



Dunmore Solar Power Plant

Solar Glare Hazard Analysis Report

Client: Dunmore Solar Inc.

Reference: 24-013

Version 2.0



June 2024

Report Prepared for:
 Dunmore Solar Inc.

Issue History	Date	Details
V1.0	May 12, 2023	Final for Issue
V2.0	June 7, 2024	Project Expansion

Version History	Author	Reviewed By	Approved By	Issue Date
V1.0	Laura Essak	Jason Mah (March 22, 2023)	Cameron Sutherland (March 27, 2023)	May 12, 2023
V2.0	Laura Essak	Jacqueline Gallagher (May 21, 2024)	Jason Mah (May 23, 2024)	June 7, 2024

This document has been prepared by Green Cat Renewables Canada Corporation. The material and data in this report were prepared under the supervision and direction of the undersigned.



Jason Mah, P.Eng.

This solar glare hazard analysis is being issued with professional engineering authentication. The information contained in this report, to which the engineering authentication applies, is deemed complete for the intended purpose.

Disclaimer

This report has been compiled according to good engineering practice and judgement. The inputs to this study are based on third party provided and collected data that was not witnessed by Green Cat Renewables Canada (GCR), the third party provided data was analyzed and verified as it was presented. It is assumed that the information included in this document is accurate. GCR shall not assume any warranty, liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usability of the results or data disclosed in this report. Any use of this document or the data contained herein, as well as passing this information on to third parties shall be at recipient's own risk. The interpretation of this report and other data and reports pertaining to the current project remain the sole responsibility of the recipient. Any conclusions and recommendations made in this report are subject to the premise that the data and assumptions underlying the analysis and calculations are correct. No liability is assumed for any software errors. Any claims for damages are excluded.

Executive Summary

The Dunmore Solar Power Plant (the Project)¹ was previously submitted to and approved by the Alberta Utilities Commission (AUC) in 2023, as a 173-megawatt (MW_{AC}) photovoltaic (PV) electricity generating power plant. Green Cat Renewables Canada Corporation (GCR) was retained by Dunmore Solar Inc. (Dunmore Solar) to prepare the Solar Glare Hazard Analysis Report (SGHAR)² for the Project. The Project is located in Cypress County, Alberta, approximately 9km northeast of the Hamlet of Dunmore.

Following AUC approval of the Project, revisions were made to the permitted design, including the expansion of the Project area. GCR was therefore retained to complete an updated SGHA for the Project, considering the revised Project design. The Project is now proposed to have a higher capacity of 216 MW_{AC}, consisting of ground mounted, single-axis tracking modules.

GCR utilizes ForgeSolar's GlareGauge software to assess user-input PV arrays for potential glare on identified roadways and aviation assets. The software evaluates the occurrence of glare on a minute-by-minute basis. If glare is predicted, each minute of glare as a function of retinal irradiance and subtended angle is plotted on a hazard plot. Retinal irradiance and subtended angle predict the ocular hazard associated with the glare as either green (low potential for after-image), yellow (potential for temporary after-image), or red (potential for retinal damage). The software does not consider obstacles such as trees, hills, buildings, etc. between the PV array and glare receptor.

GCR followed the guidelines provided in Alberta Utilities Commission (AUC) Rule 007 for the receptors to be included in a solar glare assessment but Rule 007 does not specify any modelling parameters or glare threshold limits.³ GCR also referred to the information provided in Leden et al.'s *Verhinderung von Sonnenreflexionen in Lärmschutzwällen – ein Laborexperiment [Obstruction of sun reflections in noise barriers - laboratory experiment]*,⁴ Alberta Transportation guidelines,⁵ and other relevant literature.

GCR evaluated the area within 4,000m of the Project for aerodromes and within 800m for any other receptors. The assessment considered the following receptors near the Project:

- Five observation points representing nearby dwellings;
- One highway;
- Four local roads; and
- One private, unregistered aerodrome.

The glare analysis indicates that the Project is not likely to have the potential to create hazardous glare conditions for the dwellings, roads, or flight paths that were assessed. The actual glare impacts that will be experienced by vehicle operators are anticipated to be only a fraction of the results presented in this report. The actual impact is expected to be less because vehicle operators will be travelling past the affected areas, not standing still while looking at the solar PV arrays. The impact of the glare on affected receptors may also be reduced by sun-masking as the glare occurs around sunrise/sunset when the sun aligns with the glare spot and observer, and the sunlight glances across the arrays

¹ AUC Power Plant Approval 28506-D02-2023

² AUC Exhibit 28506_X0007

³ AUC Rule 007: *Applications for Power Plants, Substations, Transmission Lines, Industrial System Designations, Hydro Developments and Gas Utility Pipelines* (April 2022), subsection 4.4.2 SP14.

⁴ *Verhinderung von Sonnenreflexionen in Lärmschutzwällen – ein Laborexperiment [Obstruction of sun reflections in noise barriers - laboratory experiment]* (Leden, N. & Alferdinck, J.W.A.M. & Toet, Alexander, 2015).

⁵ *Assessment requirements for solar development near provincial highways* (Alberta Transportation, December 2021).

at a shallow angle. The results are also conservative because the models assume conditions are sunny and clear at all times, and they do not consider obstructions blocking sightlines between observers and glare spots.

Based on the assessment results, glare from the Dunmore Solar Power Plant is not expected to present a hazard to drivers along nearby roads, pilots landing at the unregistered aerodrome, or have an adverse effect on a resident's use of their home. As such, mitigation has not been proposed or recommended for the evaluated receptors.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	iii
1 Introduction	1
2 Background Information	2
3 Project Description	4
4 Legislation and Guidelines	5
4.1 Geometric Analysis – Use of the Solar Glare Hazard Analysis Tool	6
5 Assessment Methodology	8
5.1 Assessment Input Parameters	8
5.2 Glare Analysis Procedure	16
6 Assessment of Impact	18
6.1 Route Path Results	18
6.2 Dwelling Results	22
6.3 Flight Path Results	25
6.4 Comparison with Past Results	28
6.5 Mitigation	30
7 Summary	31
8 Conclusion	33
9 Glare Practitioners' Information	34
Appendix A – ±50° FOV Results for Highway 41	35

1 Introduction

The Dunmore Solar Power Plant (the Project)⁶ was previously submitted to the Alberta Utilities Commission (AUC) in 2023, as a 173-megawatt (MW_{AC}) photovoltaic (PV) electricity generating power plant. Green Cat Renewables Canada Corporation (GCR) was retained by Dunmore Solar Inc. (Dunmore Solar) to prepare the Solar Glare Hazard Analysis Report (SGHAR)⁷ for the Project. Following the SGHAR, ASCENT Energy Partners Ltd. (ASCENT), on behalf of Dunmore Solar, updated the design specification of the Project, including an increase in ground cover ratio and array centroid height, but the layout did not change. Those design changes did not change the conclusion of the 2023 SGHAR and a final Solar Glare Hazard Analysis update letter was submitted to the AUC.⁸ The Project was granted approval in November 2023.⁹

Following AUC approval of the Project, revisions were made to the permitted design in January 2024. The revisions include the expansion of the Project area, resulting in an increase to the Project Capacity. GCR was retained to complete this additional SGHAR for the Project, considering the revised Project design. The Project is now proposed to have a higher capacity of 216 MW_{AC}, consisting of ground mounted, single-axis tracking modules.

