



Linn County Renewable Energy Advisory Committees Statement Feedback

Below is a summary of public feedback submitted to Linn County regarding statements created by the four Renewable Energy Advisory Committees in early 2023. The four committees are: Good Neighbor Practices; Battery Energy Storage Systems; Balancing Agriculture and Solar; and Lifecycle Costs.

Good Neighbor Practices

Respondents displayed general support for agrivoltaics, and practices that encourage cooperation and communication between utility-scale solar applicants and non-participating landowners.

Respondents expressed concern that increased setbacks would result in reductions to monetary benefits for participating landowners, and that implementing additional requirements would slow down approval process.

Feedback in agreement

- Agrivoltaics encouraged
- Vegetative Management Plan
- Encourage cooperation between applicants and non-participating landowners
- Viewshed assessments should be specific.
- Proactively engage communities regarding strategic growth plans
- Pre-application communication plan

Feedback in disagreement

- Screening requirements may increase costs, create additional shading
- Setbacks stay as is to allow participating landowners to take full advantage of lease
- Belief that non-participating landowners will not be receptive to communication from applicants
- Screening requirements should be flexible due to varied site conditions
- Utilizing Corn Suitability Rating (CSR) and Land Evaluation Site Assessment (LESA) would be an objective measurement for subject site consideration

Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS)

There were fewer comments submitted for this topic. Feedback included mixed opinions on requiring a Conditional Use Permit for BESS installations proposed in conjunction with utility-scale solar project.

Feedback in agreement

- Confidence in Linn County Emergency Management to address any safety concerns
- General support for BESS standards because this is not in existing ordinance

Feedback in Disagreement

- Conditional Use Permit should not be required for BESS in conjunction with utility-scale project

Balancing Agriculture and Solar

Variety of comments and concerns. Support for vegetative management and agricultural impact mitigation plan, but some concern that increasing the number of plans required will create barriers to development. Mixed responses to panel height increases with concerns noting that increased panel height may also increase visibility of projects.

Concerns that the proposed wildlife corridor is too large. Concerns that an annual performance report is too onerous on applicants.

Feedback in agreement

- Vegetative Management Plan
- Agricultural Impact Mitigation Plan
- Scorecard could be a good guide
- Sheep grazing encouraged
- Increased panel height allows for more diverse prairie

Feedback in disagreement

- Panel height should not be increased
- Allowing land to “rest” for life of project is enough for land to recover
- Cut and fill limited to 12 inches would greatly impact design and limit locations. Could create stormwater runoff concerns.
- Proposed 300ft wildlife corridor is too large
- Annual report is too onerous

Lifecycle Costs

Feedback contained many “no comments.” The comments we did receive noted that costs should be evaluated throughout life of project and express desire to remove all equipment from project site after decommissioning. One comment referenced a statement regarding BESS and the time frame to return those sites to agricultural use is inaccurate.

Feedback in agreement

- Decommissioning costs should be evaluated often to address market changes
- Desire to ensure all equipment is removed from project site

Feedback in disagreement

- BESS projects would allow for agriculture within a year of full decommissioning with decompaction and soil amendments.

Center for Infrastructure & Economic Development:

Below is a summary of feedback submitted to Linn County by the Center for Infrastructure & Economic Development regarding statements created by the four Renewable Energy Advisory Committees in early 2023.

Good Neighbor Practices

- Setbacks proposed reasonable. Believe this should be measured from occupied dwellings.
- Consider how additional screening may impact solar energy production.
- Additional agrivoltaics research is needed to properly implement. Do not codify at this moment.
- Separate construction noise standards for solar projects could be seen as discriminatory. Noise standards during operation should be specific to decibel level and how it is measured.
- Communication plan should be considered, but would propose that it runs concurrently with the application process rather than pre-application in order avoid delays in applications.
- Renewable energy projects and agriculture co-exist well and allows land to return to agricultural use after decommissioning. Protect farmland from urban sprawl and other industrial uses.
- County should keep in mind that participating landowners know what is best for their property and should respect their right to use land how they see best.

Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS)

- Most BESS projects exist as part of the solar or wind facilities and should allow projects to be paired during approval process.
- BESS facility safety has improved. Concrete walls may be cost prohibitive as a requirement and standard fencing is sufficient.
- During decommissioning, restoration back to undeveloped condition should be subject to the preference of the landowner.

Balancing Agriculture and Solar

- Scorecards for solar projects create a “one size fits all” approach and may not accurately weigh merits of projects and could be seen as discriminatory.
- Additional panel height may discourage project interest and would make project more visible to neighbors.
- State and federal guidelines regarding vegetative management, agricultural impact mitigation, and wildlife/ habitat assessment and mitigation plans are appropriate and do not require additional local guidelines.
- Additional standards and reviews specific to the solar ordinance should be applied to all other industries equally.

Lifecycle Costs

- No comments

Bright Future Iowa:

Below is a summary of feedback submitted to Linn County by Bright Future Iowa regarding statements created by the four Renewable Energy Advisory Committees in early 2023.

