000
AES HAWAII LLC	workplace safety or health violation	2019	OSHA	\$21,860
AES Redondo Beach, LLC	air pollution violation	2017	CA-SCAQMD	\$15,150
AES Huntington Beach, LLC	air pollution violation	2016	CA-SCAQMD	\$6,000
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY	workplace safety or health violation	2016	OSHA	\$6,500
Indianapolis Power & Light Company	energy market violation	2014	FERC	\$333,500
AES Southland LLC	air pollution violation	2014	CA-ARB	\$127,800
AES WARRIOR RUN	air pollution violation	2014	MD-ENV	\$60,000
The Dayton Power and Light Co.	environmental violation	2014	OH-ENV	\$100,000
AES Deepwater, LLC	environmental violation	2014	TX-ENV	\$13,700
AES Redondo Beach, LLC	air pollution violation	2014	CA-SCAQMD	\$6,500
AES INC.	workplace safety or health violation	2014	OSHA	\$6,300
INDIANAPOLIS POWER & LIGHT COMPANY	workplace safety or health violation	2013	OSHA	\$18,000
AES HAWAII, INC.	workplace safety or health violation	2013	OSHA	\$19,000
Dayton Power and Light Company	environmental violation	2013	EPA	\$120,000
AES Redondo Beach, LLC	air pollution violation	2012	CA-SCAQMD	\$6,000
INDIANAPOLIS POWER & LIGHT COMPANY	workplace safety or health violation	2012	OSHA	\$165,300
AES Puerto Rico, L.P.	environmental violation	2012	EPA	\$170,000
AES Thames, LLC	water pollution violation	2010	EPA	\$140,000
Dayton Power and Light Co.	environmental violation	2010	OH-ENV	\$14,595
AES HUNTINGTON BEACH LLC	workplace safety or health violation	2010	OSHA	\$19,310
AES THAMES, LLC	environmental violation	2010	EPA	[*] \$140,000
AES Alamitos, LLC	air pollution violation	2009	CA-SCAQMD	\$6,100
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY	workplace safety or health violation	2009	OSHA	\$6,250
THE DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY	workplace safety or health violation	2009	OSHA	\$17,500
INDIANAPOLIS POWER & LIGHT CO - EAGLE VALLEY GENERATION STA	environmental violation	2008	IN-ENV	\$23,800
INDIANAPOLIS P&L PETERSBURG GENERATING STATION	air pollution violation	2008	IN-ENV	\$11,000
INDIANAPOLIS P&L EAGLE VALLEY GENERATING STA	air pollution violation	2006	IN-ENV	\$6,750
AES Redondo Beach, LLC	air pollution violation	2006	CA-SCAQMD	\$60,000
AES Corporation	environmental violation	2005	NY-AG	\$1,700,000
AES HUNTINGTON BEACH LLC	workplace safety or health violation	2004	OSHA	\$6,560
AES Deepwater, Inc.	environmental violation	2003	TX-ENV	\$6,250
THE DAYTON POWER & LIGHT COMPANY	workplace safety or health violation	2003	OSHA	\$14,000
THE DAYTON POWER & LIGHT COMPANY	workplace safety or health violation	2003	OSHA	\$7,125
AES Thames, LLC	environmental violation	2002	CT-ENV	\$7,720
AES Huntington Beach, LLC	air pollution violation	2002	CA-SCAQMD	\$60,000
AES Redondo Beach, LLC	air pollution violation	2002	CA-SCAQMD	\$120,000
AES Huntington Beach, LLC	air pollution violation	2002	CA-SCAQMD	\$70,320
Dayton Power and Light Co.	environmental violation	2001	OH-ENV	\$21,000
AES HAWAII	environmental violation	2001	EPA	\$65,430
DAYTON POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY	labor relations violation	2000	NLRB	\$6,800,000
INDIANAPOLIS P&L CO	air pollution violation	2000	IN-ENV	\$6,000
INDIANAPOLIS P&L PETERSBURG GENERATING STATION	hazardous waste violation	2000	IN-ENV	\$7,750
AES Alamitos, LLC	air pollution violation	2000	CA-SCAQMD	\$17,000,000

https://violationtracker.goodjobsfirst.org/?parent=aes-corp&order=pen_year&sort=

On January 8, I wrote the following letter to my Santa Fe County Commissioner (see also the Commissioner's reply, below):

[Congratulations]... on your election and I'm glad you have landed in your position among our County Commissioners.