It is considered that a developer, in this case Dunmore Solar, should provide safety assurances regarding the full potential impact of the installation on nearby receptors in the form of a glare assessment.

Glint and glare refer to light reflected off smooth surfaces, either momentarily and intense (glint) or less intense for a more sustained period (glare). Solar PV technology is specifically designed to absorb as much sunlight as possible and modules are generally coated in an anti-reflective coating, as is the case with the modules selected for the Project. Solar PV sites have been developed alongside major transport routes and airports around the world, including adjacent to road infrastructure. This suggests that solar PV technology, such as that being used for the Project, can safely coexist with roads and aerodromes.

The Project is located in Cypress County, Alberta, approximately 9km northeast of the Hamlet of Dunmore. The assessment considers the glare impact of the Project on dwellings and ground transportation routes within 800m of the Project. The nearest registered aerodrome, Medicine Hat Regional Airport, is approximately 16km west of the Project. Due to its distance, this aerodrome was not considered in this analysis. One private, unregistered aerodrome was identified within 4,000m of the Project, so it has been analyzed in this assessment.

⁶ AUC Power Plant Approval 28506-D02-2023

⁷ AUC Exhibit 28506_X0007

⁸ AUC Exhibit 28506_X0006

⁹ AUC Power Plant Approval 28506-D02-2023

2 Background Information

The potential for glint and glare from solar PV modules on the surrounding roads, residential properties and nearby aerodromes should be fully considered when planning a solar project.

Glint and glare are both caused by the reflection of light from a surface, in this case sunlight from a solar module. Glare is caused by a continuous but less intense reflection of a bright light, whereas glint is caused by a strong, momentary reflection of sunlight. Reflections from smooth surfaces produce more direct “specular” reflections, and rougher surfaces disperse the light in multiple directions, creating “diffuse” reflections. **Figure 2-1** shows these two types of reflections from a solar PV module.




Figure 2-1 – Types of Light Reflection from Solar Modules

Calculation of potential glare requires the azimuth and elevation angle of the sun, and the consequent angles of incidence and reflection at the array, at all times throughout the year.

The angle of incidence is the angle at which the sun strikes the module (measured from normal/perpendicular to the surface). The angle of reflection is equal and opposite the angle of incidence. Light transmission through the glass and absorption by the PV module is greatest when the light is normal to the glass surface, while more light is reflected at shallower angles. As shown in **Figure 2-2** a low incidence angle in a fixed tilt system is associated with the sun being high in the sky such that the sun's rays are shining at close to a right angle with the module surface. The highest incidence angles will occur in the early morning and late evening when the sun is low in the sky.




Figure 2-2 – Angles of Incidence relative to the Sun's Position

Throughout the day the sun will track across the sky; therefore, the angle at which the light is incident on the module will vary. **Figure 2-3** shows the two angles (azimuth and elevation/zenith) required to define the orientation of the sun with respect to the solar module.




Figure 2-3 – Sun's Position relative to Solar Module

There are many factors that affect the glare level. These include but are not limited to:

- The type of solar module
- The module's tilt angle and orientation
- Size of solar development
- Shape of solar development
- Location of solar development
- Distance between solar development and observer
- Angle to observer
- Relative height of observer

Single-axis tracking systems will often include a backtracking function, as is the case with the system selected for the Project. At low sun elevation angles, high array tilt angles will result in shading from rows nearer the sun on those behind them. To mitigate consequent production losses, the trackers will gradually tilt away from the sun back toward horizontal.

The following section describes the proposed development and the associated infrastructure in detail.

3 Project Description

The proposed Project site is located in Cypress County, Alberta, approximately 9km northeast of the Hamlet of Dunmore, and 13km east of the City of Medicine Hat. The Project location relative to Dunmore and Medicine Hat is shown in **Figure 3-1**. The approved project area is outlined in red, with the expansion area shown in blue.

The Project has a total fenced area of approximately 913 acres with a total capacity of 216 MW_{AC}. The PV modules will be mounted on single-axis trackers secured to the ground with piles.




Figure 3-1 – Dunmore Solar Power Plant Location

4 Legislation and Guidelines

There is currently no adopted legislation for assessing the impacts of glare for solar energy development in Alberta or Canada, and standardized guidance only specify what receptors to include in an assessment without specifying acceptable thresholds.

The AUC's Rule 007 states that solar glare assessment reports must include receptors within 800m from the boundary of the project and aerodromes within 4,000m from the boundary of the project.¹⁰ It continues to state the following requirements:

- Describe the time, location, duration, and intensity of solar glare predicted to be caused by the project.
- Describe the software or tools used in the assessment, the assumptions, and the input parameters (equipment-specific and environmental) utilized.
- Describe the qualification of the individual(s) performing the assessment.
- Identify the potential solar glare at critical points along highways, major roadways, and railways.
- Identify the potential solar glare at any aerodrome within 4,000 metres from the boundary of the project, including the potential effect on runways, flight paths and air traffic control towers.
- Include a map (or maps) identifying the solar glare receptors, critical points along highways, major roadways and railways, and aerodromes that were assessed.
- Include a table that provides the expected intensity of the solar glare (e.g., green, yellow, or red) and the expected duration of solar glare at each identified receptor, critical points along highways, major roadways and railways, and any registered and known unregistered aerodromes that were assessed.

