

From: [Abby Swygard](#)
To: [PLN-Planner on Duty](#)
Subject: No to Industrial Utility-Scale Solar Facilities!
Date: Sunday, February 20, 2022 9:15:34 PM

You don't often get email from acswygard@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

*****This message came from outside of Johnson County Government - please use caution when opening attachments or links.*****

Dear Commissioners,

As a very happy resident of Olathe, I ask you to vote against allowing any Utility-Scale Solar facilities to be built in Johnson and Douglas Counties. It will destroy farmland, historical landmarks, and property values. It will negatively impact the health of our citizens. And it will not bring the jobs we want to the area; rather, it will destroy hard-working Kansans' jobs--our farmers in particular.

Please vote to strengthen our bylaws to prevent such degradation to our communities.

Sincerely,
Abby Swygard
2129 E. 152nd Ter.
Olathe, KS 66062

From: [Meyers, Jeff, BOC](#)
To: [PLN-Planner on Duty](#)
Subject: FW: Solar for Electricity
Date: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 12:23:50 PM

From: Chambers, Erin, CMO <Erin.Chambers@jocogov.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 6:23:47 PM (UTC) Coordinated Universal Time
To: BOCC-Commissioners <BOCC-Commissioners@jocogov.org>
Subject: FW: Solar for Electricity

Good Afternoon,
Please see comments below.
1605 W Maple Street
Nevada Mo 64772
DISTRICT- Not a current resident

From: Marvin Knoche <mlknoche1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 21, 2022 8:43 AM
To: BOCC-Clerk <BOCC-Clerk@jocogov.org>
Subject: Solar for Electricity

Some people who received this message don't often get email from mlknoche1@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

*****This message came from outside of Johnson County Government - please use caution when opening attachments or links.*****

Feb 21, 2021

Hello, Johnson County Board of Commissioners,

Thank you for your time. I am writing to you about the mission statement for Johnson County Kansas. Johnson County claims to be a leader and a forward looking county in making the United States great. This pertains to schools, most populated county in Kansas, excellent public service, where people want to be, to live and to work. This also requires economic development.

The West Gardner Solar project incorporates all these values. For people to want to be, live, and work here, it must be reasonable and economical. This is measured by jobs, growth and fair living costs. If this county plans on continued growth, it will require new business and more electricity. Part of growth will be the demand for utilities infrastructure. The demand and need for electricity will continue to increase to support our lifestyle. This in itself is reason for the solar farm.

Who wants to have no heat in the winter? Who wants to have no A/C in the summer from blackouts or restricted power consumption? How will you be able to cook your food? Fuel your vehicles? Can you name 2 actions that do not require electricity?

Every new development will evolve with time. Solar has changed over the last 30 years. Solar panels have improved so much that the expected life of panels in a solar farm will last over 30 years. Thus, the permit term should be at least 25 years. The materials used in these panels are now 90 percent recyclable. There is no need for these panels to be higher than 6 feet off the ground, incur intense pile driving, or have water runoff cause soil erosion.

Farmers and land owners alike should have the opportunity to earn money off their land as they see fit.

Marvin Knoche

From: [Allenbrand, Shirley, BOC](#)
To: [PLN-Planner on Duty](#)
Subject: FW: Anti-Solar Bias and Misinformation from Johnson County Commissioner O'Hara
Date: Tuesday, February 22, 2022 11:27:18 PM

From: Steven Clark <clarkville80@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 5:26:51 AM (UTC) Coordinated Universal Time
To: Eilert, Ed, BOC <Ed.Eilert@jocogov.org>; Allenbrand, Shirley, BOC <Shirley.Allenbrand@jocogov.org>; Hanzlick, Janee, BOC <Janee.Hanzlick@jocogov.org>; Fast, Becky, BOC <Becky.Fast@jocogov.org>; BOCC-Clerk <BOCC-Clerk@jocogov.org>; Meyers, Jeff, BOC <Jeff.Meyers@jocogov.org>; Ashcraft, Michael, BOC <Michael.Ashcraft@jocogov.org>; O'Hara, Charlotte, BOC <Charlotte.OHara@jocogov.org>; Trent, Peg, LGL <Peg.Trent@jocogov.org>; Ford, Robert, LGL <Robert.Ford@jocogov.org>
Subject: Anti-Solar Bias and Misinformation from Johnson County Commissioner O'Hara