Particularly so on account of this:

"This risk (the proposed solar collector and battery array) is compounded by the distance of these areas from County fire fighting stations, none of which has a hazardous material team," Hebert wrote in the order. "The evidence indicates the Project would be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the area." SFNM 12/24/24.

You have the experience and the critical thinking tools to read Ms. Hebert's report. I have looked for it and have not found it. Has it been released to the public?

Does she realize that when she cites "the evidence" she is inviting a close examination of "evidence?" I hope so.

What rules of evidence will you rely upon when you evaluate her's?
What rules of evidence were cited in her contract with the county?
Will the "evidence" withstand scrutiny? Your scrutiny?
Is it verifiable and verified?
Do neighbors "fears" that she reports in the next sentence of the article constitute "evidence?" The structure of the New Mexican's article seem to suggest that she thinks so, but you are not going to evaluate the article(s), you are going to evaluate her evidence as contained in her report and its supporting documents.

As I am sure you noticed, the paper also ran an article on the subsequent presentation from AES. (SFNM 1/7/2025)
The company's representative alleged that Ms. Hebert's findings were "built on unsubstantiated claims and non-expert testimony."
Since then, others, including the Sierra Club and the Green Chamber of Commerce have argued for the project.

There's another opportunity to validate a claim. Is the company right or is the hearing officer?

Where is evidence and where is rhetoric?

The complainant community spokesperson said, "We have evidence, too...". I'll bet he thinks he does.

Fortunately for you, a vast array of opaque questions has now been reduced to two. Him or her?

Good for you. That's what a hearing officer is for — get the relevant questions reduced to a manageable number so elected decision makers can discharge their duty to decide. But having a report from a hearing officer does not resolve the matter nor does it provide an avenue for you to defer to her for decision.

My bet is that you know that as well or better than I do, but I have my doubts about some of your colleagues. Fortunately, all of the current Commissioners are better equipped to discern that nuance than their predecessors were.

Frankly, I will find a huge solar array in my community to be a beautiful thing.

And if its batteries are flammable, are they more so than gas stations or less so?

If by your own lights, you weigh the evidence and vote to sustain the application, even with conditions that you might impose, you would have done constituents like me quite a solid.

Finally, the decision that is before you illustrates another weakness.

Your County Manager finds it all too easy to simplify things with a broad-brush appeal to quasi-judicial function.

When I was on the city's Charter Commission, we were faced with the need to make headway on the dysfunctional references to quasi-judicial function.

Some steps in a good direction would be to get your Manager into a room with the next City Attorney, plus all City Councilors and County

Commissioners and develop a unified field theory for administering the famous Quasi-Judicial Function and teaching the public about it. My impression is that the two bodies manage this feature slightly differently and that in itself causes unnecessary hardship.

A second fix would be to have a thorough investigation of how planning documents and their **public** processes are meant to counterbalance the rights of **developers** that also need protection — hence the due process provisions of Quasi-Judicial Function. That weak theory breaks down when the public's interests are met on a very occasional timeline while the private developers' rights are protected incident to incident and constantly. Good theory poorly executed in actual practice.

I would like to see a more robust public interest due process with the same calendar frequency as the private interest due process with lots of attention to balancing the two.

Whatever you and your colleagues decide, some will judge as right or wrong, but others like me will opine that you did your duty from where you sat while we on our couches could not see what you saw.

