

Kenneth Comia

*Per comments
of Airport Commission*

From: Greg Carey <greg.carey@easycleanenergy.com>
Sent: Friday, December 28, 2018 12:37 PM
To: Kenneth Comia
Cc: Jay Myrto; Mike Scott
Subject: FW: solar array on Clemence Hill Rd.
Attachments: DOER Clean Energy Results QA (002).pdf; DOER Clean Energy Results QA - Glare page 22.pdf

Hello Ken,

I have reached out to the Airport Commission regarding their comment letter to the Board but have not heard back from them.

Attached for the PB's review is a report prepared by DOER which provides helpful information about solar, including the question of glare from solar panels. As I am sure the PB knows, many airports, including Boston's Logan Airport, have solar panels located on airport property. I am not aware of any reported impacts from the panels on airport operations.

The panels installed for our project will have anti-reflective glass. We have also received a Determination of No Hazard from the FAA for our proposed project.

Greg

Greg Carey
Director of Real Estate & Permitting | Clean Energy Collective
M: 617.834.8567

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. Nothing contained in this e-mail shall be considered a legally binding agreement, amendment or modification of any agreement, each of which requires a separate fully executed agreement in writing with signatures.

From: Greg Carey
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2018 3:55 PM
To: 'vignljv@gmail.com' <vignljv@gmail.com>
Cc: 'Mike Scott' <mScott@wda-dg.com>; Jay Myrto <jay.myrto@easycleanenergy.com>; 'Kenneth Comia' <kcomia@southbridgemass.org>
Subject: solar array on Clemence Hill Rd.

Hello Lenny,

Ken Comia provided us with a copy of your comment letter to the Planning Board regarding our proposed solar project on Clemence Hill Rd. CEC's project engineer (WDA Design Group) and I would be happy to meet with you and the Commission to review our proposed solar project. WDA designed and permitted a solar project next to Westover Air Reserve Base and are very familiar with the FAA's policies. Fyi, we filed the Clemence Hill Road solar project with the FAA and have received a Determination of No Hazard finding from them.

Please let me know if you'd like to meet. Thank you.

CLEAN ENERGY RESULTS

Questions & Answers

Ground-Mounted Solar Photovoltaic Systems



Westford Solar Park, photo courtesy of EEA

June 2015

Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection

Massachusetts Clean Energy Center

Table of Contents

Background.....3

Hazardous Materials.....5

End-of-Life/Decommissioning.....7

Ambient Temperature (“Heat Island”).....9

Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF).....10

Property Values.....13

Public Safety (including fires).....14

Historic Preservation.....16

Noise.....18

Water-Related Impacts.....20

Glare.....22

Endangered Species and Natural Heritage.....23

Background

Encouraging increased use of solar photovoltaic (PV) technology, which converts sunlight directly into electricity, is a key priority for state clean energy efforts. The environmental benefits of solar PV abound. Unlike conventional fossil fuel power generation (such as coal, gas and oil), generating electricity with ground-mounted solar PV involves no moving parts, uses no water, and produces no direct emissions of climate-warming greenhouse gases.

Solar PV environmental and energy benefits, combined with strong incentives available for solar projects, have significantly increased the use of this technology recently. The Commonwealth's vibrant solar industry has a variety of ownership and financing options for Massachusetts residents and businesses looking to install solar PV systems. Purchasing a solar PV system generally involves upfront installation and equipment costs, but there are significant upfront and production-based incentives¹.

As the Massachusetts clean energy sector grows, the Baker Administration is working to ensure that solar PV and other clean energy technologies are sited in a way that is most protective of human health and the environment, and minimizes impacts on scenic, natural, and historic resources.

Purpose of Guide

This guide is intended to help local decision-makers and community members answer common questions about ground-mounted solar PV development. Ground-mounted solar PV has many proven advantages and there has been a steady growth of well received projects in the Commonwealth. However, these systems are still relatively new and unfamiliar additions to our physical landscape.

This guide focuses on questions that have been raised concerning the installation and operation of ground-mounted solar PV projects. It provides summaries and links to existing research and studies that can help understand solar PV technology in general and ground-mounted solar in particular.

Solar PV panels can and are of course also installed on buildings², car ports or light poles. This guide focuses on ground-mounted systems since most questions relate to this type of solar installation.

Developed through the partnership of the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources (DOER), the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP), and the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center (MassCEC), this guide draws from existing recent literature in the United States and abroad and is not the result of new original scientific studies. The text was reviewed by the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL).

As more or new information becomes available, the guide will be updated and expanded accordingly.

¹ For a comprehensive overview, start at <http://masscec.com/index.cfm/page/Solar-PV/pid/12584>

² For an overview of the multiple options for siting PV and buildings in the same footprint, see the Solar Ready Buildings Planning Guide, NREL, 2009.

Solar PV Projects Are Sited Locally

The siting authority for solar PV projects resides at the local - not the state - level. One purpose of this guide is to inform and facilitate local efforts to expand clean energy generation in a sustainable way, and provide a consolidated source of existing research and information that addresses common questions faced by communities.