- Approval for solar projects should be consistent with approval process for development in other industries.
- Additional studies, limitations, and restrictions may infringe on participating landowners property rights.
- Support for the existing ordinance stating that it allows for flexibility and agreements to be made through conditions of approval between the applicant and various County departments rather than a very prescriptive ordinance that creates additional barriers.

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name	Alex Delworth
Last Name	Center for Rural Affairs
Address1	1400 Fawcett Pkwy
Address2	Suite D
City	Nevada
State	Iowa
Zip	50201
Email	alexdelworth@cfra.org
Phone	7654148275

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?	<p>Including agrivoltaics within the full ordinance along with setbacks and other good neighbor practices is recommended. This can be included in the form of a thorough native vegetation management plan which is designed during the application phase. Tools for guidance, such as a pollinator scorecard can clarify standards for developing various management plans.</p> <p>We also agree that ordinances should encourage cooperation between applicants and adjacent landowners. We recommend encouraging developers to engage the public early and often, and to consider the addition of community benefit agreements, which can offer value to the broader community.</p>
What statements did you disagree with and why?	<p>We do not encourage the use of screening requirements. According to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), requiring solar energy systems to be screened from public view adds costs, can cause shading, and may prevent many installations. If there is a recommendation for screening, there should be language addressing potential shading issues on the panels.</p>
Additional Comments	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why? We agree that any plans for the establishment of a solar project, such as vegetative management and agricultural mitigation, should be submitted prior to project approval. The additional inclusion of a general project environmental scorecard can be used to best guide developers and operators towards a robust plan that meets clear expectations.

What statements did you disagree with and why? We do not recommend implementing height restrictions as they may interfere with future agrivoltaic practices with planting or grazing underneath panels. There is no compelling safety reason for this as well.

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? We agree with the beginning four final statements. It's important that ordinances include a detailed decommissioning plan that adequately lays out the expectations for site restorations, financial surety to cover costs associated with decommissioning, and the estimated cost of decommissioning including regular updates to those costs and financial surety plans. Additional language addressing the specifics to the site restoration to pre-construction standards could potentially include re-vegetation of affected areas and allowance of negotiated contracts with lessors of the land and developer.

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name	Cheryl
Last Name	Valenta
Address1	2409 C Ave NE
Address2	<i>Field not completed.</i>
City	Cedar Rapids
State	IA
Zip	52402
Email	<i>Field not completed.</i>
Phone	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?	The property set back requirement should remain at 50' so the leasing landowner can take full advantage of their lease. Otherwise it's land not being used.
What statements did you disagree with and why?	1) All the sound requirements. The only noise from the installation is temporary and will be minimal - similar to tractor volume. 2) I'm not sure why leasing landowners are expected/"encouraged" to "cooperate" with adjacent landowners. Does this happen when crops are planted and they have to agree on how their land is used? Seeing all the anger from some of the non-participating home owners, I actually think it may not be a good idea to force them to "cooperate". Is there any other ordinance that requires people to cooperate with others that have differing opinions? 3) Re: the trade-off between renewable energy and ag production, there should be so much more renewable energy if the Linn County Board of Supervisors has any intention of fulfilling their climate plan goals. The state of Iowa is 85% ag production which is excessive given our water quality issues that continue to be ignored by farmers, the ag industry and legislators. Given the fact that agriculture is a big contributor to climate change and solar energy helps offset carbon emissions, we need more solar energy in Iowa.

Additional Comments I understand trying to work with everyone who has concerns about solar installation, however the scrutiny this project has received is way above and beyond for an outcome that will not only benefit the vast majority, but it will help mitigate our climate crisis. This project is safe, will improve the health of the soil and air, and has great community benefit.

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? I'm confident in the ability of Linn County Emergency Management and the regulations set in place to handle any issues with the batteries for solar energy storage, as well as the federal safety regulations and standards.

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments I'm confident NextEra abides by the safety standards in place for battery storage. They want to be a positive addition to the community.

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why? I don't see any statements that I agree with. This group is applying standards that should be considered when the land is used for agricultural purposes. Is there ever a time when these standards are applied to companies who build on precious land and completely cover up the soil? Is the loss of precious farmland ever addressed? Usually their projects are welcomed with open arms.

What statements did you disagree with and why? I disagree with most of their findings. If only there were any of these requirements for corn and soybean row crops, Iowa's water and soil health would be better. Why should these requirements be applied to a solar panel array? All the findings for soil health of solar arrays shows a significant improvement in even a few years of "rest" without fertilizers, tilling, etc.

Additional Comments The land used by this project will some day be returned to the owners for another use, with richer soil and 30 years of compensation for the land owner for doing nothing....without any labor, fertilizers, irrigation, etc.