So have at it. And show up for the next tough one, they are standing in line.

Congratulations again.

Best

Paul

To which the Commissioner, doing the right thing under the current inadequate rules, replied in part the very next day:

Thanks, Paul.

I'm intrigued by your suggestion about a collective training, and subsequent public education, on the quasi-judicial function. It's for that function that I won't comment on the AES case and need to be careful about what I read and who I talk to... I'm looking forward to diving in, even though I know it will be contentious either way.

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Representatives,

I'm forwarding you an important news alert about the BESS fire going on right now in Moss Landing California. I received notice of this fire this morning from many Santa Fe residents with links to over a dozen different news outlets covering this thermal runaway event, including: [x.com](#)— [ksbw.com](#)— [politico.com](#)— energy storage news— [cnn.com](#)— [npr.org](#)— abc7news— news center 5— ap news— associated press— nbc news— [breitbart.com/politics](#)

You'll also find a link below to a local grassroots video. In 10 minutes it provides a clear and easy to digest explanation and offers a smarter solution to meet our renewable energy goals that can be implemented right now without the risks of what's happening at Moss Landing.

Thanks,
Dayna Matlin

Date: Fri, Jan 17, 2025 at 1:02 PM

Subject: News Alert! Thermal Runaway Fire Now in CA

To: <daynamatlin@gmail.com>



Clean Energy Coalition for Santa Fe County

A nonprofit organization run entirely by local volunteers.

NEWS ALERT

Thermal runaway fire now in progress...

Moss Landing California

This fire began yesterday Jan. 16, 2025 and the evacuation zone was huge, 3.5 miles to the east and 8 miles to the south of the facility. A Monterey County emergency meeting has reported that 75% of the building and equipment in the Phase 1 portion of the facility has been destroyed. Listen to what the Monterey County Supervisor says at exactly 3:00 minutes into the video.

<http://youtube.com/post/UgkxMMx1L-Em18Vi852BxmXubVCkV39GT1Ok?si=ZW5YARloELh659uV>



Moss Landing battery plant fire update at 11 p.m. 1/16/25

PLAN TO ATTEND - *in person!*

The County Planning Commission Hearing

February 3, 2025 — Monday 1:30p

We need to fill the room to win this!

Santa Fe Convention Center

201 W Marcy St, Santa Fe, NM 87501

Parking Garage in rear at 119 S Federal Pl

If you anticipate needing a ride (or can give one)

please let us know preferably by Jan. 28th.

Contact: Dayna, the CEC Liaison at: CleanEnergyCoalitionSFC@gmail.com

GRASSROOTS VIDEO

SHARE and SIGN PETITION...

As so many of the residents from the greater Santa Fe area wanted their voices to be heard, we've made a short video to help spread the word. So please take a look and share it TODAY with everyone you think should see it. And, if they share our concerns, please ask them to sign our petition.



WATCH VIDEO

<https://www.cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org>

SIGN PETITION

<https://cleanenergycoalitionsfc.org/petition/>

NEXT CEC INFLUENCERS' MEETING

More Volunteers Needed...

Join us to learn more or to volunteer with this easy and coordinated letter writing effort. You'll have your questions answered by members of the CEC steering committee, and meet your CEC captains who will help get you started. This is a worthwhile endeavor that is making a huge difference!

Online Zoom

January 21, Tuesday 6:30p-7:30p

Meeting link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81153161545pwd=ZZzWkQt1zgtPihRsfuuifApbK0xYpC.1>

Thanks,

Dayna & Lee and the CEC Steering Committee



CEC Steering Committee

Clean Energy Coalition for Santa Fe County

7 Avenida Vista Grande B7-115

Santa Fe NM 87508



www.CleanEnergyCoalitionSFC.org

facebook.com/cleanenergysantafe

Email: info@CleanEnergyCoalitionSFC.org

Alternate Email: CleanEnergyCoalitionSFC@gmail.com

If this email was forwarded to you by a friend please join our email list [HERE](#).