As part of the Green Communities Act of 2008, DOER and the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EOEEA) developed a model zoning by-law/ordinance called “as-of-right siting” that does not require a special permit. It is designed to help communities considering adoption of zoning for siting of large-scale solar. This model zoning by-law/ordinance provides standards for the placement, design, construction, operation, monitoring, modification and removal of new large-scale ground-mounted solar PV installations. The latest version of the model by-law was published in December 2014³. It provides useful information that will not be repeated extensively in this guide.

Consider Impacts of Other Possible Developments at Site

Use of land for the purpose of solar photovoltaic power generation should be compatible with most other types of land usage. However, DOER strongly discourages designating locations that require significant tree cutting because of the important water management, cooling and climate benefits trees provide. DOER encourages designating locations in industrial and commercial districts, or on vacant, disturbed land.

When assessing the impact of new ground-mounted solar arrays, communities and other stakeholders should carefully consider other types of development that might take place in a particular location if there was no solar installation. Stakeholders should bear in mind the higher or lower impacts that those alternatives might have in terms of noise, air pollution or landscape. These alternative impacts fall outside the scope of this guide, but are relevant when looking at individual projects.

³ <http://www.mass.gov/eea/docs/doer/green-communities/grant-program/model-solar-zoning.pdf>

Hazardous Materials

The Question: What, if any, health risks do chemicals used to manufacture solar panels and other devices used in solar PV arrays pose if they are released into the environment?

Bottom Line: Because PV panel materials are enclosed, and don't mix with water or vaporize into the air, there is little, if any, risk of chemical releases to the environment during normal use. The most common type of PV panel is made of tempered glass, which is quite strong. They pass hail tests, and are regularly installed in Arctic and Antarctic conditions. Only in the unlikely event of a sufficiently hot fire is there a slight chance that chemicals could be released. This is unlikely because most residential fires are not hot enough to melt PV components and PV systems must conform to state and federal fire safety, electrical and building codes.

Transformers used at PV installations, that are similar to the ones used throughout the electricity distribution system in cities and towns, have the potential to release chemicals if they leak or catch fire. Transformer coolants containing halogens have some potential for toxic releases to the air if combusted. However, modern transformers typically use non-toxic coolants, such as mineral oils. Potential releases from transformers using these coolants at PV installations are not expected to present a risk to human health.

More Information: Ground-mounted PV solar arrays are typically made up of panels of silicon solar cells covered by a thin layer of protective glass, which is attached to an inert solid underlying substance (or "substrate"). While the vast majority of PV panels currently in use are made of silicon, certain types of solar cells may contain cadmium telluride (CdTe), copper indium diselenide (CIS), and gallium arsenide (GaAs).

All solar panel materials, including the chemicals noted above, are contained in a solid matrix, insoluble and non-volatile at ambient conditions, and enclosed. Therefore, releases to the ground from leaching, to the air from volatilization during use, or from panel breakage, are not a concern. Particulate emissions could only occur if the materials were ground to a fine dust, but there is no realistic scenario for this. Panels exposed to extremely high heat could emit vapors and particulates from PV panel components to the air. However, researchers have concluded that the potential for emissions derived from PV components during typical fires is limited given the relatively short-duration of most fires and the high melting point (>1000 degrees Celsius) of PV materials compared to the roof level temperatures typically observed during residential fires (800-900 degrees Celsius). In the rare instance where a solar panel might be subject to higher temperatures, the silicon and other chemicals that comprise the solar panel would likely bind to the glass that covers the PV cells and be retained there.

Release of any toxic materials from solid state inverters is also unlikely provided appropriate electrical and installation requirements are followed. For more information on public safety and fire, see the Public Safety section of this document.

We should also note that usually the rain is sufficient to keep the panels clean, so no extra cleaning in which cleaning products might be used, is necessary.

Resources:

Fthenakis, V.M., Overview of Potential Hazards in *Practical Handbook of Photovoltaics: Fundamentals and Applications*, General editors T. Markvart and L. Castaner, to be published by Elsevier in 2003.

Fthenakis, V.M. Life cycle impact analysis of cadmium in CdTe PV production. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 8, 303-334, 2004.

Fthenakis V.M., Kim H.C., Colli A., and Kirchsteiger C., [Evaluation of Risks in the Life Cycle of Photovoltaics in a Comparative Context](#), 21st European Photovoltaic Solar Energy Conference, Dresden, Germany, 4-8 September 2006.

Moskowitz P. and Fthenakis V., Toxic materials released from photovoltaic modules during fires; health risks, *Solar Cells*, 29, 63-71, 1990.

Sherwani, A.F., Usmani, J.A., & Varun. Life cycle assessment of solar PV based electricity generation systems: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 14, 540-544, 2010.

Zayed, J; Philippe, S (2009-08). "[Acute Oral and Inhalation Toxicities in Rats With Cadmium Telluride](#)" (PDF). *International journal of toxicology* (International Journal of Toxicology) **28** (4): 259–65. doi:[10.1177/1091581809337630](https://doi.org/10.1177/1091581809337630). PMID [19636069](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19636069/). <http://ijt.sagepub.com/cgi/content/short/28/4/259>.

End-of-Life/Decommissioning

Question: How do I manage solar panels after they are decommissioned and no longer in use? Can they be recycled and do hazardous waste disposal requirements apply?

Bottom Line: As more solar panels are decommissioned interest in recycling the panels has increased in Europe and the U.S. Massachusetts regulations ensure proper disposal and recycling of panels if they have components that constitute solid or hazardous waste under state regulations.