Alberta Transportation developed requirements for the assessment of solar PV projects being proposed near provincial highways. The guideline is based on AUC Rule 007 with additional specifications for the assessment of roads. This includes vehicle heights, consideration of potential shading and sun-masking, and discussion of potential mitigation for glare predicted within $\pm 15^\circ$ of a driver's heading.¹¹ In AUC Decision 27842-D01-2024, the AUC indicated that presenting conservative glare predictions within $\pm 50^\circ$ of heading may be helpful in understanding potential glare impacts on highways and railways, though glare within this wider range does not necessarily need to be mitigated. Similarly, the AUC noted a contextual $\pm 25^\circ$ range would be sufficient for more minor roads.¹²

Leden et al. performed a laboratory experiment to study the impact of solar glare on motorists. While this assessment was performed to assess sunlight reflected off roadside noise barriers, the fundamental principles remain the same for glare from solar projects. The study assessed glare at angles of 5° , 10° , and 20° from heading and determined that glare impacts are greater at smaller angles than at larger angles. Glare at 5° from heading had a pronounced impact on a driver's performance, glare at 10° resulted in a minor decrease in performance, and glare at 20° did not have an adverse impact on performance. This indicates that considering the $\pm 15^\circ$ field-of-view (FOV) is reasonable when assessing potential solar PV glare impacts that may affect a driver's operation of their vehicle. Glare between 15° and 50° of heading should not be expected to create a hazard for drivers on minor roads or highways (and by extension,

¹⁰ AUC Rule 007: *Applications for Power Plants, Substations, Transmission Lines, Industrial System Designations, Hydro Developments and Gas Utility Pipelines* (April 2022), subsection 4.4.2 SP14.

¹¹ *Assessment requirements for solar development near provincial highways* (Alberta Transportation, December 2021).

¹² *Decision 27842-D01-2024, Aira Solar Project and Moose Trail 1049S Substation* (AUC, March 2024).

railways).¹³ Per the precedent established in AUC Decision 27842-D01-2024, an intermediate FOV of $\pm 25^\circ$ can provide context for peripheral glare observations along route receptors, and can be viewed as a conservative FOV considering the findings of the Leden et al. study.

Transport Canada publication TP1247E indicates that glare from solar arrays should be evaluated when proposed near aerodromes but does not provide additional specifications.¹⁴

This report will abide by: requirements in AUC Rule 007; suggestions made in Zehndorfer Engineering's *Solar Glare and Glint Project Report*;¹⁵ findings from Leden et al.'s study of glare impacts on drivers;¹⁶ Alberta Transportation guidelines; and other relevant literature.

As observed in the Zehndorfer document, solar glare assessments in Canada typically utilize Sandia National Laboratories' Solar Glare Hazard Analysis Tool (SGHAT) through ForgeSolar's software called GlareGauge. The Zehndorfer report notes that: "*the typical Solar Glare Assessment in Canada consists of more than just the plain SGHAT report. It describes the geometric situation, highlights glare duration and suggests glare-reducing measures.*"¹⁷ This approach has been adopted for this assessment.

The Zehndorfer report also comments that: "*with respect to dwellings, geometrical considerations can be useful. The inclination angle towards a window makes a difference, because light rays perpendicular towards the glass will penetrate the window, while window recesses will shade flat-angled rays of light.*"¹⁸

In addition to Zehndorfer's report, the US Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) have provided the *Technical Guidance for Evaluating Selected Solar Technologies on Airports*.¹⁹ This document states that potential for glare might vary depending on site specifics such as existing land uses, location, and size of the project.

A geometric analysis may be required to assess any reflectivity issues coming from the solar modules. FAA guidelines have also been informed by the 2015 study, *Evaluation of Glare as a Hazard for General Aviation Pilots on Final Approach*, by Rogers, et al. This study concludes that glare of sufficient size and intensity in an airplane pilot's view, within $\pm 25^\circ$ of heading, may have an adverse impact on the pilot's ability to read their instruments or land their plane. The study also indicates that glare beyond $\pm 50^\circ$ of heading is not likely to impair a pilot.²⁰

4.1 Geometric Analysis – Use of the Solar Glare Hazard Analysis Tool

The SGHAT is a validated tool specifically designed to estimate potential glare according to a Solar Glare Hazard Analysis Plot at a certain module height, tilt, type, and observer location. ForgeSolar's GlareGauge/SGHAT software allows for the analysis of potential glare on flight paths, routes, and stationary observation points. It is widely accepted as the most comprehensive tool to assess potential glare impacts on receptors near solar power projects. The Zehndorfer report reviewed several glare software packages that may be used to assess solar PV glare, including ForgeSolar's GlareGauge/SGHAT. The report does not make a specific recommendation, but the findings suggest that

¹³ *Verhinderung von Sonnenreflexionen in Lärmschutzwällen – ein Laborexperiment [Obstruction of sun reflections in noise barriers - laboratory experiment]* (Leden, N. & Alferdinck, J.W.A.M. & Toet, Alexander, 2015).

¹⁴ *Aviation – Land Use in the Vicinity of Aerodromes – TP1247E* (Transport Canada, 2013/14).

¹⁵ *Solar Glare and Glint Project* (Zehndorfer Engineering, September 2019).

¹⁶ *Verhinderung von Sonnenreflexionen in Lärmschutzwällen – ein Laborexperiment [Obstruction of sun reflections in noise barriers - laboratory experiment]* (Leden, N. & Alferdinck, J.W.A.M. & Toet, Alexander, 2015).

¹⁷ *Solar Glare and Glint Project* (Zehndorfer Engineering, September 2019), PDF page 8.

¹⁸ *Solar Glare and Glint Project* (Zehndorfer Engineering, September 2019), PDF page 6.

¹⁹ *Technical Guidance for Evaluating Selected Solar Technologies on Airports* (FAA, April 2018), pg. 40.

²⁰ *Evaluation of Glare as a Hazard for General Aviation Pilots on Final Approach* (Rogers, J. A., et al., July 2015).

the SGHAT is the most accessible tool of those evaluated, and the most robust with respect to the output information.²¹

²¹ *Solar Glare and Glint Project* (Zehndorfer Engineering, September 2019).

5 Assessment Methodology

For ground-based routes, the FOV within $\pm 15^\circ$ from the vehicle operator's heading is assessed based on Alberta Transportation guidelines and Leden et al.'s work.²² This covers the region where a person's vision will be most focussed, which is the critical area of concern where glare may present a safety hazard. The analysis has focused on the potential for glare impacts to occur within this range as glare outside this range has not been found to affect a driver's ability to operate their vehicle on rural roads or highways.

A $\pm 25^\circ$ FOV can also be modelled to provide context for routes that may be peripherally impacted by glare. This wider FOV is based on a conservative interpretation of Leden et al.'s study of glare impacts on drivers, as well as the information presented in the Rogers FAA report for airplane pilots, adapted to suit vehicle operators using ground-based routes. The AUC has also suggested modelling a peripheral $\pm 50^\circ$ FOV for highways and railways to provide additional context for higher speed transportation routes.²³ This assessment includes peripheral viewing ranges to provide greater context, but the peripheral results do not describe glare with the potential to affect a driver's ability to safely operate their vehicle.