OUR NUMBERS MATTER!

[View this email in browser](#)

Copyright (C) 2024 Clean Energy Coalition For Santa Fe County. All rights reserved.

Want to change how you receive these emails?

You can [update your preferences](#) or [unsubscribe](#)

Dear Alexandra Ladd - I am writing this letter to you today as a concerned citizen. I am very concerned about the safety and location of the Rancho Viejo Solar Project. I live in the northwest corner of Eldorado about 1 mile from the project boundary.

The proposed Ranch Viejo Solar Project, a very large solar energy farm with battery storage, is seeking a conditional use permit (CUP) permit from the County of Santa Fe. This CUP application is soon to be put in front of the Santa Fe County Planning commission on Monday, February 3, 2025, Santa Fe Convention Center.

This will be the second of three public meetings hosted by Santa Fe County concerning this matter

In case you didn't know the first public meeting was held on December 4, 2024. This project was the subject of a "Hearing Officer Meeting". At this public meeting the application for the CUP, the conditional use permit, was presented in detail. In addition testimony from opponents, the Clean Energy Coalition for Santa Fe County and the San Marcos Association, was also presented.

The results of this meeting were reported in an 18 page document on December 23, 2024, and it "...recommends the Application be denied ...".

I strongly agree with this recommendation because of two reasons:

1) Recent wildfires in Los Angeles have taught us that the spread of wildfires is dependent on debris, such as tumbleweeds and embers, being launched by very high winds. In fact this smoldering debris can travel 3 to 5 miles! Therefore this project must be at least 5 miles away from any buildings. Santa Fe is only 3 miles from the project! Furthermore there are suspicions that the fires were started by power lines downed by high winds. This project has 2.5 miles of above ground power lines. Not safe.

2) Lithium-ion battery storage is proposed to store the collected solar energy. The problem is that these battery storage facilities have a history of runaway fires. They are anything but safe. In fact as recently as January 17, 2025, a runaway battery fire at Moss Landing, California was reported. This was the fourth reported fire at this facility in the last three years!

Please support the opposition to this project. Thank you for your time.

--

~ Most Cordially ~ Barney Magrath

~ Eldorado at Santa Fe ~ New Mexico ~USA ~

"Finish each day and be done with it. You have done what you could. Tomorrow is a new day. You shall begin it serenely and with too high a spirit to be encumbered with your old nonsense."

--Ralph Waldo Emerson

Dear Lisaida Archuleta - I am writing this letter to you today as a concerned citizen. I am very concerned about the safety and location of the Rancho Viejo Solar Project. I live in the northwest corner of Eldorado about 1 mile from the project boundary.

The proposed Ranch Viejo Solar Project, a very large solar energy farm with battery storage, is seeking a conditional use permit (CUP) permit from the County of Santa Fe. This CUP application is soon to be put in front of the Santa Fe County Planning commission on Monday, February 3, 2025, Santa Fe Convention Center.

This will be the second of three public meetings hosted by Santa Fe County concerning this matter

In case you didn't know the first public meeting was held on December 4, 2024. This project was the subject of a "Hearing Officer Meeting". At this public meeting the application for the CUP, the conditional use permit, was presented in detail. In addition testimony from opponents, the Clean Energy Coalition for Santa Fe County and the San Marcos Association, was also presented.

The results of this meeting were reported in an 18 page document on December 23, 2024, and it "...recommends the Application be denied ...".

I strongly agree with this recommendation because of two reasons:

1) Recent wildfires in Los Angeles have taught us that the spread of wildfires is dependent on debris, such as tumbleweeds and embers, being launched by very high winds. In fact this smoldering debris can travel 3 to 5 miles! Therefore this project must be at least 5 miles away from any buildings. Santa Fe is only 3 miles from the project! Furthermore there are suspicions that the fires were started by power lines downed by high winds. This project has 2.5 miles of above ground power lines. Not safe.