More information: The average life of solar PV panels can be 20-30 years (or longer) after initial installation. PV cells typically lose about 0.5% of their energy production capacity per year. At the time of decommissioning, panels may be reused, recycled or disposed. Since widespread use of solar PV is recent in Massachusetts, only a small percentage of solar panels in use in the state have had to be replaced due to damage or reached the end of their useful lifetime. A significant increase in the amount of end-of-life PV modules is expected over the next few decades.

When solar panels are decommissioned and discarded, state rules require that panel disposal be “properly managed” pursuant to the Massachusetts hazardous waste regulations, 310 CMR 30.000. There are many different types of solar panels used in ground-mounted or roof mounted solar PV systems; some of these panels have components that may require special hazardous waste disposal or recycling. Solar module manufacturers typically provide a list of materials used in the manufacturing of their product, which may be used to determine the proper disposal requirements at the time of decommissioning. Under the hazardous waste regulations, the burden is on the generator of the panels to determine if the waste being generated (the solar panels) is hazardous or not. This determination can be made using “knowledge” (i.e. an MSDS sheet listing the materials used in manufacture of the panels) or testing (i.e. the Toxicity Characteristic Leaching Procedure – TCLP).

If a panel is tested and passes TCLP then it is regulated as a solid waste; if it fails TCLP then it is regulated as a hazardous waste.

However, if the solar panel is determined to be hazardous due solely to the presence of metal-bearing circuit boards, the panels may be conditionally exempt from the hazardous waste regulations if destined for recycling. See 310 CMR 30.202(5)(d)-(e) in the Mass. Hazardous Waste Regulations.⁴

People who lease land for solar projects are encouraged to include end-of-life panel management as part of the lease. In cases where panels are purchased, owners need to determine whether the end-of

⁴ (5) The following materials are not subject to 310 CMR 30.200, or any other provision of 310 CMR 30.000:

(d) Whole used circuit boards being recycled provided they are free of mercury switches, mercury relays, nickel-cadmium batteries, or lithium batteries.

(e) Shredded circuit boards being recycled provided that they are:

1. managed in containers sufficient to prevent a release to the environment prior to recovery; and,
2. free of mercury switches, mercury relays and nickel-cadmium batteries and lithium batteries.

life panels are a solid or hazardous waste and dispose or recycle the panels appropriately. Massachusetts regulations require testing of waste before disposal.

Because of the various materials used to produce solar panels (such as metal and glass), interest in recycling of solar modules has grown. Throughout Europe, a not-for-profit association (PV Cycle) is managing a voluntary collection and recycling program for end-of-life PV modules. The American photovoltaic industry is not required by state or federal regulation to recycle its products, but several solar companies are starting to recycle on a voluntary basis. Some manufacturers are offering end-of-life recycling options and independent companies looking to recycle solar modules are growing. This allows for the recycling of the PV panels and prevents issues with the hazardous materials. Currently, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control is considering standards for the management of solar PV panels at the end of their use.

DOER's model zoning provides language on requirements for abandonment and decommissioning of solar panels for use by local officials considering local approvals for these projects.

Resources

End-of-life PV: then what? - Recycling solar PV panels

<http://www.renewableenergyfocus.com/view/3005/end-of-life-pv-then-what-recycling-solar-pv-panels/>

MassDEP Hazardous Waste Regulations 310 CMR 30.000

<http://www.mass.gov/eea/agencies/massdep/recycle/regulations/310-cmr-30-000.html>

PV Cycle, Europe: <http://www.pvcycle.org/>

California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Proposed Standards for the Management of Hazardous Waste Solar Modules,

http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/LawsRegsPolicies/Regs/Reg_Exempt_HW_Solar_Panels.cfm

Ambient Temperature (“Heat Island”)

The Question: Does the presence of ground-mounted solar PV arrays cause higher ambient temperatures in the surrounding neighborhood (i.e., the “heat island” effect)?

Bottom Line: All available evidence indicates that there is no solar “heat island” effect caused by the functioning of solar arrays. Cutting shade trees for solar PV might increase the need for cooling if those trees were shading buildings. This is primarily a concern in town centers and residential areas (locations where large ground-mounted PV is not encouraged) and is a potential impact of any development activity that requires tree-cutting.

More Information: All available evidence indicates that there is no solar “heat island” effect caused by the functioning of solar arrays. Solar panels absorb photons from direct sunlight and convert it to electricity. This minimizes the likelihood of substantially changing temperatures at the site or the surrounding neighborhood. For an area with no PV system, solar energy impacting the ground is either reflected or absorbed. There is no research to support heat production from the solar panels themselves.

Sunpower, a private solar manufacturer, conducted a study on the impact of solar PV on the local temperature, and concluded that a solar PV array can absorb a higher percentage of heat than a forested parcel of land without an array. The study points out that while solar PV modules can reach high operating temperatures up to 120 degrees Fahrenheit, they are thin and lightweight and therefore do not store a large amount of heat. Because of this, and the fact that panels are also shown to cool to ambient air temperature shortly after the sun sets, the Sunpower study concludes that the area surrounding a large-scale solar array is unlikely to experience a net heating change from the panels.