*****This message came from outside of Johnson County Government - please use caution when opening attachments or links.*****

Honorable Johnson County BOCC Members and Johnson County Attorneys,

I am writing you again about egregious public statements by one of your Johnson County BOCC colleagues, Commissioner Charlotte O'Hara, with regard to the pending consideration of solar zoning regulations. Commissioner O'Hara is quoted multiple times in the following Kansas City Business Journal article, and she clearly states she is unabashedly opposed to solar farms in Johnson County. Her factual statements are incorrect, and her statements, in total, indicate she can not fairly consider solar zoning regulations. She has a closed mind and will not consider verifiable positive information about solar farms. I can only request, to be fair, she be forced to recuse herself from the solar zoning regulation hearings, Committee of the Whole meetings, and certainly from voting on solar zoning regulations.

<https://www.bizjournals.com/kansascity/news/2022/02/11/nextera-energy-solar-farm-johnson-county-kansas.html>

Here are statements attributed to Commissioner O'Hara from this article.

"Johnson County Commissioner Charlotte O'Hara said her main concerns with the NextEra proposal are bringing heavy industrial use to rural areas of the county and how much tax the project actually will pay. Although NextEra estimated that the project would generate tens of millions of dollars in taxes in its lifespan, breaks on purchases of business equipment could mean payments don't begin for 10 years.

"The only thing green about green energy are the dollars being chased by investors," O'Hara said. "This is very atypical to be putting solar farms in an urban area."

Let's break down her statements:

"bringing heavy industrial use to rural areas of the county". Apparently, Commissioner O'Hara believes that a solar farm is "heavy industrial use". If she had ever toured an actual solar farm in the Midwest or Texas, or if she ever listened to testimony provided to the Planning Commission,

she would know that solar equipment makes minimal noise, is low profile, uses no water and produces no wastewater, has no smokestack and no air emissions or smells. It has minimal traffic and virtually no nighttime lighting. What does Commissioner O'Hara consider to be heavy industrial use? Her statement is a deliberate mischaracterization designed to misinform nearby residents and to engage them in public opposition to solar.

"how much tax the project actually will pay". "breaks on purchases of business equipment could mean payments don't begin for 10 years" Commissioner O'Hara is deliberately misleading with her constant references to the Kansas 10 year property tax exemption regulation, which applies to a host of other facilities that the Commissioner does not oppose (e.g. warehouses in Edgerton). A solar farm would pay extensive property taxes after year 10 for another 20 years or more, and it's owner would very likely pay for all county costs associated with the permitting, permit compliance, emergency response training and equipment, and payments in lieu of taxes that would be negotiated with solar farm developers. A solar farm would have a very significant positive economic impact which others have estimated for the BOCC.

"The only thing green about green energy are the dollars being chased by investors". Apparently, Commissioner O'Hara doesn't understand that, in our capitalist economic system, all investors are motivated by a return on investment. She has consistently stated her strong dislike for the federal tax credits that are provided for qualifying solar installations, which are actually set to decline over time. Is she willing to consider the federal tax incentives and regulations that support the oil, gas, and coal industries, which are much larger? Or is it only "green" incentives she despises? And regarding her claim that solar farms are not "green", if anyone was to impartially compare the environmental damage from the coal fired power plants she prefers vs. solar farms, the very clear conclusion is that coal fired plants' impacts dwarf solar farms. If Commissioner O'Hara can point out any valid way in which solar farms are not green, then there could be a discussion about appropriate mitigation measures and regulations. These recent statements along with her past statements prove that she is not interested in having this discussion.

"This is very atypical to be putting solar farms in an urban area." Commissioner O'Hara must have misspoken when she said this. Her previous quote said it was wrong to "bring heavy industrial use to rural areas of the county" and now she's quoted as saying developers are proposing "in an urban area"? You know that solar farms are only being proposed in very rural areas of the county where residential development isn't a realistic possibility for decades. They are also only proposed to be located where the current rural landowners willingly enter land lease agreements. Commissioner O'Hara wants to prevent these land owners from participating in solar farm leases, thereby increasing their modest agricultural income.

Commissioner O'Hara, by her own statements in this article and in several other instances which I've previously informed you, has made it very clear she will never fairly consider zoning regulations for solar farms. She obviously has a closed mind that will not consider factual evidence provided in your upcoming hearing and public meetings. She also has a demonstrated political axe to grind against solar farms. It would be like trusting a radical vegetarian and PETA member to license a new BBQ restaurant; it wouldn't happen.