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
What statements did you disagree with and why?	1) How/why would a determination of decommissioning cost be made every 5 yrs? Does this same requirement apply to all businesses and industries? What is the point of this? 2) Why would this site be abandoned? It will be very profitable for Alliant Energy. This is a mute point.
Additional Comments	I hope that Linn County and the Linn Board of Supervisors moves forward with prudent policy and guidelines that align with good business practice and intelligent critical thinking, and steers clear of creating policy out of fear mongering. Solar energy is safe and desperately needed to help avert our climate crisis. Please stick to your climate action plan and do what is right for the vast majority so our kids have a chance at a future.

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name	Daniel
Last Name	McGrail
Address1	3324 Wenig Road NE
Address2	<i>Field not completed.</i>
City	Cedar Rapids
State	Iowa
Zip	52402
Email	dmcgrail@protonmail.com
Phone	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Additional Comments I recommend solar installations be approved without restrictions.

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments I recommend solar installations be approved without restrictions.

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments I recommend solar installations be approved without restrictions.

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments I recommend solar installations be approved without restrictions.

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name Darrow

Last Name Center

Address1 1078 Garfield Ave

Address2 *Field not completed.*

City	Tipton
State	Iowa
Zip	52772
Email	oakleaf7@gmail.com
Phone	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
Additional Comments	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
Additional Comments	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
Additional Comments	Please have the ordinance require the following:

The solar developer must document the intended vegetation management plan, and if that plan is to include machine mowing - then the developer must also document a cost estimate for sheep grazing by an existing sheep grazer located within Linn county or a neighboring county. A solar sheep grazing service contract is not required, but is the encouraged alternative to machine mowing.

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name David

Last Name Weiler

Address1 309 Brougham Ct

Address2 *Field not completed.*

City Robins

State IA

Zip 52328

Email david.weiler1982@gmail.com

Phone 3194313784

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? Some blocking is reasonable.

What statements did you disagree with and why? Setback - solar should not have significant setback requirements. This would be costly for the solar generator, resulting in the landowners getting less payment. The landowners should be allowed to use their land as they desire.

Additional Comments Linn County needs to move faster to capture the solar energy agreements. If we wait too long other areas will take the investments away from Linn County landowners and taxpayers.

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? Battery energy systems should be managed as any industrial site in Linn County.

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments Rules should consider using hydrogen production and storage as a viable method to store energy.

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why? Both solar energy production and agriculture are businesses. Landowners should be able to do as they feel is best for solid business.

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name Deb

Last Name Yates

Address1 2362 Young Rd

Address2 *Field not completed.*

City Palo

State Iowa

Zip 52324

Email dryfarm@netins.net

Phone 3195212302

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? I in general agree with the statements, additional considerations may still be needed depending on the concentration and total size of the near by projects.

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? Agree with their statements. BESS does not belong in the REO, on ag or CNR land and their recommendations for hazard associated with it.

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why? In general agree with statements.

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments I feel the scorecard should be based on the LESA evaluation to level requirements of other rezoning, retaining a priority of retaining prime farmland rather than giving REO and exception. Using the CSR as a starting point would make it fair to all, then items like the fewer number of non-participating landowners affected, lower population density, directly adjoining another solar field and other items considered already in LESA could offset a high CSR

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? I agree these additional items need attention.

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name Duane Arnold Solar III, LLC; Duane Arnold Solar IV, LLC

Last Name Duane Arnold Solar III, LLC; Duane Arnold Solar IV, LLC

Address1 606 First Street

Address2 *Field not completed.*

City Palo

State Iowa

Zip 52324

Email kimberly.dickey@nexteraenergy.com

Phone 3195364891

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? Statement “Current ordinance property line setbacks of 50 feet are adequate to mitigate conflict between solar and land in agricultural use” is consistent with most local utility scale solar siting regulations across the U.S.

Statement “All projects should have a consistent baseline for screening requirements. Viewshed assessments should be utilized and specifications for how the assessment is performed should be spelled out. Viewshed baseline should be determined from residences” is consistent with the intent and purpose for conducting view shed assessments. However, Linn County should continue to allow flexibility in the Applicant’s approach to screening since each project will present unique challenges therefore prescriptive requirements may not perform toward best outcomes on a case-by-case basis.

Statement “Agrivoltaic practices bring utility-scale solar projects

more in line with the rural character of the area” is consistent with current trends in local ordinances. Implementation of pollinator species at scale provides agricultural ecosystem services, and benefits surrounding agriculture. Statement “A pre-application communication plan for properties within a specific distance to the project should be required” is a requirement of the Iowa Utilities Board which requires a certified letter, a description of the proposed project, and a map of the project study area to be mailed by the Applicant to all residents within one thousand feet of the proposed project boundary.

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Statement “Current ordinance property line setbacks of 50 feet are inadequate to mitigate conflict between solar and residential uses” is inconsistent with most local utility scale solar siting regulations across the U.S. because utility scale solar is not compatible with and impermissible within residential zoning districts.

Statement “helping to mitigate the dissimilarity between residential and utility-scale solar uses” is inconsistent with most local utility scale solar siting regulations across the U.S. because utility scale solar and agricultural practices are not common and impermissible within residential zoning districts.