2) Lithium-ion battery storage is proposed to store the collected solar energy. The problem is that these battery storage facilities have a history of runaway fires. They are anything but safe. In fact as recently as January 17, 2025, a runaway battery fire at Moss Landing, California was reported. This was the fourth reported fire at this facility in the last three years!

Please support the opposition to this project. Thank you for your time.

--

~ Most Cordially ~ Barney Magrath
~ Eldorado at Santa Fe ~ New Mexico ~USA ~

"Finish each day and be done with it. You have done what you could. Tomorrow is a new day. You shall begin it serenely and with too high a spirit to be encumbered with your old nonsense."
--Ralph Waldo Emerson

From: Barry Goldberg <barry@hwgoldberg.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 12:53:13 PM

To: Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>; Gabriel C. Bustos <gcbustos@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES solar project

Hello,

I am writing about the proposed AES solar project proposed off the 285 corridor. Thanks for listening to my thoughts. I hope to be at the next community meeting but I am not a good public speaker, so I am sending you this in writing. I am a resident of El Dorado. I moved here in September. I am fully aware of the climate change that is happening now. I fully recognize the need to change our lifestyles and culture to a more sustainable way of living on this planet, including adapting to a renewable energy economy. I had a solar system on our old home and I think solar farms are beautiful, in the right locations.

I am opposed to this project for the following reasons:

The majority of residents in the proposed location are against building it so close to our homes.

The majority of residents support solar projects just not so close to our homes.

The battery technology, while safer and better equipped for failures, is still a developing technology. Why would we chance failures that could potentially cause great harm to be built too close to existing homes and businesses? Too many problems develop from evolving tech that is unanticipated. We need to adhere to the cautionary principal.

Large corporations, especially multinational corporations are not to be trusted. Our capitalistic system prioritizes profits over all else. Doing the right thing takes second position to maximizing corporate and shareholder profits in almost all cases. AES has a history of prioritizing profits over all else. They have been fined and reprimanded on numerous occasions for this position. Why would we trust that they would act differently Here?

One suggestion I've heard is to place the solar farm in the proposed location but move the battery installation further away all the home developments. This would cost more but make it safer for all of us that live here.

We should be thinking of better ways to meet our energy needs. Microgrids and distributed energy generation should be considered. Concentrating power supply and concentrating wealth in the hands of large corporate entities does not move us in the direction of a more sustainable economy. It's time for a new way of thinking about this. Please show courage by denying this project as conceived. Have them redesign in a more appropriate location and with more thought for a new way of doing things.

Thank you,
Barry and Lyn Goldberg
99 Encantado Loop
Santa Fe, NM 87508
970-749-1808

From: Jennifer Warren <Jennifer.Warren@messages.cropamerica.com>

Sent: Sunday, January 26, 2025 6:42 PM

To: Dominic J. Sisneros <djsisneros@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: I do NOT support the Rancho Viejo Solar Project - Case #24-5200

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commissioners,

As a County resident, I am writing you to share my strong NON support for the Rancho Viejo Solar and Battery Storage project.

I urge you to vote NOT in favor of the Conditional Use Permit for the Rancho Viejo Solar and Battery Storage project. It is a liability for our community. A concerned citizen.

From: Leslie Bischoff <lsbischoff@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, January 17, 2025 9:25 AM

To: sgreene@santafecountynm.gov <sgreene@santafecountynm.gov>; Lisa Cacari Stone <cacaristone@santafecountynm.gov>; Camilla M. Bustamante <cbustamante@santafecountynm.gov>; Adam Fulton Johnson <afjohnson@santafecountynm.gov>; Hank Hughes <hhughes@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Worlds Largest Battery Facility is on Fire

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

This was in the news this morning about the lithium battery storage facility at Moss Landing in Monterey County, CA is currently on fire. Residents in the area have been evacuated due to toxic fumes. It will be interesting to see how this plays out.