I trust that you will seriously consider this matter and take appropriate actions including forcing Commissioner O'Hara to recuse herself from any meeting where solar zoning regulations are considered.

Thank you for your public service to Johnson County.

Steven M. Clark

916-705-3232
3422 Kensington Court
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

p.s. As I have previously done, I want you to know that my in-laws have signed a solar land lease agreement for their property in Johnson County. I am also a registered professional engineer with 42 years of power engineering and construction experience, including coal, gas, nuclear, and solar power generation. From personal experience permitting and designing/building dozens of solar farms across the country, I've never experienced the type of solar misinformation being put forth in Johnson County, my home county, with a highly educated population that's open to technical innovation. As I've also previously stated, you may chose not to believe me, but please check with independent power engineering and construction firms in your own county, such as Black & Veatch and Kiewit. The JOCO Planning Commission did NOT take this step; however, the Douglas County Planning Commission has, and their proposed zoning regulations are more rationale and their meetings have been orderly and fact based.

From: [Meyers, Jeff, BOC](#)
To: [PLN-Planner on Duty](#)
Subject: FW: Johnson County resident comment for the Commission supporting utility scale solar farms
Date: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 2:55:10 PM

From: Jerry Rees (reesveenstra@aol.com) Sent You a Personal Message <kwautomail@phone2action.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 8:55:06 PM (UTC) Coordinated Universal Time
To: Meyers, Jeff, BOC
Subject: Johnson County resident comment for the Commission supporting utility scale solar farms

This message came from outside of Johnson County Government - please use caution when opening attachments or links.

Dear Mr. Jeff Meyers,

As a Johnson County resident and Sierra Club supporter, I support changing the following proposed regulations so that Kansans can enjoy the benefits of renewable energy development. Johnson County Commissioners should remove the onerous and arbitrary limits on maximum project areas, distance from cities, and conditional use permits from the proposed planning commission amendments to the Rural Comprehensive Plan and Johnson County Zoning and Subdivision Regulations. We don't want over regulation of landowners in Johnson County. The county should not dictate arbitrary limits on solar that may impact return on investment or market development of critical energy transformation in the county. The county should respect landowners rights? to enter into agreements and responsibly manage their land to support renewable energy.

Our commissioners should not be discouraging healthy, economic benefits to our county with permit, size and setback limitations. Instead of adding unnecessary barriers to Johnson County's economics and energy development, work with renewable energy companies to help those Kansans struggling most from the pandemic to enjoy the benefits of renewable energy development. The emphasis should be on quality of each project, regardless of its size.

Please do not hold Johnson County back from reducing our greenhouse gas emissions in keeping with the Climate Action Plan. Kansans don't want to be forced into using expensive and unreliable coal and fracked gas. In order to lower electric prices and meet health and climate targets, county commissioners need to facilitate large-scale solar in the state (bringing jobs and increased tax base to Kansas counties that sorely need the investment).

Sincerely,

Mr. Jerry Rees
2016 W 92nd St
Leawood, KS 66206
reesveenstra@aol.com
(913) 568-4250

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Lillian Miller at Sierra Club at core.help@sierraclub.org or (415) 977-5500.

From: [Fast, Becky, BOC](#)
To: [PLN-Planner on Duty](#)
Subject: FW: Refuting the claim that solar panels will leach toxic waste and may contaminate groundwater
Date: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 1:28:30 AM

From: stanleeknoche <stanleeknoche@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 1:28:21 AM (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)
To: boccc@jocogov.org <boccc@jocogov.org>; Hanzlick, Janee, BOC <Janee.Hanzlick@jocogov.org>; Allenbrand, Shirley, BOC <Shirley.Allenbrand@jocogov.org>; Fast, Becky, BOC <Becky.Fast@jocogov.org>; Eilert, Ed, BOC <Ed.Eilert@jocogov.org>; Meyers, Jeff, BOC <Jeff.Meyers@jocogov.org>
Subject: Refuting the claim that solar panels will leach toxic waste and may contaminate groundwater

Some people who received this message don't often get email from stanleeknoche@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

*****This message came from outside of Johnson County Government - please use caution when opening attachments or links.*****

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S® 6, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

Dear Johnson County Board of County Commissioners,

I am writing in support of fair and reasonable zoning regulation for solar farms in Johnson County. I believe the regulations should be based on the facts of how solar farms and equipment are designed, built, and operated. Not on the many false claims that solar opponents have continued to make. If you look into solar opponents claims, you will easily see they do not come from credible sources or they have twisted truthful information to a totally wrong conclusion. By comparison, I will provide you with links to credible information about solar farms and equipment, by which you can fairly judge the truth about solar.