In line with Alberta Transportation guidelines,²⁴ passenger, truck, and commercial vehicle heights are considered in the analysis.

In line with AUC Rule 007's guidelines for choosing receptors to include in a solar glare analysis, the assessment evaluated the receptors listed below.

- Five observation points representing nearby dwellings;
- One highway;
- Four local roads; and
- One private, unregistered aerodrome

There were no railways identified within 800m of the Project, so none were evaluated in this assessment. There are no other known solar power projects within the study area, so a cumulative assessment was not completed. The nearest solar power project is the Saamis Solar Project located approximately 12km northwest of the Project.

Note, if the modules are not visible to the individual receptor, then no glare can be observed at that receptor.

5.1 Assessment Input Parameters

The solar arrays, transportation routes, and dwellings were plotted using an interactive Google map, and site-specific data was entered into the software prior to modelling. The following sections provide details of the parameters specified for the analysis calculations in the GlareGauge software.

²² *Verhinderung von Sonnenreflexionen in Lärmschutzwällen – ein Laborexperiment [Obstruction of sun reflections in noise barriers - laboratory experiment]* (Leden, N. & Alferdinck, J.W.A.M. & Toet, Alexander, 2015).

²³ *Decision 27842-D01-2024, Aira Solar Project and Moose Trail 1049S Substation* (AUC, March 2024).

²⁴ *Assessment requirements for solar development near provincial highways* (Alberta Transportation, December 2021).

5.1.1 PV Array

The general PV array areas were plotted on the interactive Google map as shown in **Figure 5-1**. The Project was split into 17 sub-arrays to avoid conflict between complex array geometry and software calculations, while also providing additional detail in areas with greater topographical variation. The modelled arrays include more land than the proposed PV array coverage, which results in a more conservative analysis.



Figure 5-1 – General PV Array Areas Plotted in GlareGauge Software

The modelled sub-arrays were plotted to balance the influences of several factors on the glare modelling and results. Sub-array polygons were sized to be small enough to capture varying topographical changes, but large enough to allow for representative glare spot sizes. The modelled polygons were also designed to follow and be representative of the module layout, while also avoiding concave perimeters and including extra area to be conservative.

The Project details in **Table 5-1** were specified in the model.

Table 5-1– PV Array Specified Parameters – Current Assessment

Required Inputs	Specified Parameters	Description
Axis Tracking	Single	Modules are mounted on single-axis trackers
Tilt of Tracking Axis	0°	Elevation angle of tracking axis with 0° being faced up (flat) parallel to the ground
Orientation	180°	Azimuthal position measured from true north
Maximum Tracking Angle	60°	Rotation limit of the arrays in each direction
Resting Angle, Backtracking	0°-10°	Minimum rotation angle of modules outside of the normal tracking range (during backtracking)
Ground Coverage Ratio	43.8%	Ratio between the PV module area and total ground area
Offset Angle	0°	Additional elevation angle between tracking axis and modules
Module Surface Material	Smooth glass with anti-reflective coating	Surface material of modules
Module Height Above Ground	1.80m	Array centroid height

The Project details in **Table 5-2** were specified in the model used in the previous report. The orientation remained the same between both reports. The main differences are the minor changes to the maximum tracking angle, ground cover ratio, and module height.

Table 5-2– PV Array Specified Parameters – Previous Assessment

Required Inputs	Specified Parameters	Description
Axis Tracking	Single	Modules are mounted on single-axis trackers
Tilt of Tracking Axis	0°	Elevation angle of tracking axis with 0° being faced up (flat) parallel to the ground
Orientation	180°	Azimuthal position measured from true north
Maximum Tracking Angle	55°	Rotation limit of the arrays in each direction
Resting Angle, Backtracking	0°-10°	Minimum rotation angle of modules outside of the normal tracking range (during backtracking)
Ground Coverage Ratio	40.8%	Ratio between the PV module area and total ground area
Offset Angle	0°	Additional elevation angle between tracking axis and modules

Required Inputs	Specified Parameters	Description
Module Surface Material	Smooth glass with anti-reflective coating	Surface material of modules
Module Height Above Ground	1.50m	Array centroid height

Solar PV modules are designed to maximize light absorption and conversion to electricity. Specifying different types of glass and coatings used on the modules can affect a system’s energy production and glare potential. Smooth glass with anti-reflective coatings (typical of solar PV modules) will generally reflect less light, i.e., create less glare, than uncoated or conventional glass.

The backtracking operation of the SAT system has been considered in this analysis. The GlareGauge backtracking algorithms account for the geometry between arrays and the sun, as well as the slope of the plotted sub-arrays. In the morning and evening when the sun is outside of the normal tracking range, the rotation angle in the model will adjust to shallower angles to avoid inter-row shading. The user-specified resting angle sets the lower limit for backtracking rotation.

The elevation variation across the site is mild, ranging from approximately 740m to 770m above mean sea level (AMSL). The landscape is relatively smooth, and ground elevations are generally lower in the southern area of the Project than the north area. As noted, topographical variations were incorporated into the sub-array breakdown in the models, which is more apparent in the layout of sub-arrays PV02-PV08.

5.1.2 Route Paths

Five route paths were evaluated for glare impacts from the Project: Highway 41, Range Road 42, Range Road 44, Township Road 124, and Township Road 130 within approximately 800m of the Project. Highway 41 is outside the required 800m assessment zone but was included in the analysis to be consistent with the previous assessments. **Figure 5-2** shows the routes in relation to the Project.




Figure 5-2 – Roads near the Project

All routes were modelled as two-way routes to represent vehicles travelling in both possible directions. Two horizontal viewing angles were evaluated for vehicle operators: $\pm 15^\circ$ and $\pm 25^\circ$ (30° and 50° total FOV). The $\pm 15^\circ$ range encompasses the region where a person's vision will be most focussed, which is the critical area of concern.²⁵ The $\pm 25^\circ$ range is a more conservative view representing a person's extended visual range that may be impacted by glare. The $\pm 50^\circ$ FOV was also assessed for highways to provide further peripheral context to glare that may be observed by highway drivers. The road routes were set at an elevation of 1.08m to represent the height of a typical passenger vehicle, 1.8m to represent the height of a typical truck or bus, and 2.3m to represent the height of a commercial truck in accordance with Alberta Transportation guidelines.²⁶ Commercial vehicles are typically more susceptible to glare than passenger vehicles due to their increased height.