Statement “Sound requirements for projects should include specific numerical standards for both construction and operation noise as well as time of day. There should be a verification process for these standards spelled out in the ordinance” to be fairly applied, would limit all permitted land uses during construction and operation activities, including housing developments, as well as agricultural uses. Instead, to balance and grow alternative and renewable energy resources, Linn County should more carefully consider the number of housing developments it permits in the future within agricultural zoning districts and compatible conditionally permitted land uses therein.

Additional Comments

Field not completed.

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?

Statement “This committee would suggest requiring the inclusion of the following information along with any utility-scale

BESS application” includes items which are required documents under Sec. 107-117. - Standards for transportation and utility uses subsection (h) Utilities, utility scale solar installations, or required under current BESS conditions of approval. However, to avoid confusion, Linn County should combine and adopt applicable requirements currently under Sec. 107-117 subsection (h), and BESS conditions of approval under a new subsection within Sec. 107-117. - Standards for transportation and utility uses such as (i) Utilities, battery energy storage system installations.

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Statement “For permitting approval, we believe BESS should not be included in the Renewable Energy Overlay but rather require a separate conditional use permit even when included with solar or wind projects” and listed supportive Committee reasoning is unfounded based on technology distinction, and emergency planning alone. Hybrid systems, i.e., wind or solar paired with BESS, offer core benefits in terms of energy supply and consumption which means the renewable energy generated by wind and solar facilities are effectively distributed at peak demand times while simultaneously offering frequency regulation, transmission, and distribution support. The trend in pairing solar/wind energy with BESS is increasing and will only continue. Standalone BESS applications offer unique core benefits including peak shaving, load shifting, emergency backup, and various grid services. Therefore, we believe Linn County should continue to allow Applicants to permit hybrid systems (PV and Wind paired with BESS) and stand-alone systems under Sec. 107-149. – Renewable Energy Overlay District. As a tool, overlay zoning is designed to create special zoning over existing base zoning which identifies special provisions in addition to those in the underlying base zone. Because standalone BESS will be smaller-scale developments in contrast to utility scale solar or wind, it may be necessary to include provisions for a streamlined form of site plan review for these projects.

Additional Comments

Field not completed.

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why?

Statement “A Vegetative Management Plan should be submitted as a required document” is consistent with most local ordinances for utility scale solar across the United States.

VMPs are submitted for every NextEra Energy Resources project during local and state permitting.

Statement “A Wildlife/Habitat Assessment and Mitigation Plan should be submitted as a required document” is consistent with most ordinances for utility scale solar projects in other regions of the United States, however much less so in the Central region. The Iowa Utilities Board requires all Projects to submit a Biological Habitat Assessment which is available to the public and can be useful to develop a separate wildlife conservation plan.

Statement “A Stormwater Management Plan, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan should be submitted as a required document” are required documents under Sec. 107-117 subsection (h) and conditions of approval. However, to avoid confusion, Linn County should combine and adopt applicable requirements.

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Statement “A minimum solar panel height of thirty-two inches for the array zones should be required” is in direct conflict with adjacent non-leasing landowner sentiment and concern related to visual impacts. Increased panel heights will increase visibility of the arrays.

Statement “Changes to existing surface grades (cut and fill) should be limited to 12 inches or less to avoid unnecessary soil compaction and disruption to the existing soil profile, maintain opportunity for future agricultural productivity at current levels, and lessen the likelihood of negative impacts to offsite natural resources and properties” would greatly impact civil design measures for all development in Linn County and engineered civil designs would struggle to implement stormwater control measures such as temporary and permanent basins, thereby contributing to increased potential for flooding of sites and adjacent properties. Further, topsoil layers often exceed twelve inches. Unlike other forms of development, solar installations only grade where necessary, and natural topography is preserved as much as possible.

Statement “Primary components of the assessment should include at minimum: protection or creation of wildlife corridors including 300 feet of separation from roadways, consideration for established migration patterns, emphasis on habitat segmentation avoidance, and allowance for wildlife movement

into and through array zones via wildlife friendly perimeter fencing designs” goes too far in specifically recommending a 300 foot setback from roadways, and severely limits a plethora of land uses, and land owner’s ability to best monetize use of their land, writ large.

Statement “A fenced-off array area should be limited to a maximum of 160-acres before establishment of a wildlife corridor is required” does not consider the fact that wildlife friendly fencing allows for wildlife to move through array areas, and simultaneously creates wildlife corridors.

Statement “A Woodland Inventory, Avoidance and Mitigation Plan should be submitted as a required document” is unnecessary due to lack of tree clearing planned for these projects due to USFWS restrictions on bat habitat clearance. Most trees on project sites are not cleared due to siting avoidance. If tree clearing is required, qualified field biologists assess habitat per federal regulations. A woodland inventory is unnecessary due to our currently level of due diligence and general lack of tree clearing.

