

Cohoctah Township Planning Commission  
Public Hearing: Special Land Use Permit Headland Solar LLC  
July 16, 2025

Sarah Porter  
Lisa Brown  
John Beach  
Ronda Beach

As a resident, I have the following questions, comments, and concerns for the Planning Commission:

1. Why does the application say, "Prepared For: Michigan Public Service Commission" and not Conway and Cohoctah Township? Is this PA233 compliant? It appears from the start of the application process that they do not intend to work with the townships.
2. How will the project contribute to this community's energy independence and resilience?
3. Conway Township is the only township in Livingston County that drains stormwater runoff into adjacent townships due to its elevation. Cohoctah Township residents should be concerned with any additional water runoff created by this project. I see that it has been determined by the LCDC that the Project will need to improve several county drains, but no further information is provided. I have been reviewing the Acceleration Solar Project in Ingham County that is before the MSPC. The information on the drains is almost a carbon copy of our application. That project contains two drains, and this proposed project has ten drains. The developer is only going to do what our Drain Commission requires, and I am hopeful that serious inquiries have been made about the Assembly Solar project with the Shiawassee County Drain Commissioner and more importantly, the residents surrounding the project. That project has had significant and ongoing drainage issues.
4. How is this proposed project similar to Assembly Solar and more importantly, how is it different? At Ranger Power's open house on 2-27-25, one of the employees stated, "We learned our lesson with Assembly." What does that mean?
5. The "Minimize, Mitigate, Repair" approach to issues seems more reactionary than advance planning and implementation of procedures. The application is riddled with boilerplate terms like "industry best practices." Instead of providing details on emergency response, stormwater mitigation, and unanticipated discoveries, stating "industry best practice" feels simply like lip service.
6. Is the developer willing to build a Fire Department substation in Conway Township to properly respond to an emergency when it arises?
7. The application states that training will be provided to the Fire Departments on an annual basis. Our fire departments are mostly staffed as paid on call, which makes turnover an issue. Quarterly training seems more appropriate.



8. What resources do we have in the townships to verify the Tax Revenue Memorandum provided in the application? If the proposed project moves forward, we should understand the financial benefits that are being proposed. I do not think we should rely on the fox guarding the hen house for an inventory on the number of hens. The document from Anderson Economic Group dated 2-14-25 claims \$3.5 million in the first year, \$25.7 million to local schools, and \$42.7 million over 40 years. However, in a different section of the application I found the same report from their hired consultant, dated 8-15-22, with the same benchmarks showing the lifetime revenue at \$18 million. So, in only 2.5 years the personal property taxes are \$24.7 million more over the life of the project? This is a substantial difference. Can the townships have their assessors, and/or the county assessor confirm and verify the calculations used and provide an accurate estimate of tax revenue anticipated?
9. I took some time to analyze the participating vs non-participating parcel lists. There are 192 parcels participating and non-participating directly adjacent to the project. The directly adjacent, non-participating parcels make up 71% of those parcels. There are 47 participating parcels; of those, 60% of the acreage is owned by taxpayers that do not reside in Conway or Cohoctah Townships. They do not live here; they do not vote here; they will not have to look at it. Of the 60% of the participating acreage, 44% is owned by a relative of the developer. And because the term "large landowner" has been thrown around so much in this process, I analyzed just the acreage. The non-participating adjacent landowners have 2,877 acres surrounding the proposed project. After reducing that figure for the Jekyll & Hyde's that appear on both lists, the non-participating adjacent property owners have 2,539 acres compared to the participating property owners of 2,415. So, the non-participating landowners have 124 more acres than the people who brought this here, ironic.
10. From the public hearing in Conway Township last week, we learned that Ranger Power will sell this project to a construction company at the pre-construction phase. As this meeting goes on, I urge you to listen carefully to all the times that they respond with answers stating "we." The "we" this, and "we" that, will not be them, because they will be long gone. When it comes to drainage, they will be gone, when it comes to complaints, they will be gone, when it comes to decommission, THEY WILL BE GONE. Quite frankly, all the "we, we" in their answers having me questioning if they are French or have a mouse in their pocket.
11. Ranger Power has a reputation that precedes them. It does not take long when talking to others regarding their projects to hear them described as bullies that wear down the community. The application includes statements like "with respect to receptiveness of the community, Ranger Power places great importance on



community supported projects. In order to be a good neighbor, it is important that the project start on the right foot by being transparent and being in constant communication with the public." They even state they have a "proven track record of community supported development." It is good to write your own narrative. The only constant, transparent participants involved in this proposed project are the residents of Conway and Cohoctah Townships. On November 15, 2022, the Conway Planning Commission meeting was cancelled due to the hall being over capacity after residents were informed of the proposed solar project. On December 12, 2022, we listened to hours of public comments that did not support this project. For almost three years the majority of this community still has not supported this project. Despite the politics of the State of Michigan, I hope this community stands firm and does not let them wear us down.

*Sarah K. Porter*