One of solar opponent's big claims is that solar panels are made with lots of toxic chemicals which are bound to contaminate the soil and groundwater around a solar farm, and that solar panels will eventually be dumped into ordinary landfills and cause soil and groundwater pollution there. In our County, several residents who might have a solar farm near them have used this false claim to object to any solar farms being permitted anywhere in the County.

1. First, I'd like to point out that the draft solar zoning regulations already include appropriate requirements for disposal and recycling at the "end of life" for solar panels. The Draft Solar Zoning Regulations dated Dec. 14, 2021, Page 40, Item g states the following.

"Disposal and Recycling of Materials: Unless specifically indicated in the approved Decommissioning and Reclamation Plan, all US Solar Facility materials and equipment, including but not limited to PV panels, inverters and batteries, shall be removed from the Project Area. Disposal and recycling of such materials and equipment shall fully comply with all applicable county, state and federal laws, regulations and code requirements, which includes a county-approved demolition permit to a licensed contractor and an approved location for disposal of such materials and equipment."

Therefore, all solar farm material is already required to be disposed and recycled in full compliance with all applicable laws. When a JOCO solar farm closes in 30 years or more, those disposal and recycling laws will be more stringent than today, so I don't think there's a concern. As an example, Kansas could adopt requirements for solar module disposal and recycling as California has already done, which is based on extensive experience. See: <https://dtsc.ca.gov/solar-panel-faqs/#easy-faq-363955>

2. Solar panels are built in a very rugged way to last 25 to 30 years or longer, and must pass many stringent tests, including a hail strike test and wind tunnel tests, to be certified for sale in the U.S. Most of the weight of solar panels is glass, aluminum frame, and silicon wafers. The actual amount of toxic chemicals used in a solar panel is small and all of it is fully encapsulated and sealed so that it's not exposed to the environment. No rain water comes into contact with any of these chemicals, unless a solar module should become broken, which is rare. And if a module should become broken, the plant's control system has a performance monitor that will alert the plant operator to a broken solar panel. The plant operator has an incentive to replace all broken modules quickly to maintain plant output. Zoning regulations could require the plant owner/operator to pick up and properly dispose of any PV panels that break, for whatever reason, during plant operation. Additional comfort comes from solar module manufacturers warranties that provide a minimum 10 year product warranty and a minimum 85% power output warranty for 25 years. This means that the manufacturers are very confident all modules will not "break" and expose the inner chemicals to rain or air for 25 years or longer. See the following references.

<https://www.cleanenergyreviews.info/blog/solar-pv-cell-construction>

See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4T6VbzC889k> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hR0dHI58zwE> for videos that demonstrate solar panels' ability to withstand impacts without shattering.

A 12-gauge shotgun shell contains ~1 ounce of lead (<https://www.fws.gov/uploadedFiles/FAQsfortheweb.pdf>). The average solar panel has ~12 grams, or $\frac{1}{2}$ an ounce, of lead, mostly in the soldering ("Recent facts about photovoltaics in Germany," Fraunhofer Institute for Solar Energy Systems, section 22.1, available at: <https://www.ise.fraunhofer.de/content/dam/ise/en/documents/publications/studies/recent-facts-about-photovoltaics-in-germany.pdf>). As referenced below, unlike the lead in shotgun shells which are regularly distributed annually across many farm fields by hunters, the lead in solar panels is encapsulated within an airtight, waterproof, and shatter resistant envelope mounted off the ground.

3. Multiple experienced solar experts and technical papers have concluded that there is little or no chance of toxic chemicals affecting either the solar farm soil or groundwater in the area. JOCO Planning Commission's own solar zoning consultant confirmed this in his testimony at public

hearings. Here are additional quotes and references with the same conclusion.