Statement “The solar applicant should be required to submit an annual project performance report regarding the effectiveness of the vegetation, habitat, agricultural impact, and stormwater management plans” seems overly burdensome to Linn County and development applicants if applied fairly to all Developers in Linn County, not just solar development.

Additional Comments

Field not completed.

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?

Field not completed.

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Statement “The BESS property will not be restored to an agricultural or critical natural resource use in the same timeline as the solar arrays. Jon Gallagher estimates it will take 30-50 years after decommissioning to return soil on a BESS property to agricultural-ready” is unfounded. There is nothing unique to a BESS facility (like a common gravel pad as base) that would render it unusable for 30-50 years. Decompaction, combined with minor grading/recontouring, and soil amendments (fertilizer, organics, etc.) would return soils to agricultural-ready within a year. Laydown yards much larger than BESS facilities are removed and returned to agricultural use all the time. Statement “Decommissioning cost estimates should include

filling the voids created from removing the pilings” is unnecessary since solar array structural design and construction involves the use of driven piles. Piles are driven during construction. Soil is not removed from the pile area when the site is constructed. Removal of the piles may result in some natural soil collapse, then standard grading and decompaction work would be sufficient to backfill the rest (to reiterate, since the piles are driven, all the original soil will still be in situ). Removal can be viewed as an aeration technique and combining this with the decompaction and tilling exercises at the end of the Project life cycle will loosen the compacted soil and help in new plant material establishment and root growth, costs which are accounted for in the decommissioning cost estimates.

Additional Comments	<i>Field not completed.</i>
---------------------	-----------------------------

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name	Elliott
------------	---------

Last Name	Meyer
-----------	-------

Address1	106 West Harrison St.
----------	-----------------------

Address2	<i>Field not completed.</i>
----------	-----------------------------

City	Edgewood
------	----------

State	IA
-------	----

Zip	52042
-----	-------

Email	<i>Field not completed.</i>
-------	-----------------------------

Phone	<i>Field not completed.</i>
-------	-----------------------------

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?	I agree that the county should proactively engage communities to routinely update strategic growth plans.
---	---

What statements did you disagree with and why?	I disagree that the setback should be placed 300 ft from the property line, not the dwelling. This will restrict development
--	--

and restrict the property rights of landowners who wish to sign up for a project. The screening requirement suggestions fail to take into consideration that landowners who sign up with projects already make an agreement with the developers regarding screening. The escalation process will undoubtedly delay the ordinance process and will be a poison pill to future development. While agrivoltaics are always a great thing in concept, raising the height of the turbines will make them more noticeable, and coming to a consensus on what should be required is another way to delay this already drawn-out process. If sound requirements are inserted into the solar ordinance, then they should be required for all types of development. Lastly, regarding requiring tradeoffs between renewables and agriculture, solar is already a great way to protect against urban sprawl. No urban development can happen on land which solar already occupies, and in 30 years the land can be returned right to where it started.

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why? I agree a disaster management plan should be submitted and I agree that the vegetative management plan should be submitted, but these two are already required by the current ordinance.

What statements did you disagree with and why? As I said above, there are numerous suggestions that are asking to hold solar development to a standard that other types of development are not held to. For example, other developments are not required to create project scorecards. I am wondering if the county will require other types of agricultural developments like hog confinements to also do this? On height, the more you raise the panels, the more visible they will be and the more cost associated with building them.

With the agricultural impact mitigation plan, will these be required for all developers? With a 300 ft separation for wildlife corridors, will this be required for all types of developments in the county? Regarding the stormwater management plan, will these be required for all types of development? If not for farms or hog buildings, why solar? With the woodland inventory section, landowners have the right to take advantage of the resources on their property as long as they are not violating federal or state environmental laws. This is a property rights issue, and if landowners wish to clear timber on their land, they have the right to do so. For project performance reports, does the county plan to require this for hog confinements or grain storage operations? This seems to be a way to continue delaying this ordinance and prevent any development from happening.

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name FIRMIN

Last Name STALLMAN

Address1 4077 GREENS GROVE ROAD

Address2 *Field not completed.*

City CENTER POINT

State IA

Zip 52213

Email *Field not completed.*

Phone *Field not completed.*

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why?

I DO NOT agree with the 300' setback. If this setback is from the parcel lines, it will not allow me to use my land how I want to.

Viewshed - I don't want to be forced to plant trees if I'm doing solar. Viewshed is subjective and I don't believe you can or should make it a standard for everyone.

Determining an escalation process - this feels like a delay tactic, and will this escalation process apply to ALL development in the county?

Sound requirements - are they really necessary? We don't have sound requirements for farming or house-building, do we? Construction of anything is temporary.

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Minimum solar panel height of 32" - this is just going to make them even more visible to those who don't 'like' them.

Limiting surface cut and fill to 12" - this limit is not necessary as each area will dictate the appropriate amounts that will adequately manage storm water.

A 300' wildlife corridor - it prioritizes wildlife above all other land uses and I might want to use my land otherwise.