If trees are removed that were previously shading a building, that building could get warmer in full sunshine than when the trees were shading it. The June 1, 2011 tornado that ripped through Western Massachusetts created an opportunity to empirically measure the effects of the loss of neighborhood trees on temperatures and air humidity in the streets. A report by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service concluded that daily mean morning and afternoon temperatures were typically greater in the tornado-impacted neighborhood in Springfield, Massachusetts than in the unaffected neighborhood and forest sites, but were similar at night. Residents noted increased use of air-conditioning units and an overall increase in energy costs in July and August of 2011.

Resources:

SUNPOWER, Impact of PV Systems on Local Temperature, July 2010

USDA Forest Services report: <http://www.regreenspringfield.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/tornado%20climate%20report%203.pdf>

Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF)

The Question: What, if any, health risks do the electric and magnetic fields (EMF) from solar panels and other components of solar PV arrays pose?

Bottom Line: Electric and magnetic fields are a normal part of life in the modern world. PV arrays generate EMF in the same extremely low frequency (ELF) range as electrical appliances and wiring found in most homes and buildings. The average daily background exposure to magnetic fields is estimated to be around one mG (milligauss – the unit used to measure magnetic field strength), but can vary considerably depending on a person's exposure to EMF from household electrical devices and wiring. The lowest exposure level that has been potentially associated with a health effect is three mG. Measurements at three commercial PV arrays in Massachusetts demonstrated that their contributions to off-site EMF exposures were low (less than 0.5 mG at the site boundary), which is consistent with the drop off of EMF strength based on distance from the source.

More Information: Solar PV panels, inverters and other components that make up solar PV arrays produce extremely low frequency EMF when generating and transmitting electricity. The extremely low frequency EMF from PV arrays is the same as the EMF people are exposed to from household electrical appliances, wiring in buildings, and power transmission lines (all at the power frequency of 60 hertz). EMF produced by cell phones, radios and microwaves is at much higher frequencies (30,000 hertz and above).

Electric fields are present when a device is connected to a power source, but are shielded or blocked by common materials, resulting in low potential for exposures. On the other hand, magnetic fields, which are only generated when a device is turned on, are not easily shielded and pass through most objects, resulting in greater potential for exposure. Both types of fields are strongest at the source and their strength decreases rapidly as the distance from the source increases. For example, the magnetic field from a vacuum cleaner six inches away from the motor is 300 mG and decreases to two mG three feet away. People are exposed to EMF during normal use of electricity and exposure varies greatly over time, depending on the distance to various household appliances and the length of time they are on. The daily average background level of magnetic fields for US residents is one mG.

EMF from PV Arrays: Solar PV panels produce low levels of extremely low frequency (ELF) EMF, with measured field strengths of less than one mG three inches from the panel. Solar PV power inverters, transformers and conduits generate higher levels of ELF-EMF. The amount of ELF-EMF is proportional to the electrical capacity of the inverter and is greater when more current (electricity) is flowing through a power line.

In a study of two PV arrays (using 10-20 kW invertors) in Kerman and Davis, California, the magnetic field was highest at the inverters and transformers, but decreased rapidly to less than one mG within 50 feet of the units, well within the boundary of the PV array (Chang and Jennings 1994). This data indicates that extremely low frequency EMF field strengths at residences near systems of this size would be below the typical levels experienced by most people at home. The highest extremely low frequency EMF (up to 1,050 mG) was found next to an inverter unit at the point of entry of the electrical conduits. Even this

value is less than the extremely low frequency EMF reported for some common household devices such as an electric can opener with a maximum of 1500 mG at 6 inches.

In a recent study of three ground mounted PV arrays in Massachusetts, the above results were confirmed. The PV arrays had a capacity range of 1 to 3.5 MW. Magnetic field levels along the PV array site boundary were in the very low range of 0.2 to 0.4 mG. Magnetic fields at 3 to 7 feet from the inverters ranged from 500 to 150 mG. At a distance of 150 feet from the inverters, these fields dropped back to very low levels of 0.5 mG or less, and in many cases to much less than background levels (0.2 mG).

Potential Health Effects: Four research studies have reported an association between three to four mG EMF exposure and childhood leukemia, while 11 other studies have not. These studies are inconsistent and do not demonstrate a causal link that would trigger a World Health Organization (WHO) designation of EMF as a possible carcinogen⁵. Studies looking at other cancers in humans and animals have not found evidence of a link to residential ELF-EMF exposure.

Reference Exposure Levels: To protect the general public from health effects from short-term high level magnetic fields, the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP, 2010) advised an exposure limit for extremely low frequency magnetic fields at 2000 mG. ICNIRP determined that the evidence on the impact of long-term exposure to low level magnetic fields was too uncertain to use to set a guideline. Guidelines for the magnetic field allowed at the edge of transmission line right-of-ways have been set at 200 mG by Florida and New York. Exposure to magnetic fields greater than 1000 mG is not recommended for people with pacemakers or defibrillators (ACGIH, 2001).

Resources:

American Conference of Government Industrial Hygienist (ACGIH). 2001. as cited in NIEHS 2002.

Chang, GJ and Jennings, C. 1994. Magnetic field survey at PG&E photovoltaic sites. PG&E R&D Report 007.5-94-6.

Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). 2012. EMF and your health.
http://my.epri.com/portal/server.pt?Abstract_id=00000000001023105.