<https://www.msn.com/en-us/weather/topstories/world-s-largest-battery-plant-on-fire-in-central-california/ar-AA1xlUgs?ocid=hpmsn&cvid=17a1a084fead4ff08ae691751aa6a7ca&ei=13>

Leslie Bischoff

From: Linda Barlow <lindabarlow5@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, January 19, 2025 12:10 PM

To: Adam Fulton Johnson <afjohnson@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: AES Battery Farm

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioner Johnson:

While the Vistra Moss Landing Battery Fire is burning people are experiencing headaches and sore throats due to the toxic fumes. Your decision literally affects our lives. The technology for the Rancho Viejo AES project is not substantially more modern or advanced than what's at this facility. I'm asking you to please protect the people you were elected to serve.

Sincerely,
Linda Barlow

From: Marita Prandoni <mprandoni@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, January 17, 2025 1:56 PM

To: CleanEnergyCoalitionSFC@gmail.com <CleanEnergyCoalitionSFC@gmail.com>

Cc: Adam Fulton Johnson <afjohnson@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Why the AES Project must be rejected

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

This is an article that was published today in The Guardian.



Big fire at California battery plant prompts evacuations amid toxic smoke
theguardian.com

I hope it will help to convince Santa Fe County to reject the AES Project proposal.

Marita Prandoni

From: Mark Young <myoungeld@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, January 19, 2025 10:34 AM

To: Adam Fulton Johnson <afjohnson@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Vote no to aes

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hopefully, you're already aware that there was another fire at a lithium ion battery storage area just like the one proposed for the AES project at Santa Fe if you haven't already heard here are the details

1. Another HUGE Lithium-Ion BESS Thermal Runaway Fire

One of the world's largest Lithium-Ion BESS Storage Facilities is on Fire in Moss Landing California. This is the 4th Lithium-Ion BESS Fire at Moss Landing. Fluence Energy (which was formed by AES and Siemens in 2018) was the engineering contractor for this section of the facility (which is still on fire as of tonight). This same section of the facility also caught fire back in September 2021 (before it even went online).

We urge you to vote no in this dangerous project Our home is located on the Western side of Eldorado and just a mile from potential fires, I am not opposed to Solar as I have it on my roof as well, but strongly opposed to the lithium ion battery storage systems like the AES project uses

Please vote no to the project

Thank you. Mark and Mary Young 47 Camarata Rd., Santa Fe.

From: Penny Lee <pclee@bellsouth.net>

Sent: Sunday, January 19, 2025 9:11 AM

To: Adam Fulton Johnson <afjohnson@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: People in the vicinity of the Moss Landing Battery storage Fire, are already feeling effects of the fumes.
Photos included

WARNING:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Please consider the Affects that the Moss Landing battery storage facility fires fumes have already had on nearby communities and actual people.

I don't Want this happening in Eldorado where The winds usually blow to.

If there were to be an evacuation in this community of ELdorado, the school that has over 400 students would not be able to evacuate all the children because the school buses are not kept on the property during the day, I called two sources and verified this as a fact.

Parents and caregivers would have to go to the school, find their child or children and then leave. Parents and caregivers that did not realize the school could not evacuate their children, would not be going to pick up their child, so that means other parents, would be taking extra children, some children they might not even know. Just imagine what a mess that would be, and probably traumatic for some kids.

Please say no to the AES Rancho Viejo proposal.

was “no immediate threat” from smoke Friday morning. “Moderate” air quality is expected Friday and Saturday, according to the [Monterey Bay Air Resources District](#). Hydrogen fluoride is a hazardous gas that can be emitted by a lithium battery fire, and none of the Vistra’s air monitors had detected the gas, officials said Friday morning. The pollutants are expected to break down within hours or days, experts said.

Teachers at Ohlone Elementary School in Royal Oaks reported “fumes” in the air Friday. “A lot of the kids are complaining that it smells really bad, and some students are starting to feel really sick,” said Janette Martinez, a second-grade teacher at Ohlone Elementary in Royal Oaks. “A lot of staff members were starting to get headaches and itchy eyes.”