Project performance reports - why for solar and not other

projects such as hog confinements?
Solar project signage - we do NOT need any more signs!
Disaster management plan - already accounted for in
emergency action plan and decommissioning plan..

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name frank

Last Name Kintzle

Address1 4851 Lakewood Dr

Address2 *Field not completed.*

City cedar rapids

State iowa

Zip 52411

Email frankkintzle@gmail.com

Phone 3193609541

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? I agree with this overall , you spent a lot of time and effort to get it a good as possible

What statements did you disagree with and why? really none

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? I agree that the Battery is not on ag/cnr and should not be part of the REO

What statements did you disagree with and why? none

Additional Comments none

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why? Overall , you done a good job

What statements did you disagree with and why? I believe think that consideration of CSR and use of LESA should be incorporated to make it fair to all rezoning

Additional Comments none

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? Overall you done a good job.

What statements did you disagree with and why? nonr

Additional Comments none

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name Judy

Last Name Vopava

Address1 1650 Koehler Dr NW

Address2 Unit 347

City Cedar Rapids

State IA

Zip 52405

Email judy-vopava@uiowa.edu

Phone *Field not completed.*

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? Verification and enforcement statement. Because I think rules should be clear and easy to follow.

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments I strongly support more renewable energy.

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name	Laura
Last Name	Myres
Address1	3372 64th Street Dr Lot 3
Address2	<i>Field not completed.</i>
City	Palo
State	Iowa
Zip	52324
Email	lsmyres1990@gmail.com
Phone	319 981 6308

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?	I believe that since all statement were agreed upon by the "bipartisan" committee they should be adopted
What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
Additional Comments	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?	I believe that since the statements were agreed upon by a "bipartisan" committee they should be adopted
What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
Additional Comments	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why?	I believe that since the statements were agreed upon by a "bipartisan" committee they should be adopted
What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? I believe that since the statements were agreed upon by a "bipartisan" committee they should be adopted

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name mike

Last Name zieser

Address1 4655 cedar ridge rd

Address2 *Field not completed.*

City center point

State iowa

Zip 52213

Email michael.zieser@ipaper.com

Phone 3198493962

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? I disagree with the setbacks from road and adjacent agricultural land and road ways. My wife and I were hoping to use the solar field as a retirement and will have all around are place . i have talked to my neighbors before sighing contract with nextera and they have no problem so i dont understand having to set back because someone else doesn't like it. I drive buy millions of acres of corn in summer and bare ground in winter and don't expect those land owners to make me happy how it looks when

i drive by. I believe nextera is going out of their way to put up alot of screening where necessary .

Additional Comments

I believe we will need all the energy we can get in the future and we should look at all forms to help fill the needs. solar seems to be very clean to me.

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?

Field not completed.

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Field not completed.

Additional Comments

Field not completed.

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why?

Field not completed.

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Field not completed.

Additional Comments

we make corn into fuel which makes no sense to me. if we get hungry we can always take down the panels and make food.

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?

Field not completed.

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Field not completed.

Additional Comments

Field not completed.

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name

Nick

Last Name

Boeyink

Address1

905 36th St. SW

Address2	<i>Field not completed.</i>
City	Bondurant
State	IA
Zip	50035
Email	nick@iowacef.org
Phone	563-260-4545

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?	I agree it is important to engage the community regularly to keep the the strategic growth plans up to date and relevant.
What statements did you disagree with and why?	<p>Changing the setbacks from dwellings to property lines would decrease the amount of land willing landowners are able to utilize for solar. This would further inhibit a landowner's right to decide how to best use their own land and infringes on property rights. Regarding screening requirements, residents are involved in the decision-making process when it comes to where to plant screening and what to plant. Regulating what a landowner must plant on their land in order to appease a non-participating landowner infringes on the landowner's property rights. By moving forward with an escalation process the county will delay updating the ordinance and therefore delay development in the county.</p> <p>By raising the height requirement of solar panels, the developer will be forced to spend more money on production than would be necessary otherwise. Additionally, this would make panels more visible to surrounding residents, which is already a complaint the opposition to solar projects has stated. Land used for solar development will be allowed to regenerate over the life of the project. This will preserve the land for future agriculture use and also protect against urban sprawl, which would take agriculture land out of commission forever. Regulating sound during construction of solar projects uniquely is wrong. If other projects such as normal farm operations, lawn care, tree clearing, etc. are not regulated, why should solar construction be limited?</p>

Additional Comments	<i>Field not completed.</i>
---------------------	-----------------------------

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? If other agriculture practices such as hog confinements, grain bins, and crop production do not require scorecards, neither should solar farms. By raising the height requirement of solar panels, the developer will be forced to spend more money on production than would be necessary otherwise. The added agricultural impact mitigation plan requirements would add additional constraints to the landowner and company. This would also reduce income for participating landowners. Regarding the 300-foot separation from wildlife corridors, applying this regulation to solar farms and not requiring the same regulation for other projects such as hog confinements, dwellings, and silos is wrong. Why should this regulation only apply to solar farms? The same goes for project performance reports. These reports are not required of other aforementioned projects, so why should they only apply to solar farms?