International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). 2010. ICNIRP Guidelines for limiting exposure to time-varying electric and magnetic fields (1 Hz – 100kHz). Health Physics 99(6):818-836.

National Cancer Institute (NCI). 2005. Magnetic Field Exposure and Cancer: Questions and Answers. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health. Available
<http://www.cancer.gov/cancertopics/factsheet/Risk/magnetic-fields>, accessed May 14, 2012.

⁵ WHO has designated ELF-EMF as a possible carcinogen. The use of the label “possible carcinogen” indicates that there is not enough evidence to designate ELF-EMF as a “probable carcinogen” or “human carcinogen,” the two indicators of higher potential for being carcinogenic in humans.

National Institute of Environmental Health Science (NIEHS) 2002. Electric and Magnetic Fields Associated with the Use of Electric Power: Questions and Answers. Available http://www.niehs.nih.gov/health/assets/docs_p_z/results_of_emf_research_emf_questions_answers_booklet.pdf, accessed May 11, 2012.

National Institute of Environmental Health Science (NIEHS) web page on EMF. Available <http://www.niehs.nih.gov/health/topics/agents/emf/>, accessed May 11, 2012.

Oregon Department of Transportation (Oregon DOT). Scaling public concerns of electromagnetic fields produced by solar photovoltaic arrays. Produced by Good Company for ODOT for the West Linn Solar Highway Project. Available www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/OIPP/docs/emfconcerns.pdf.

World Health Organization (WHO). 2007. Electromagnetic fields and public health: Exposure to extremely low frequency fields. Fact sheet N°322. June 2007. Available <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs322/en/index.html>, accessed May 16, 2012. This fact sheet provides a short summary of the in-depth review documented in the WHO 2007, Environmental Health Criteria 238. Available http://www.who.int/peh-emf/publications/elf_ehc/en/index.html.

Property Values

Question: How do ground-mounted solar PV arrays adjacent to residential neighborhoods influence the property values in those neighborhoods?

Bottom Line: No research was found specific to ground-mounted solar PV and property values. Residential property value research on roof-mounted solar PV and wind turbines illustrates no evidence of devaluation of homes in the area. Municipalities that adopt zoning for solar facilities may want to consider encouraging project developers to include screening vegetation along site borders to minimize visual impacts on surrounding neighborhoods.

More Information: A review of literature nationwide shows little evidence that solar arrays influence nearby property values. An analysis focused on roof-mounted solar PV done by the U.S. Department of Energy Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory concludes that household solar installation actually increases home property values. This research analyzes a large dataset of California homes that sold from 2000 through mid-2009 with PV installed. Across a large number of repeat sales model specifications and robustness tests, the analysis finds strong evidence that California homes with PV systems have sold for a premium over comparable homes without PV systems.

Resources:

An Analysis of the Effects of Residential Photovoltaic Energy Systems on Home Sales Prices in California
<http://emp.lbl.gov/sites/all/files/lbni-4476e.pdf>

Public Safety (including fires)

Question: What public safety issues arise from people's (including children) access to areas where solar arrays are installed? Can electrical and other equipment associated with solar projects cause electrical fires?

Bottom Line: Large-scale ground-mounted arrays are typically enclosed by fencing. This prevents children and the general public from coming into contact with the installations, thus preventing unsafe situations. The National Electric Code has mandatory requirements to promote the electrical safety of solar PV arrays. Emergency personnel responding to potential emergencies at a solar PV site face the most risk, but the solar industry and firefighters provide training and education for emergency personnel to ensure that the proper safety precautions are taken.

More Information: The National Electric Code has mandatory requirements for the electrical safety of solar PV arrays. To protect against intruders, Article 690 of the National Electric Code covers the safety standards for solar PV installation and requires that conductors installed as part of solar PV be "not readily accessible". With a large-scale ground-mounted array, a fence is typically installed around the system to prevent intruders. Some communities have solar PV or signage by-laws that require identification of the system owner and 24-hour emergency contact information.

DOER's Model by-Law/ordinance requires owners of solar PV facilities to provide a copy of the project summary, electrical schematic, and site plan to the local fire chief, who can then work with the owner and local emergency services to develop an emergency response plan.

These measures can be combined with products to prevent theft of the panels. Some are very low cost options (fastener type) while there are other options that are more expensive (alarm system type) but also more effective. The biggest potential risk associated with solar PV systems is the risk of shock or electrocution for firefighters and other emergency responders who could come in contact with high voltage conductors. A 2010 study on firefighter safety and emergency response for solar PV systems by the Fire Protection Research Foundation, based in Quincy, Massachusetts, recommended steps firefighters can take when dealing with wiring and other components that may be energized. The Solar Energy Business Association of New England (SEBANE) has been working to provide training and education to first-responders to identify and avoid potential hazards when responding to a solar PV fire.

For more information about toxics/fires, see the Hazardous Materials Section.

Resources:

Moskowitz, P.D. and Fthenakis, V.M., Toxic Materials Released from Photovoltaic Modules During Fires: Health Risks, *Solar Cells*, 29, 63-71, 1990. 21.