<https://content.ces.ncsu.edu/health-and-safety-impacts-of-solar-photovoltaics>

States the following conclusion:

"The purpose of this paper is to address and alleviate concerns of public health and safety for utility-scale solar PV projects. Concerns of public health and safety were divided and discussed in the four following sections: (1) Toxicity, (2) Electromagnetic Fields, (3) Electric Shock and Arc Flash, and (4) Fire. In each of these sections, the negative health and safety impacts of utility-scale PV development were shown to be negligible, while the public health and safety benefits of installing these facilities are significant and far outweigh any negative impacts."

<https://carolinasceba.com/carolinas-ceba-solar-decommissioning-fact-sheet/> Includes the following conclusions.

"Yes, it is possible to recycle most solar panels."

"By weight, most solar panels are around 80 percent glass and aluminum which are easy components to recycle at general-purpose recycling centers. Solar panels also contain at least one rare or precious metal which may be recycled at the end of its useful life. Metal racking, framing, copper wire, and other equipment may offer scrap value that can offset decommissioning costs. A study by the International Renewable Energy Agency has estimated that \$15 billion worth of raw materials may be recovered by 2050 when the first installed solar panels reach end-of-life."

"No, solar energy is not a type of hazardous waste for disposal."

4. As more solar PV projects have increased, recycling efforts and programs have already begun and will further develop in the future. The EPA is very aware of issues regarding solar module recycling and has already developed programs. Recycling businesses are in operation and many technical studies have been completed. See attached for applicable references.

<https://www.epa.gov/hw/solar-panel-recycling>

[What It Takes To Realize a Circular Economy for Solar Photovoltaic System Materials](#)

5. The volume of waste and toxic waste, in particular, is tiny in comparison to the wastes generated by coal-fired plants such as Evergy's LaCygne Power Plant, which currently supplies much of Evergy's electricity for Johnson County. In one day, the total air emissions and solid waste production from the LaCygne Power Plant is hundreds of times more quantity than the life time of waste from a 150 MW solar PV power plant which could fit on a 1,000 acre site. Air emissions from coal fired plants contain very significant quantities of greenhouse gas CO₂, plus large amounts of nitrous oxides, sulfur oxides, particulates, and mercury. Ash produced from coal fired power plants is a toxic waste, per the EPA and there is no known method to recycle it. It must be permanently stored in a landfill or ash pond at the coal fired plant and risks polluting surface and groundwater. Per the EPA "Coal ash contains contaminants like mercury, cadmium and arsenic. Without proper management, these contaminants can pollute waterways, ground water, drinking water, and the air. The need for federal action to help ensure protective coal ash disposal was highlighted by large spills near Kingston, TN and Eden, NC which caused widespread environmental and economic damage to nearby waterways and properties." <https://www.epa.gov/coalash/coal-ash-basics#05>

<https://www.psr.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/coal-ash-hazardous-to-human-health.pdf>
<https://www.cnn.com/2022/01/11/politics/biden-epa-coal-ash-ponds-enforcement-climate/index.html>

I trust that you will consider this convincing evidence that solar panels do not have the risks that solar opponents are claiming, based on their biased and unreliable information sources.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stan Knoche
8708 west 82nd st
Overland Park Ks 66204

From: [Allenbrand, Shirley, BOC](#)
To: [PLN-Planner on Duty](#)
Subject: FW: Sierra Club 1-page version of Frequently Asked Questions on Solar
Date: Thursday, February 24, 2022 1:39:38 PM
Attachments: [1 page solar FAQ.pdf](#)

From: Zack Pistora <zackpistora@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 24, 2022 7:38:50 PM (UTC) Coordinated Universal Time
To: Allenbrand, Shirley, BOC <Shirley.Allenbrand@jocogov.org>
Subject: Sierra Club 1-page version of Frequently Asked Questions on Solar

You don't often get email from zackpistora@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

*****This message came from outside of Johnson County Government - please use caution when opening attachments or links.*****

Hi Commissioner Allenbrand,

Here is the 1-page 'Frequently Asked Questions' on Solar that may be beneficial. I'd be curious to hear if this is at all helpful.

We will also send a more specific followup of our position on the detailed regulations after we listen to the Solar Work Session today.

Sincerely,
Zack

Zack Pistora
Kansas Sierra Club
785-865-6503
zackpistora@gmail.com

Utility Scale Solar - Why is Solar Energy Good for Kansas?

Matches peak demand: Solar energy provides a valuable renewable resource that can help provide energy during peak consumer demand in the middle of the day when buildings need cooling.