²⁵ *Solar Glare and Glint Project* (Zehndorfer Engineering, September 2019).

²⁶ *Assessment requirements for solar development near provincial highways* (Alberta Transportation, December 2021).

5.1.3 Dwellings

Five receptors were assessed to represent dwellings near the Project. Dwellings were modelled at 4.5m above ground to conservatively represent two-storey buildings. The model assumes the receptors have an unobstructed view of the arrays, i.e., the view is not affected by any part of the building being evaluated, or by any objects between the receptor and the Project. **Figure 5-3** shows the dwellings in relation to the Project.

GCR followed the guidelines provided in AUC Rule 007 to identify dwellings within 800m of the Project. R1 is the only dwelling within 800m, R2-R5 are outside the required assessment zone but were included in the analysis to be consistent with the previous assessments.




Figure 5-3 – Dwellings near the Project

5.1.4 Flight Paths

Two flight paths approaching a private, unregistered aerodrome 3,900m northwest of the Project were included in this glare assessment. This is an uncontrolled aerodrome, so it was not necessary to model an air traffic control tower. The receptors at the aerodrome can be seen in **Figure 5-4**.



Figure 5-4 – Flight Paths near the Project

The two-mile (3.2km) long flight paths utilize a typical glide slope of three degrees, ending 50 feet (15m) above the runway threshold. The SGHAT simulates flight paths with a maximum downward viewing angle of 30° from horizontal, accounting for obstructions in the cockpit below the windshield. This analysis has set the horizontal viewing angle for airplane pilots to $\pm 50^\circ$ from center (100° total field-of-view). This encompasses a conservative region where glare may affect a pilot while landing their airplane. A $\pm 25^\circ$ horizontal range has also been modelled as this is the region where yellow-grade glare is expected to adversely impact pilots.²⁷ Glare occurring outside of this range is not expected to adversely impact the pilot.

²⁷ *Evaluation of Glare as a Hazard for General Aviation Pilots on Final Approach* (Rogers, J. A., et al., July 2015).

5.1.5 Other Assumptions

The following assumptions have been made in setting the parameters for this analysis:

- Times associated with glare are denoted in Standard time. For Daylight Savings, add one hour.
- Glare analyses do not account for physical obstructions between reflectors and receptors that may mitigate impacts. This includes buildings, tree cover and geographic obstructions.
- The glare hazard determination relies on several approximations including observer eye characteristics, angle of view, and typical blink response time. Actual values may differ.
- Hazard zone boundaries shown in the Glare Hazard plot are an approximation and visual aid. Actual ocular impact outcomes encompass a continuous, not discrete, spectrum.
- Glare analysis does not account for change in weather patterns. It is assessed as clear sunny skies throughout the year.
- To increase accuracy of modelling results, parts of the array may be divided into sub-sections if the footprint covers a large surface area with drastic elevation changes, or to avoid concave outlines.
- Default parameters, as alluded to in the following section, highlight ocular metrics used in this assessment as has been acceptable according to the Sandia National Laboratories methodology on assessing potential glint and glare hazards.²⁸ These are shown below in **Table 5-3**.

Table 5-3 – Default Parameters

GlareGauge Parameters	
Direct Normal Irradiance, DNI (amount of solar radiation received in a collimated beam on a surface normal to the sun during a 60-minute period)	Varies and peaks at 1000 W/m ²
Ocular Transmission Coefficient (absorption of radiation within the eye before it reaches the retina)	0.5
Pupil Diameter (Typical daylight adjusted length)	0.002m
Eye Focal Length (distance where rays intersect in the eye)	0.017m
Sun Subtended Angle	9.3 mrad

²⁸ *Methodology to Assess Potential Glint and Glare Hazards from Concentrating Solar Power Plants: Analytical Models and Experimental Validation* (Ho, C.K., C.M. Ghanbari and R.B. Diver, Journal of Solar Energy Engineering-Transactions of the ASME, 133 (3), 2011).

5.2 Glare Analysis Procedure

GCR calculated the potential glare for observation points and route receptors using the SGHAT. Although effects from glare are subjective, depending on variables such as a person’s ocular parameters and size/distance from the glare source, the SGHAT has a generalized approach to specify the hazard that glare may produce. GCR’s commentary on the levels of glare found and related sources of mitigation, if required, are intended to help decision makers evaluate potential impacts.

The SGHAT User’s Manual v3.0 states that: *“If glare is found, the tool calculates the retinal irradiance and subtended source angle (size/distance) of the glare source to predict potential ocular hazards ranging from temporary after-image to retinal burn. The results are presented in a simple, easy-to-interpret plot that specifies when glare will occur throughout the year, with color codes indicating the potential ocular hazard.”*²⁹

The colour codes are based on a red, yellow, and green structure to categorize the level of risk to a person’s eyes. Glare classification is dependent on the glare intensity and the apparent size of the glare area as viewed from the eye. The severity of glare is proportional to the effects of an after-image, which can be described as a lingering image of glare in the field-of-view, or a flash blindness when observed prior to a typical blink response time. The descriptions for each category are as follows:

- Green: Glare is present but there is a low potential for temporary after-image;
- Yellow: Glare is present with the potential for temporary after-image; and
- Red: Glare is present with the potential for permanent eye damage.

The level of glare is derived using the graph below that plots the level of irradiance against the angle that is occupied by the glare in the field-of-view.

ForgeSolar have developed a plot to categorize glare based on its intensity at the eye and its size in the observer’s FOV. The plot is divided into the red, yellow, and green regions described above. The hazard associated with directly viewing the sun unfiltered is also plotted for comparison. **Figure 5-5** shows an example of the hazard plot.




Figure 5-5 – Hazard Plot depicting the Retinal Effects of Light

²⁹ Solar Glare Hazard Analysis Tool (SGHAT) User’s Manual v 3.0 (Ho and Sims, Sandia National Laboratories, 2016).

Ho et al. developed a model to estimate potential impacts to eyesight with regards to retinal irradiance (amount of light entering the eye and reaching the retina) and subtended source angle (the size of the glare divided by the distance from the emitting source). Significant damage, including retinal burn, may occur at high retinal irradiances and large subtended angles. This is highlighted in the red region. The yellow section denotes the potential for a temporary after-image. The size and impact of the after-image is dependent upon the subtended source angle.³⁰ At a low retinal irradiance and small subtended angle, the hazard will be in the green section where there is very low potential for after-image.