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name	Pam Mackey
Last Name	Taylor
Address1	2200 S 31st Street
Address2	<i>Field not completed.</i>
City	Marion
State	IA
Zip	52302
Email	pammackeytaylor@aol.com
Phone	3193662428
Good Neighbor Practices Committee	
What statements did you agree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
Additional Comments	Adjoining landowners should be informed of a project throughout the process - even before an application is filed. It is disrespectful for neighbors to find out about a project in a newspaper.
Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee	
What statements did you agree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
Additional Comments	<i>Field not completed.</i>
Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee	
What statements did you agree with any why?	The 32-inch panel height. Ideally the regulations should encourage agrivoltaics, because they are more aligned to the

rural character. The panel height of 18 inches does not allow the planting of diverse prairie species under the panels - since it will restrict the plants to shorter prairie species.

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Requiring an annual report -- I am not supportive of an annual report, but would support some kind of requirement if the applicant isn't keeping up with the vegetative requirements.

Additional Comments

It seems like there are two options for plantings under the panels and around the panels - prairie and pollinators. Non-native pollinators might be shorter in height and have some value under the panels, particularly if the 18-inch height is allowed. Prairie plantings have great value in restoring soil health, but will be taller.

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?

Field not completed.

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Field not completed.

Additional Comments

The ordinance is working just fine the way it is. Do not change it.

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name

sam

Last Name

schumacher

Address1

3819 Hagerman Rd

Address2

Field not completed.

City

Toddville

State

Iowa

Zip

52341

Email

dieselmansam@hotmail.com

Phone

3195519667

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? I do not agree with planting trees on adjacent property . This puts extra responsibility and liability on someone other than the land owner/ solar land , ie - care, maintenance , removal etc that comes with caring for trees. I also think the setback should be from the property line of the solar land.

Additional Comments After reading the minutes of the meetings, I don't think this group of the committee was very interested in their subject seems there was a lack of interest in having all of their meetings and lack of subjects and topics compared to the other groups. I also think land owners should have to live within a mile of their land that they own or on the land that is going into solar.

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments this group did a great job with their subject.

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? Using deep rooted plants. Deep rooted plants have a habit of plugging drainage tile . this is from personal experience. Imagine plugging a whole 160 acre pattern tiled site , you would have a very hard time putting that land back in production without going in and destroying existing plugged tile or even have to dig it all up and remove it , and then replace it all .

Additional Comments Most of the people that live in the areas of the solar projects and the proposed areas did not ever think that they would be in the middle of an industrial complex as when they purchased their property, it was zoned ag and residential, not commercial.

The solar panels are commercial equipment , owned by a commercial entity, produces a commercial product, sold commercially. I see no where in my last statement where this is ag or residential. Also I don't understand how they can have a one sided lease on agricultural land for longer than the Iowa statute of 20 years . I can not lease ag land for longer than 20 years according to Iowa law. It's funny how money lets government smear the peanut butter any way they want to fit their criteria.

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name Sheryl

Last Name Schumacher

Address1 3845 Hagerman Rd.

Address2 *Field not completed.*

City Toddville

State Iowa

Zip 52341

Email j-sschumacher@hotmail.com

Phone 3193610962

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? Verification and enforcement methods for utility-scale solar project requirements etc. Applicants need to know exactly what is required before they submit an application. Statement 6 I

agree with both except 6B should have specific distance of 2 miles.

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Statement 1 Setbacks should be 300 feet from property line of the leased solar property not from occupied dwellings. Statement 2 screening should be done on solar leased property. Statement 4 Grazing should not be allowed, who will care for the animals, how will they get water, what would ground be seeded with?

Additional Comments

Construction noise is going to be a problem for people who work afternoon shift and sleep later than early morning, or night shift as they usually sleep during the day.

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?

I pretty much agree with all the statements as there currently are no ordinances for BESS and BESS projects are dangerous.

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Field not completed.

Additional Comments

Field not completed.

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why?

Statement 2 Panel height should be 32" especially if planting native plant species as they are varying heights.

What statements did you disagree with and why?

Statement 1 Solar Projects should have to use LESA system. Also deep rooted native plant systems will interfere with tile lines by plugging the lines with their roots.

Additional Comments

Where is the proof that solar projects sites will be able to be farmed after decommissioning? This is not the same as ground that is in CRP. CRP has to be maintained with either controlled burns or disced and reseeded every few years.

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?

Statement 1 definitely agree with all of this statement. Statement 5 BESS should not be included in Renewable Energy Overlay. It is a storage system. It is not producing energy.

What statements did you disagree with and why? Statement 3. All equipment needs to be removed from the site regardless of how deep it is in the ground. Freezing and thawing will cause items to heave and eventually come to the surface.