Better than coal: Solar energy is cheaper and cleaner than coal. Utility-scale solar will let us retire dirty coal plants which pollute over-burdened communities and consume scarce water.

Economic opportunity: Solar farms could bring huge economic investment into the state and create good-paying local jobs.

Why does the site size matter? Every megawatt (MW) of solar capacity needs 5-6 acres of land to house necessary equipment and achieve economies of scale. A 1000-acre size limit with a two-mile buffer zone could prevent solar investment.

Why put solar panels on the ground rather than rooftops? While rooftop solar development is positive, utility-scale solar projects use ground systems to achieve greater contiguous space and ease the process of acquiring development rights from property owners.

What about cloudy days and nighttime? Solar projects with onsite energy storage create energy even on cloudy days which is available when needed.

Who benefits from the solar energy? Everyone benefits from stable, low-cost energy tied to the electrical grid. Natural gas prices are rising and less expensive green energy can attract local business development.

How long does a solar project last? Most utility-scale solar projects are sited for 30-40 years or more. Conditional use permit should be equally long-term to satisfy the economic realities of project financing.

Are solar panels safe? Photovoltaic electricity does not generate offsite noise or harmful electromagnetic energy. It is one of the least environmentally-harmful power-generating technologies.

What happens to the solar panels at the end of its useful life? Local guidelines should make developers liable for decommissioning costs and specify how solar panels must be removed and properly disposed of, with the land returned to its initial condition or better.

Can I be forced to have solar development on my land? Local government does not seize private property for solar development. Private landowners have the right to lease their land to solar developers if they choose.

Will solar facilities compromise Kansas farmland? The biggest threat to Kansas farming is the climate crisis. Best management practices can address stormwater and erosion issues and herbicide drift and leaching concerns. Low-impact solar design can preserve topsoil and native vegetation under the array to increase water and soil retention and provide pollinator habitats.

Will solar farms hurt my property values? Solar has minimal impact on property values to neighboring properties, especially in rural areas.

Do solar farms harm wildlife? Solar farm design should incorporate safe wildlife corridors along protected streamways and in woodlands between fenced array areas. The biggest threat to wildlife is the burning of fossil fuels that accelerates the climate crisis.

What about the visual impact of solar farms - viewscape and glare?

Solar farms offer a low-profile viewscape with little vertical visual obstruction and nighttime light pollution compared to other energy systems. Modern solar panels reflect less sunlight than soil and wood shingles.

From: [O'Hara, Charlotte, BOC](#)
To: [PLN-Planner on Duty](#)
Subject: FW: Solar and Wind Energy Projects in Johnson County
Date: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 1:47:18 PM

From: Lisa Bishop <fab4fam@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 1:47:06 PM (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)
To: O'Hara, Charlotte, BOC
Subject: Solar and Wind Energy Projects in Johnson County

[You don't often get email from fab4fam@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important at <http://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>.]

This message came from outside of Johnson County Government - please use caution when opening attachments or links.

I've been seeing more and more about wind and solar projects in Johnson County and I understand that the Commission is meeting tomorrow. There is not enough space here to go into all the negatives but I would urge you and your fellow commissioners to be informed of all the pollution, including noise, the toxicity to the farmland, the expense, the unreliability, the disposal in the future, etc. of so-called "Green" energy. Vote NO on any solar or wind farm in Johnson County.

Thank you,

Lisa Bishop
fab4fam@sbcglobal.net
18786 S. Greenway St.
Olathe, KS 66062

Sent from my iPad

From: [O'Hara, Charlotte, BOC](#)
To: [PLN-Planner on Duty](#)
Subject: FW: Solar Farm.
Date: Thursday, February 24, 2022 12:49:13 PM

From: Sharmen Wright <sunflowerpianogal@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 24, 2022 12:49:08 PM (UTC-06:00) Central Time (US & Canada)
To: BOCC-Commissioners
Subject: Solar Farm.

This message came from outside of Johnson County Government - please use caution when opening attachments or links.

I implore each of you to vote to table the current solar farm situation to allow technology to advance and to continue to study this issue. The highest use of this rural area is for it to remain as it is, an agricultural area where families can live, have hobby farms, where crops can continue to be grown, and where animals and plants can flourish.

Thank you, Rob and Sharmen McCollum
15215 Edgerton Road
Gardner

Sent from my iPhone