5.2.1 Limitations

The SGHAT may convert the footprint of a concave polygon to a convex polygon.³¹ For example, an array that is in the shape of a 'C' has a concave section and GlareGauge will modify the 'C' shape into a semi-circle. By closing the 'C' shape, the size of the PV array is increased thus potentially over-estimating the size of the array, and consequently over-predicting the glare effects. This change in geometry is required by the glare-check algorithm during analysis. PV arrays with significant concavities should be modelled as multiple arrays to avoid over-estimating the size of the PV array and the resultant glare. The limitations of the software have been carefully considered to ensure the PV array is not concave in order to represent the glare impacts as accurately as possible.

An unavoidable limitation of the SGHAT is that *“random number computations are utilized by various steps of the annual hazard analysis algorithm. Predicted minutes of glare can vary between runs as a result. This limitation primarily affects analyses of Observation Point receptors, including [air traffic control towers].”*³²

Wind probabilities are also not considered by the SGHAT, so special operations that change the tilt of a SAT system are not modelled by the software. This includes functions like “stow mode” where arrays will be tilted closer to horizontal to reduce wind loading during high wind events. Special SAT system operations will utilize different tilt angles than standard operations, causing glare results to deviate from the values predicted by the SGHAT; however, non-standard operations are expected to occur so infrequently that it is unreasonable to include them in a general glare assessment.

³⁰ *Evaluation of glare at the Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System* (C.K. Ho et al., Elsevier Ltd., 2015).

³¹ ForgeSolar “Help” page. Retrieved May 8, 2024.

³² ForgeSolar “Help” page. Retrieved May 8, 2024.

6 Assessment of Impact

This section presents the findings of the glare assessment. The results are factual based on the model parameters used, which are considered to be conservative and as reasonable as possible. AUC Rule 007 provides guidelines for the receptors to be included in a solar glare assessment, but modelling parameters and glare threshold limits are not specified. Therefore, this analysis also considers the principles laid out in the Lenden et al.’s study,³³ Alberta Transportation guidelines,³⁴ and other relevant literature.

The GlareGauge software considers the glare potential for a full one-year period in one-minute intervals to account for the variations between seasons, DNI, and sun angle.

The results showed that glare may be seen by the evaluated receptors if the resting angle is set between 0° to 8°, with the greatest potential impact in the case using a 0° resting angle. Models with resting angles of 9° or steeper did not predict any glare for the evaluated receptors. The following results come from the worst-case model using a 0° resting angle.

6.1 Route Path Results

The following tables present the glare results for the route paths assessed from the array centroid height. Results are shown for passenger, trucks, and commercial road vehicles at 1.08m, 1.8m, and 2.3m, respectively. Results in **Table 6-1** used a ±15° FOV, which was modelled to capture potential glare within a vehicle operator’s critical visual range. Results in **Table 6-2** were evaluated with a ±25° horizontal FOV to highlight routes that may experience glare from an extended visual range. Equivalent levels of glare within ±15° will have a greater impact on the observer than glare outside that range. **Appendix A** includes the results for the ±50° FOV along Highway 41. These results do not necessarily represent an adverse impact on an observer, but they have been included separately to align with the AUC’s suggestion that evaluating a peripheral range may help provide additional broad context.

Table 6-1 – Annual Route Path Glare Levels for Passenger Vehicles, Trucks/Buses, and Commercial Vehicles (±15° FOV, 0° Resting Angle)

Receptor	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Red Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)
Highway 41 (Passenger)	0	0	0	0
Highway 41 (Truck/Bus)	0	0	0	0
Highway 41 (Commercial)	0	0	0	0
Township Road 124 (Passenger)	826	633	0	28
Township Road 124 (Truck/Bus)	798	722	0	28
Township Road 124 (Commercial)	708	850	0	30
Township Road 130 (Passenger)	815	5	0	16

³³ *Verhinderung von Sonnenreflexionen in Lärmschutzwällen – ein Laborexperiment [Obstruction of sun reflections in noise barriers - laboratory experiment]* (Leden, N. & Alferdinck, J.W.A.M. & Toet, Alexander, 2015).

³⁴ *Assessment requirements for solar development near provincial highways (Alberta Transportation, December 2021).*

Receptor	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Red Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)
Township Road 130 (Truck/Bus)	835	15	0	16
Township Road 130 (Commercial)	871	20	0	17
Range Road 42 (Passenger)	0	0	0	0
Range Road 42 (Truck/Bus)	0	0	0	0
Range Road 42 (Commercial)	0	0	0	0
Range Road 44 (Passenger)	0	0	0	0
Range Road 44 (Truck/Bus)	0	0	0	0
Range Road 44 (Commercial)	0	0	0	0

Table 6-2 – Annual Route Path Glare Levels for Passenger Vehicles, Trucks/Buses, and Commercial Vehicles (±25° FOV, 0° Resting Angle)

Receptor	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Red Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)
Highway 41 (Passenger)	0	0	0	0
Highway 41 (Truck/Bus)	0	0	0	0
Highway 41 (Commercial)	0	0	0	0
Township Road 124 (Passenger)	1,117	1,527	0	30
Township Road 124 (Truck/Bus)	1,105	1,632	0	31
Township Road 124 (Commercial)	1,099	1,727	0	33
Township Road 130 (Passenger)	1,475	6	0	19
Township Road 130 (Truck/Bus)	1,233	295	0	20
Township Road 130 (Commercial)	1,192	474	0	23
Range Road 42 (Passenger)	0	0	0	0
Range Road 42 (Truck/Bus)	0	0	0	0
Range Road 42 (Commercial)	0	0	0	0
Range Road 44 (Passenger)	0	0	0	0
Range Road 44 (Truck/Bus)	0	0	0	0
Range Road 44 (Commercial)	0	0	0	0

Drivers travelling along the evaluated sections of Highway 41, Range Road 42, and Range Road 44 are not predicted to observe glare at any level from the Project within the ±15° FOV or ±25° FOV. Township Road 124 and Township Road 130 are predicted to observe minimal to moderate levels of green and yellow glare from the Project. None of

the route receptors are predicted to observe glare at any level from the Project in the models that used a resting angle of 4° or steeper. The following describes the results for the 0° resting angle model, which showed the most potential glare.