Solar America Board for Codes and Standards

<http://www.solarabcs.org/about/publications/reports/blindspot/pdfs/BlindSpot.pdf>

Fire Fighter Safety and Emergency Response for Solar Power Systems: Final Report, May 2010. Prepared by The Fire Protection Research Foundation

National Electric Code Article 250: Grounding and Bonding, Article 300: Wiring Methods, Article 690 Solar PV Systems, Article 705 Interconnected Electric Power Production Sources

Historic Preservation

The Question: What are the appropriate standards when land with historical or archaeological significance is developed for large-scale solar PV arrays?

Bottom Line: Parties undertaking solar PV projects with state or federal agency involvement must provide the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) with complete project information as early as possible in the planning stage, by mail to the MHC's office (see Resources). Parties should also contact local planning, historical or historic district commissions to learn about any required local approvals. Municipalities should also take the presence of historic resources into account when establishing zoning regulations for solar energy facilities in order to avoid or minimize impacts.

More Information: Land being evaluated for the siting of large-scale solar PV has historical or archaeological significance including properties listed in the National or State Registers of Historic Places and/or the Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth.

Federal and state laws require that any new construction, demolition or rehabilitation projects (including new construction of solar PV) that propose to use funding, licenses or permits from federal or state government agencies must be reviewed by the MHC so that feasible alternatives are developed and implemented to avoid or mitigate any adverse effects to historic and archaeological properties. Projects receiving federal funding, licenses or permits are reviewed by the involved federal agency in consultation with the MHC and other parties in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470f) and the implementing regulations (36 CFR 800) in order to reach agreement to resolve any adverse effects. Projects receiving state funding, licenses or permits must notify the MHC in compliance with M.G.L. c. 9, ss. 26-27C and the implementing regulations 950 CMR 71. If the MHC determines that the project will have an adverse effect, the involved state agency, the project proponent, the local historical preservation agencies, and other interested parties consult to reach an agreement that outlines measures to be implemented to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects. For projects with both federal and state agency involvement, the Section 106 process is used.

Some communities have local preservation ordinances or established local historic districts that require local approval for new construction visible from a public way. Local historic district commissions have adopted design guidelines for new construction within their historic districts and historic neighborhoods. However, these guidelines must account for Chapter 40C Section 7 of the General Laws, which requires a historic district commission to consider the policy of the Commonwealth to encourage the use of solar energy systems and to protect solar access.

Resources:

Federal Agency Assisted Projects:

Section 106 review information and the federal regulations 36 CFR 800 are available at the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) web site: www.achp.gov. Check with the involved federal agency for how they propose to initiate the MHC notification required by 36 CFR 800.3.

State Agency Assisted Projects:

Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 9, sections 26-27C

MHC Regulations 950 CMR 71 (available from the State House Bookstore)

MHC Review & Compliance FAQs <http://www.sec.state.ma.us/mhc/mhcrevcom/revcomidx.htm>

MHC Project Notification Form (PNF) & Guidance for Completing the PNF and required attachments (USGS locus map, project plans, current photographs keyed to the plan). Mail or deliver the complete project information to the MHC's office: <http://www.sec.state.ma.us/mhc/mhcform/formidx.htm>

General Guidance about Designing Solar PV Projects on Historic Buildings and in Historic Areas:
<http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy11osti/51297.pdf>

Noise

Question: Do the inverters, transformers or other equipment used as part of ground-mounted solar PV create noise that will impact the surrounding neighborhood?

Bottom Line: Ground-mounted solar PV array inverters and transformers make a humming noise during daytime, when the array generates electricity. At 50 to 150 feet from the boundary of the arrays, any sound from the inverters is inaudible. Parties that are planning and designing ground-mounted solar PV should explore options to minimize noise impacts to surrounding areas. This could include conducting pre-construction sound studies, evaluating where to place transformers, and undertaking appropriate noise mitigation measures.

More Information: Most typically, the source of noise associated with ground-mounted solar PV comes from inverters and transformers. There also may be some minimal noise from switching gear associated with power substations. The crackling or hissing sound caused by high-voltage transmission lines (the “Corona Effect”) is not a concern in the case of solar PV, which uses lower voltage lines.

Parties siting ground-mounted solar PV projects should consult equipment manufacturers to obtain information about sound that can be expected from electrical equipment, since this can vary. For example, according to manufacturer’s information, a SatCon Powergate Plus 1 MW Commercial Solar PV Inverter has an unshielded noise rating of 65 decibels (dBA) at five feet. This is approximately the sound equivalent of having a normal conversation with someone three feet away. Another source of information is the National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA) standards, which will provide maximum sound levels from various equipment arrays. From NEMA, a large dry-type transformer (2001-3333 kVA) that is forced air cooled and ventilated has an average sound level of 71 dBA, which is approximately the sound level one would expect from a vacuum cleaner at ten feet. There may be several such units on a substantially sized PV site, which would increase the sound level to some degree.

Sound impacts from electrical equipment can be modeled to the property line or nearest sensitive receptor (residence). Sound impacts can be mitigated with the use of enclosures, shielding and careful placement of the sound-generating equipment on-site. The rule of thumb for siting noise-generating equipment is that the sound impact can be reduced by half by doubling the distance to the receptor.

In some areas both in the US and Canada, sound impact analysis is required as part of the permitting process for large PV systems. For example, in the Province of Ontario, Canada, any project greater than 12 MW is required to perform a sound impact analysis (Ontario 359/09). California also requires a sound impact analysis for large PV projects. Massachusetts currently has no such requirement, but the reader should note that ground-mounted systems in Massachusetts very rarely go over 6 MW, which is half the size of the 12 MW that triggers a sound analysis in Ontario.