**Santa Cruz County air quality
information**

Update: Residents told to monitor hazardous smoke from Moss Landing fire

By [Nik Altenberg](#), [Jesse Kathan](#) and [Stephen Baxter](#) | January 17, 2025 | Tags: [batteries](#), [environment](#), [Featured](#), [fire](#), [health](#), [Jesse Kathan](#), [Moss Landing](#), [Stephen Baxter](#), [Vistra Corp.](#), [wildfire](#)



Smoke is visible from a fire at a Moss Landing battery facility about 9:45 a.m. Friday from Merritt Street near Castroville. (Nik Altenberg – Santa Cruz Local)

From: Robyn Johnson <rleigh92@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 11:56 AM

To: Jordan A. Yutzy <jjutzy@santafecountynm.gov>

Subject: Proposed Rancho Viejo Battery/Solar Project

Warning:

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

To Jordan Yutzy:

As a resident of Santa Fe County, I am writing to state my objection to the proposed plan to build a utility-scale lithium-ion battery facility just outside the city of Santa Fe in the center of three residential communities. This facility would pose a significant risk of fire and toxic chemicals, threatening our air, water, and homes. Please be aware that there is no current means of extinguishing the type of thermal runaway fire produced by a Lithium-Ion Battery Energy Storage System (*BESS*). With persistent and ever-increasing high winds and high wildfire risk, no west-end exit in Eldorado and more than 20 minutes from adequate fire response and Haz mat personnel, the concept of locating a utility-scale battery facility here is simply unacceptable.

Considering what has happened in the Los Angeles area in recent times and Lahaina in 2023, we must be vigilant in appreciating the ever-increasing threats from climate change. The Hermits Peak and Calf Canyon (341,735 acres) and Black Fire (325,136 acres) wildfires have demonstrated that New Mexico is especially vulnerable with great consequences to humans, structures, vegetation and wildlife.

I believe a better, more thoughtful way forward is to explore the possibilities of providing renewable solar energy to the county through a decentralized micro-grid system. This would use current New Mexico companies and local resources to build a safer, sustainable and more reliable energy system whose benefits would go to residents and local businesses.

Please take the time and diligence required to fully understand the threats. It is all of our responsibility to understand what is at stake and prioritize the protection of our valued and treasured communities.

Robyn Johnson
Long Term Eldorado Resident

To Lisaida Archuleta:

As a resident of Santa Fe County, I am writing to state my objection to the proposed plan to build a utility-scale lithium-ion battery facility just outside the city of Santa Fe in the center of three residential communities. This facility would pose a significant risk of fire and toxic chemicals, threatening our air, water, and homes. Please be aware that there is no current means of extinguishing the type of thermal runaway fire produced by a Lithium-Ion Battery Energy Storage System (*BESS*). With persistent and ever increasing high winds and high wildfire risk, no west-end exit in Eldorado and more than 20 minutes from adequate fire response and Haz mat personnel, the concept of locating a utility-scale battery facility here is simply unacceptable.

Considering what has happened in the Los Angeles area in recent times and Lahaina in 2023, we must be vigilant in appreciating the ever-increasing threats from climate change. The Hermits Peak and Calf Canyon (341,735 acres) and Black Fire (325,136 acres) wildfires have demonstrated that New Mexico is especially vulnerable with great consequences to humans, structures, vegetation and wildlife.

I believe a better, more thoughtful way forward is to explore the possibilities of providing renewable solar energy to the county through a decentralized micro-grid system. This would use current New Mexico companies and local resources to build a safer, sustainable and more reliable energy system whose benefits would go to residents and local businesses.

Please take the time and diligence required to fully understand the threats. It is all of our responsibility to understand what is at stake and prioritize the protection of our valued and treasured communities.

Robyn Johnson
Long Term Eldorado Resident