The assessed portion of Township Road 124 is the ground route predicted to observe the most glare from the Project. The results indicate that taller vehicles may see more glare than shorter vehicles. Along this route, observers are predicted to see yellow glare in the more critical $\pm 15^\circ$ FOV for a maximum of 850 minutes/year. The glare is predicted around sunrise and sunset between late March and late April, as well as mid-August and mid-September. Yellow glare may be seen along this route between 05:26 and 06:14 MST for up to 15 minutes per morning, and between 18:23 and 19:23 MST for up to 11 minutes per evening.³⁵ The glare is expected to originate from the same general direction as the sun for these periods, so glare impacts may be eclipsed by the direct effects of the sun if both can be seen simultaneously by the observer. This is an effect called “sun-masking”. The actual impact is expected to be less because vehicle operators will be travelling past the affected areas, not standing still while looking at the solar PV arrays. Satellite imagery shows that this is a remote road that is likely to experience minimal traffic, which further reduces the likelihood that there will be observers to see glare from the Project.

The following figures represent the predicted glare within the $\pm 15^\circ$ FOV of commercial vehicle drivers travelling along Township Road 124. **Figure 6-1** shows the daily time periods during which glare is predicted, and **Figure 6-2** shows the daily duration of predicted glare.

Figure 6-3 presents the glare hazard plot for glare predicted to affect drivers of commercial vehicles using Township Road 124. The hazard plot shows that the glare seen from Township Road 124 will be approximately nine times the subtended angle of the sun, but it will be around 475 times dimmer. The glare is also around two orders of magnitude below the threshold for glare that has the potential to cause permanent eye damage at the same subtended angle. Glare at this level is not expected to create a hazardous situation.

If glare is determined to be an issue after the Project is built, specific mitigation measures can be developed in consultation with the affected stakeholder. Potential mitigation measures for glare to road users include: modified backtracking behaviour; installing road signs to warn motorists of the potential glare at particular times of day and year; or, installing a sufficiently tall and opaque visual barrier along the route at impacted points. Due to the predicted duration and level of glare, mitigation is not expected to be required. If mitigation were to be required, then it is expected that any glare could be completely mitigated by altering the backtracking behaviour of the arrays. None of the route receptors are predicted to observe glare at any level from the Project in the models that used a resting angle of 4° or steeper. Given the minor nature of the route, it is suggested that mitigation via visual barriers would be an unnecessary intervention.

³⁵ These results apply to a portion of the route, not just a single point along the route. The results describe a time period during which a vehicle operator may see glare from the Project, but it is highly unlikely that an observer will be affected by the glare for the full duration.




Figure 6-1 – Annual Predicted Glare occurrence for Township Road 124 (Commercial, ±15° FOV, 0° Resting Angle)




Figure 6-2 – Daily Duration of Glare for Township Road 124 (Commercial, ±15° FOV, 0° Resting Angle)




Figure 6-3 – Hazard Plot for Township Road 124 (Commercial, ±15° FOV, 0° Resting Angle)

6.2 Dwelling Results

Five observation points were plotted to represent dwellings near the Project. Dwellings were modelled at 4.5m above ground to conservatively represent two-storey buildings. GCR followed the guidelines provided in AUC Rule 007 to identify dwellings within 800m of the Project. R1 is the only dwelling within 800m, R2-R5 are outside the required assessment zone but were included in the analysis to be consistent with the previous assessments. Impacts on dwellings outside of the 800m assessment zone are not expected to be significant because the solar glare forms a lesser part of the resident’s view at that distance.

A resting angle of 0° had the greatest glare impact on the dwellings, therefore the results from that model are shown below. **Table 6-3** provides the glare results for the dwellings assessed.

Table 6-3 – Annual Glare Levels for Dwellings near the Project (0° Resting Angle)

Receptor	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Red Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)
R1	340	2	0	12
R2	477	0	0	13
R3	522	0	0	15
R4	1,180	1	0	12
R5	2,179	0	0	17

Dwellings R1 and R4 are predicted to observe moderate annual durations of green glare from the Project and minimal yellow glare from the Project. R2, R3 and R5 are predicted to observe moderate annual durations of green glare from the Project and no yellow glare. Glare was not predicted for any of the evaluated dwellings in the models using a resting/minimum backtracking angle of 8° or steeper. The results for R5 are described in further detail below.

In the worst-case models using 0° resting angle, R5 is the dwelling predicted to be the most impacted by glare from the Project. Observers are predicted to see green glare for a maximum of 2,179 minutes/year. The green glare is predicted at sunrise between 04:20 and 07:05 MST for up to 17 minutes per morning in March to September. The glare impacts experienced at R5 may be eclipsed by sun-masking.

R5 is approximately 850m west of the expanded Project area with some vegetation between the dwelling and the site, as determined from satellite imagery. The existing vegetation may obstruct some of the predicted glare. The receptor was modelled from a second-storey window to be conservative, but a site visit can confirm the type of structure. A ground level receptor is likely to observe less glare than a second-storey receptor. The results of the assessment are the “worst-case” scenario, and the actual observed glare may be less.

The following figures represent the predicted glare for R5. **Figure 6-4** shows the daily time periods during which glare is predicted, and **Figure 6-5** shows the daily duration of predicted glare.

Figure 6-6 presents the glare hazard plot for glare predicted to be seen at R5. The hazard plot shows that the glare seen from R5 will be approximately three times the subtended angle of the sun, but it will be around 466 times dimmer. The glare is also around two orders of magnitude below the threshold for glare that has the potential to cause permanent eye damage at the same subtended angle. Glare at this level is not expected to create a hazardous situation or affect a resident’s use of their home, so mitigation is not expected to be required.

If glare is determined to be an issue during the Project's operation, mitigation measures may be designed to reduce or eliminate its impact on an observer, and specific mitigation measures may be developed in consultation with affected stakeholders. Potential mitigation measures may include installing blinds over windows, modified backtracking behaviour, planting vegetation like trees or hedges, or installing fencing or other visual barriers. Glare was not predicted for any of the evaluated dwellings in the models using a resting/minimum backtracking angle of 8° or steeper. Due to the predicted duration and level of glare, mitigation is not expected to be required.





Figure 6-4 – Annual Predicted Glare occurrence for R5 (0° Resting Angle)

Figure 6-5 – Daily Duration of Glare for R5 (0° Resting Angle)




Figure 6-6 – Hazard Plot for R5 (0° Resting Angle)

6.3 Flight Path Results

The tables below present the glare results for the flight paths assessed from the array centroid height. **Table 6-4** shows the results for the flight paths modelled with a $\pm 25^\circ$ FOV to assess glare within a pilot’s critical visual range. **Table 6-5** shows the results for the flight paths evaluated with a conservative $\pm 50^\circ$ horizontal FOV to capture potential glare a pilot may see while landing an airplane. Equivalent levels of glare within $\pm 25^\circ$ will have a greater impact on the observer than glare outside that range.