A recent study measured noise levels at set distances from the inverters and from the outer boundary of three ground-mounted PV arrays in Massachusetts with a capacity range of 1 to 3.5 MW. Close to the inverters (10 feet), sound levels varied from an average of 55 dBA to 65 dBA. Sound levels along the fenced boundary of the PV arrays were generally at background levels, though a faint inverter hum could be heard at some locations. Any sound from the PV array and equipment was inaudible and

sound levels were at background levels at setback distances of 50 to 150 feet from the boundary. Project developers should consult with local planning and zoning officials to determine if local noise ordinances may be applicable. Many local noise ordinances establish absolute limits on project impact noise (such as a 40 dBA nighttime limit). In these communities, a noise impact assessment may be required.

Resources:

NEMA Standards Publication No. TR=1-1993(R2000), *Transformers, Regulators and Reactors*

Noise Assessment: Borrego 1 Solar Project, MUP 3300-10-26 Prepared by Ldn Consulting, Inc, Fallbrook, CA. January 14, 2011

Ontario Regulation 359/09 Renewable Energy Approval (REA) Regulation, Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Canada <http://www.ontario.ca/environment-and-energy/renewable-energy-approvals>

Tech Environmental, Study of Acoustic and EMF levels from Solar Photovoltaic Projects, Prepared for the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center, December 2012,
http://images.masscec.com/uploads/attachments/Create%20Basic%20page/Study_of_Acoustic_and_E_MF_Levels_from_Solar_Photovoltaic_Projects.pdf

Water-Related Impacts

Question: Can chemicals that might be contained in solar PV threaten public drinking water systems? Will flooding occur in cases where trees must be removed in order to install the solar arrays? How do we ensure that wetland resources are protected?

Bottom Line: Rules are in place to ensure that ground-mounted solar arrays are installed in a ways that protect public water supplies, wetlands, and other water resource areas. All solar panels are contained in a solid matrix, are insoluble and are enclosed. Therefore, releases are not a concern.

More Information: Because trees offer multiple water management, cooling and climate benefits, clear-cutting of trees for the installation of ground-mounted solar PV is discouraged. For projects that do propose to alter trees, the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) has thresholds for the proposed alteration of a certain number of acres of land, the size of electrical facilities, and other criteria that trigger state review of proposed projects. Clear cutting of trees and other aspects of proposed projects would be reviewed through an Environmental Notification Form/Environmental Impact Statement if thresholds are triggered. More information is available at:

MassDEP has determined that the installation of solar arrays can be compatible with the operation and protection of public drinking water systems. This includes the installation of solar arrays within the Zone I, which is a 400-foot protective radius around a public ground water well. Solar projects proposed on lands owned by public water systems outside the Zone I may be approved subject to standard best management practices, such as the proper labeling, storage, use, and disposal of products. MassDEP has a guidance/review process in place to ensure that the installation of ground-mounted solar PV in these areas protects public water supplies.

Installing solar arrays on undeveloped land can preserve the permeable nature of the land surface provided the project design minimizes disturbance to natural vegetative cover, avoids concentrated runoff, and precipitation is otherwise recharged into the ground to the greatest extent practicable. Storm water flow, as well as information about site-specific soils and slope, is taken into account during the design and installation of solar arrays.

MassDEP discourages installation of ground-mounted solar PV systems in wetland areas, including riverfront locations. Solar projects within wetland areas are unlikely to comply with the performance standards in the Wetlands Protection Act regulations. If a solar installation is proposed in a wetland, a riverfront area, a floodplain, or within 100 feet of certain wetlands, the project proponent must file a notice of intent (or application to work in wetland areas) with the local Conservation Commission, which administers the Wetlands Protection Act at the municipal level. Copies should also go to MassDEP. Solar installations may be sited near, but outside of wetlands, in a manner that protects the functions of wetlands and that minimizes impacts from associated activities such as access and maintenance. Ancillary structures related to construction of a solar installation or transmission of power may be permitted to cross rivers and streams using best design and management practices.

Resources:

More information about the Wetlands Protection Act requirements may be found in the implementing regulations at 310 CMR 10.00: <http://www.mass.gov/eea/agencies/massdep/water/regulations/310-cmr-10-00-wetlands-protection-act-regulations.html>

MassDEP Guidance for Siting Wind and Solar in Public Water Supply Land:
<http://www.mass.gov/eea/agencies/massdep/water/regulations/wind-and-solar-energy-project-on-public-water-supply-land.html>

MassDEP Chapter 91 Guidance for Renewable Energy Projects:
<http://www.mass.gov/eea/agencies/massdep/water/reports/chapter-91-licensing-and-renewable-energy.html>

Glare

Question: How important is reflectivity and potential visual impacts from solar projects, especially near airports?

Bottom Line: Solar panels are designed to reflect only about 2 percent of incoming light, so issues with glare from PV panels are rare. Pre-construction modeling can ensure that the placement of solar panels prevents glare.

More Information: Solar panels are designed to absorb solar energy and convert it into electricity. Most are designed with anti-reflective glass front surfaces to capture and retain as much of the solar spectrum as possible. Solar module glass has less reflectivity than water or window glass. Typical panels are designed to reflect only about 2 percent of incoming sunlight. Reflected light from solar panels will have a significantly lower intensity than glare from direct sunlight.

