

To: Comments@efsec.wa.gov;sonia.bumpus@efsec.wa.gov

From: kathleen.drew@efsec.wa.gov

Received: 2024-03-10T19:59:42+00:00

Subject: Fwd: Cypress Creek

Has attachment? False

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Virginia Fitzpatrick <virginiaf51@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, March 9, 2024 7:42:48 AM

To: Drew, Kathleen (EFSEC) <kathleen.drew@efsec.wa.gov>

Subject: Cypress Creek

External Email

Dear Ms Drew,

As a state leader and in the energy field I know you are under tremendous pressure to meet certain goals. However you are also charged to protect the public, at least do NO harm, as a publicly paid employee.

The proposed Carriger Solar Farm in Klickitat county is an example of not protecting the people from unintended consequences. Even considering such a site is irresponsible, 2 miles west of a town in a windy area that is fire prone. The wind that makes it so attractive for windmills. A much cheaper site to build on but at what cost. We had a 60k acre fire here last year.

We have no history to know any actual data. Remember when nuclear was the latest and greatest, until it wasn't?

The rapid expansion and plans for Industrial Scale Solar needs to slow a bit.

There are so many questions and concerns about these solar farms and the ESS that need to be addressed-

In my research I found the Department of Commerce is investigating whether imports of solar panels from Southeast Asia are circumventing anti-dumping rules that limit imports from China.

Gov Inslee is outlawing several forever chemicals, how can we be sure they are not in the PV panels? Who will check? Trusting a stakeholder is not an option.

Recently the Washington State Department of Agriculture says solar installations will damage soils, disputing a claim by an energy company that the 1000 acres of prime farmland in Klickitat County could revert to agriculture in 25 years and be as productive as before. The Ag policy advisor said "the proposed Carriger solar project near Goldendale would compact and shade ground, depriving of sunlight and organic material". The soil may take decades to recover and does not expect the ground to meet preproject agriculture viability after decommissioning. The proposed site is 634 acres of wheat, 358 acres of hay, 70 IRRIGATED acres and 179 acres pasture, all turned to wasteland.

Carriger's response - "the solar panels will rotate exposing the ground to sunlight. Hard surfaces cover 40 acres and the rest will be undisturbed or planted with low growing vegetation".

"Because we do not anticipate widespread soil compaction or long term impacts - they did not see the need for soil sampling"

WA dept of Agriculture said 93% of the acreage is classified as prime farmland or farmland of statewide significance. Soil sampling is a quick easy test, but no Cypress Creek home based in North Carolina says not necessary.

How much is Cypress Creek willing to put up for decommissioning? You know the price will be double or triple

what it would cost today.

There are so many other issues, you've heard them all.

I understand Washington is instituting a take back program - starts in July 2025. why not now? And what is the state going to do with used PV panels?

I thank you for your time and I would appreciate a response to my concerns mentioned above.

Virginia Fitzpatrick
Goldendale

Attachments:

□