Additional Comments What are the additional comments and recommendations of the Linn County Staff?

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name Thomas

Last Name Bean

Address1 4660 Leprechaun Lane

Address2 *Field not completed.*

City Cedar Rapids

State IA

Zip 52411

Email *Field not completed.*

Phone *Field not completed.*

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? Changing the setbacks from dwellings to property lines would decrease the amount of land willing landowners are able to utilize for solar. This would further inhibit a landowner's right to decide how to best use their own land and infringes on property rights. By moving forward with an escalation process the county will delay updating the ordinance and therefore delay development in the county even further. Additionally, this would make panels more visible to surrounding residents, which is already a complaint the opposition to solar projects has stated. Land used for solar development will be allowed to regenerate over the life of the project. This will preserve the land for future

agriculture use and protect against urban sprawl. If the city continues to expand, the development will take agriculture land out of commission forever.

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? If other agriculture practices such as hog confinements, grain bins, and crop production do not require scorecards, neither should solar farms. The added agricultural impact mitigation plan requirements would add additional constraints to the landowner and company. This would also reduce income for participating landowners.

The 300-foot separation from wildlife corridors is applying a regulation to solar farms and not requiring the same regulation for other projects such as hog confinements, dwellings, and silos does not make sense. Why should this regulation only apply to solar farms? The same goes for project performance reports.

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name	Thomas
Last Name	Swyers
Address1	485 W WILLIAMS DR
Address2	<i>Field not completed.</i>
City	MARION
State	IA
Zip	52302
Email	thomas.swyers@gmail.com
Phone	<i>Field not completed.</i>
Good Neighbor Practices Committee	
What statements did you agree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
What statements did you disagree with and why?	300 ft is actually to far from property and may make it hard to find good placement for solar.
Additional Comments	If you get a home for your mom to live in, it should be livable first and have nice curbside appeal second. Similarly, we should have a livable functional planet first and worry about curbside appeal second. To hell with NIMBY.
Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee	
What statements did you agree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
Additional Comments	Please consider modern electrical storage practices and use logic and an evidence based solution.
Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee	

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? *Field not completed.*

Additional Comments *Field not completed.*

Renewable Energy Committees Statement Feedback

First Name Tim

Last Name Arnold

Address1 4207 Twin Ridge Ct.

Address2 *Field not completed.*

City Cedar Rapids

State IA

Zip 52403

Email tim.arnold@kirkwood.edu

Phone 13193896763

Good Neighbor Practices Committee

What statements did you agree with and why? *Field not completed.*

What statements did you disagree with and why? Current ordinance property line setbacks of 50 feet are adequate to mitigate conflict between solar and land in agricultural use. Current ordinance property line setbacks of 50

feet are inadequate to mitigate conflict between solar and residential uses.

I agree that the current 50' setback is adequate in an agricultural use. I do not agree that any future revisions should burden a participating landowner with a setback from adjoining property lines, but should be limited to the distance from an occupied dwelling. Using property lines to start the setback takes away the property owners' ability to maximize the value of their own land use.

Verification and enforcement methods for utility-scale solar project requirements (setbacks, sound, landscaping, viewshed, etc.) should be clearly spelled out in the ordinance. Enforcement methods should include an escalation process and utilize financial, legal, and suspension of operations to the extent allowed by Iowa law.

I don't agree that solar development should have special verification and enforcement methods. If the current methods of verification and enforcement for property development as a whole in the county are adequate, then solar development should be treated like all other types of development. If that process is generally in need of revisions, then that should happen without special impact on solar development.

Sound requirements for projects should include specific numerical standards for both construction and operation noise as well as time of day. There should be a verification process for these standards spelled out in the ordinance (see statement 3).

If this is a concern, it should be added to all property development construction ordinances, and not specific to solar development.

The ordinance should encourage cooperation between applicants and adjacent landowners.

Will this also be true for ALL development in Linn County? If it

is a legitimate concern, it should be applied across the board.

Utility-scale solar projects typically require a tradeoff between renewable energy production and agricultural production. The Board of Supervisors should consider if there is a “balancing point” in this tradeoff for Linn County.

The county should not have the right to tell landowners that they cannot participate in a project and enter into lease agreements, or place an undue burden on that participation, simply because their land use decision is non-traditional.

Additional Comments	<i>Field not completed.</i>
---------------------	-----------------------------

Battery Energy Storage Systems Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
---	-----------------------------

What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
--	-----------------------------

Additional Comments	<i>Field not completed.</i>
---------------------	-----------------------------

Balancing Agriculture and Solar Committee

What statements did you agree with any why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
---	-----------------------------

What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
--	-----------------------------

Additional Comments	<i>Field not completed.</i>
---------------------	-----------------------------

Lifecycle Costs Committee

What statements did you agree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
---	-----------------------------

What statements did you disagree with and why?	<i>Field not completed.</i>
--	-----------------------------

Additional Comments	<i>Field not completed.</i>
---------------------	-----------------------------