An analysis of a proposed 25-degree fixed-tilt flat-plate polycrystalline PV system located outside of Las Vegas, Nevada showed that the potential for hazardous glare from flat-plate PV systems is similar to that of smooth water and not expected to be a hazard to air navigation.

Many projects throughout the US and the world have been installed near airports with no impact on flight operations. United Kingdom and U.S. aircraft accident databases contain no cases of accidents in which glare caused by a solar energy facility was cited as a factor.

When siting solar PV arrays pre-construction modeling can ensure the panels are placed in a way that minimizes any potential glare to surrounding areas.

Resources:

Technical Guidance for Evaluating Selected Solar Technologies on Airports, Federal Aviation Administration, November 2010 (currently under review),
http://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/policy_guidance/media/airport_solar_guide.pdf

A Study of the Hazardous Glare Potential to Aviators from Utility-Scale Flat-Plate Photovoltaic Systems, Black & Veatch Corporation, August 2011, <http://www.isrn.com/journals/re/2011/651857/>

Solar Photovoltaic Energy Facilities, Assessment of Potential Impact on Aviation, Spaven Consulting, January 2011: <http://www.solarchoice.net.au/blog/solar-panels-near-airports-glare-issue/>

Endangered Species and Natural Heritage

Question: Who ensures that rare animal and plant species and their habitats are not displaced or destroyed during the construction of ground-mounted solar PV?

Bottom Line: Rules are in place to ensure that the installation of ground-mounted solar arrays protects state-listed rare species and animals and plants. Project proponents can check with the local Conservation Commission to determine if the footprint of the solar PV project lies within a rare species habitat.

More Information: The Massachusetts Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) was created under the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act (MESA) and is responsible for protecting rare animal and plant species and their habitats from being displaced or destroyed. Specifically, NHESP reviews projects proposed for:

- **Priority Habitats:** These are areas known to be populated by state-listed rare species of animals or plants. Any project that could result in the alteration of more than two acres of Priority Habitat is subject to NHESP regulatory review. Projects will need to file a MESA Information Request Form, along with a project plan, a U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographical map of the site, and a \$50 processing fee. NHESP will let project administrators know within 30 days if the filing is complete, then will determine within the next 60 days whether the project, as proposed, would result in a “take” of state-listed rare species that might require the project to redesign, scale down, or abandon its plan.
- **Estimated Habitats:** These are a sub-set of Priority Habitats that are based on the geographical range of state-listed rare wildlife – particularly animals that live in and around wetlands. If the project is proposed for one of these areas and the local Conservation Commission requires filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) under the Wetlands Protection Act, the project will need to submit copies of the NOI, project plans and a U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographical map to NHESP. Within 30 days of receiving this information, NHESP will send its comments to the Conservation Commission, with copies to the project administrator, project consultants, and the Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP).

Resources:

To learn more about the NHESP review process and download a MESA Information Request Form, visit: <http://www.mass.gov/eea/agencies/dfg/dfw/natural-heritage/regulatory-review/mass-endangered-species-act-mesa/>

For list of rare animal and plant species in Massachusetts, visit: <http://www.mass.gov/eea/agencies/dfg/dfw/natural-heritage/species-information-and-conservation/mesa-list/list-of-rare-species-in-massachusetts.html>



Glare

Question: How important is reflectivity and potential visual impacts from solar projects, especially near airports?

Bottom Line: Solar panels are designed to reflect only about 2 percent of incoming light, so issues with glare from PV panels are rare. Pre-construction modeling can ensure that the placement of solar panels prevents glare.

More Information: Solar panels are designed to absorb solar energy and convert it into electricity. Most are designed with anti-reflective glass front surfaces to capture and retain as much of the solar spectrum as possible. Solar module glass has less reflectivity than water or window glass. Typical panels are designed to reflect only about 2 percent of incoming sunlight. Reflected light from solar panels will have a significantly lower intensity than glare from direct sunlight.

An analysis of a proposed 25-degree fixed-tilt flat-plate polycrystalline PV system located outside of Las Vegas, Nevada showed that the potential for hazardous glare from flat-plate PV systems is similar to that of smooth water and not expected to be a hazard to air navigation.

Many projects throughout the US and the world have been installed near airports with no impact on flight operations. United Kingdom and U.S. aircraft accident databases contain no cases of accidents in which glare caused by a solar energy facility was cited as a factor.

When siting solar PV arrays pre-construction modeling can ensure the panels are placed in a way that minimizes any potential glare to surrounding areas.

Resources:

Technical Guidance for Evaluating Selected Solar Technologies on Airports, Federal Aviation Administration, November 2010 (currently under review),
http://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/policy_guidance/media/airport_solar_guide.pdf

A Study of the Hazardous Glare Potential to Aviators from Utility-Scale Flat-Plate Photovoltaic Systems, Black & Veatch Corporation, August 2011, <http://www.isrn.com/journals/re/2011/651857/>

Solar Photovoltaic Energy Facilities, Assessment of Potential Impact on Aviation, Spaven Consulting, January 2011: <http://www.solarchoice.net.au/blog/solar-panels-near-airports-glare-issue/>