

Solar Update  
September 11, 2025

The NYS Office of Renewable Energy Siting & Electric Transmission (“ORES”) continues to review Hecate Energy’s response to ORES’ second Notice of Incomplete Application (“NOIA”) for its Shepherd’s Run proposal to construct a 42 MW solar factory on prime farmland and wetlands in Craryville.

As we wait to see whether ORES will issue a 3<sup>rd</sup> Notice or grant Hecate a draft permit, we will continue to press our major concerns about the proposal, which include woefully inadequate screening with saplings instead of mature trees, lack of compensation for adjacent homeowners, clear-cutting of forested areas, and fire safety. Project components would be adjacent to the Taconic Hills School campus. There are no evacuation plans for the 1400 students, teachers, and staff; And an access road to other areas of the proposed project crosses a stream, goes through wetlands, and is too narrow to permit passage of a fire truck should a fire occur.

Since this began, we’ve repeatedly pointed out that the proposed site is all wrong. The proof is in the numbers: To construct its solar facility, Hecate needs ORES to waive compliance with 16 provisions of local law. By comparison, ORES records show that:

- A 160 MW project, *almost 4 times the size of Shepherd’s Run*, needs 8 waivers (Yellow Barn)
- A 250 MW project, *almost 6 times larger*, project needs 11 (Mill Point)
- Another 250 MW project needs no waivers (Fort Covington)
- The closest number to Shepherd’s Run is a for a 300 MW proposal, which needs 14 waivers (Flat Rock) – two fewer than Shepherd’s Run even though would be *7 times the size* of Shepherd’s Run.

There's one other interesting development, which may finally convince ORES that Hecate is a bad actor, and shouldn't be allowed to do further business in New York State. Hecate has been sued by a lender, which alleges in a lawsuit that the developer defaulted on an \$82 million loan. The lender also claims that Hecate converted proceeds from collateral it had put up to obtain the loan and pocketed the funds, which, the lender claims, should have gone to the lender.

We'll continue to follow this and report on it, and other developments, as they occur.

Thank you.