Table 6-4 – Annual Glare for Flight Paths approaching the Unregistered Aerodrome ($\pm 25^\circ$ FOV, 0° Resting Angle)

Receptor	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Red Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)
FP1 (north bound)	0	0	0	0
FP2 (south bound)	0	0	0	0

Table 6-5 – Annual Glare for Flight Paths approaching the Unregistered Aerodrome ($\pm 50^\circ$ FOV, 0° Resting Angle)

Receptor	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Red Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)
FP1 (north bound)	371	0	0	14
FP2 (south bound)	1,178	0	0	29

Both flight paths, FP1 and FP2, are only predicted to observe short to moderate annual and daily durations of green glare within the extended $\pm 50^\circ$ FOV. No glare is predicted on either flight path within the more critical $\pm 25^\circ$ FOV. FP1 and FP2 are not predicted to experience yellow glare within the $\pm 25^\circ$ FOV or $\pm 50^\circ$ FOV. Glare was not predicted for any of the evaluated flight paths in the models using a resting/minimum backtracking angle of 9° or steeper.

FP2 approaches the unregistered aerodrome while heading south with the Project to the southeast of the flight path, and is the flight path predicted to observe the most glare from the Project. Along this flight path, pilots are only predicted to see green glare in the $\pm 50^\circ$ FOV (but outside the $\pm 25^\circ$ FOV) for a maximum of 1,178 minutes/year. Green glare is not generally considered to be a hazard. The glare is predicted around sunrise from mid-November to mid-January. Glare may be seen along this route between 08:33 and 09:09 MST for up to 29 minutes per morning.³⁶ The glare is expected to originate from the same general direction as the sun for these periods, so glare impacts may be eclipsed by sun-masking. The glare and sun during these periods will be nearly perpendicular to the pilot’s direction of travel, therefore the direct effects of the sun and glare from the solar farm will not be in the pilot’s main vision. In addition, the actual impact is expected to be less because pilots will be travelling past the affected portion of the flight path, not standing still while looking at the solar PV arrays.

The following figures represent the predicted glare for FP2. **Figure 6-7** shows the daily time periods during which glare is predicted, and **Figure 6-8** shows the daily duration of predicted glare.

³⁶ These results apply to a portion of the route, not just a single point along the route. The results describe a time period during which a pilot may see glare from the Project, but it is highly unlikely that an observer will be affected by the glare for the full duration.

Figure 6-9 presents the glare hazard plot for glare predicted to affect FP2. The hazard plot shows that the glare seen from FP2 will have approximately two times the subtended angle as the sun, but it will be around 498 times dimmer. The glare is also around three orders of magnitude below the threshold for glare that has the potential to cause permanent eye damage at the same subtended angle. The predicted glare is completely within the green level, which is not generally considered a hazard. The green glare is only predicted within a viewing range outside the critical $\pm 25^\circ$ FOV, which will not necessarily have an adverse impact on a pilot's vision or ability to safely operate their airplane. Glare at this level has a low potential to temporarily affect an operator's vision, but it is not expected to create a hazardous situation.




Figure 6-7 – Annual Predicted Glare occurrence for FP2
 ($\pm 50^\circ$ FOV, 0° Resting Angle)




Figure 6-8 – Daily Duration of Glare for FP2
 ($\pm 50^\circ$ FOV, 0° Resting Angle)




Figure 6-9 – Hazard Plot for FP2 ($\pm 50^\circ$ FOV, 0° Resting Angle)

6.4 Comparison with Past Results

Comparing the new SGHAR results with the previously submitted SGHAR³⁷ shows a negligible change in glare hazard for ground transportation routes, dwellings, and flight paths near the Project. The main reason for the difference in predicted glare between the two SGHARs is due to the expansion of the Project in the southwest. The results for all receptors predicted to experience glare have been compared below. Highway 41, Range Road 42, Range Road 44 and the $\pm 25^\circ$ FOV for both flight paths were not predicted to experience glare from the current assessment or the previous assessment. Those receptors are not included in the comparison since no glare was predicted in either assessment.

Table 6-6 compares the predicted glare in the previous report and this current report for ground-based routes in the more critical $\pm 15^\circ$ FOV. There is a minimal increase in predicted glare along the assessed sections of Township Road 124 and Township Road 130. The increase in predicted glare is not likely to increase the glare hazard in comparison to the previous report. The previously approved conclusion that the Project is not expected to present a hazard to drivers along nearby roads still applies to the new Project amendment.

Table 6-6 – Comparison of Annual Route Path Glare Levels for Passenger Vehicles, Trucks/Buses, and Commercial Vehicles Annual Glare Levels for Receptors near the Project ($\pm 15^\circ$ FOV, 0° Resting Angle)

Receptor	Previous Assessment			Current Assessment		
	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)
Township Road 124 (Passenger)	180	514	13	826	633	28
Township Road 124 (Truck/Bus)	213	507	15	798	722	28
Township Road 124 (Commercial)	189	562	15	708	850	30
Township Road 130 (Passenger)	783	0	15	815	5	16
Township Road 130 (Truck/Bus)	780	23	15	835	15	16
Township Road 130 (Commercial)	821	20	16	871	20	17

Table 6-7 compares the predicted glare in the previous report and this current report for ground-based routes in the $\pm 25^\circ$ FOV. There is a minor increase in predicted glare along the assessed sections of Township Road 124 and Township Road 130. The increase in predicted glare for the other is not likely to increase the glare hazard in comparison to the previous report. Passenger vehicles and trucks/buses travelling along Township Road 130 are expected to experience a decrease in potential yellow glare. The previously approved conclusion that the Project is not expected to present a hazard to drivers along nearby roads still applies to the updated Project.

³⁷ AUC Exhibit 28506_X0007

Table 6-7 – Comparison of Annual Route Path Glare Levels for Passenger Vehicles, Trucks/Buses, and Commercial Vehicles Annual Glare Levels for Receptors near the Project ($\pm 25^\circ$ FOV, 0° Resting Angle)

Receptor	Previous Assessment			Current Assessment		
	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)
Township Road 124 (Passenger)	266	992	16	1,117	1,527	30
Township Road 124 (Truck/Bus)	269	1,076	18	1,105	1,632	31
Township Road 124 (Commercial)	272	1,140	19	1,099	1,727	33
Township Road 130 (Passenger)	1,298	88	18	1,475	6	19
Township Road 130 (Truck/Bus)	1,155	315	19	1,233	295	20
Township Road 130 (Commercial)	1,088	466	22	1,192	474	23

Table 6-8 compares the predicted glare in the previous report and this current report for dwellings near the Project. The same five receptors were used to represent dwellings around the Project for both SGHARs. R1-R4 are predicted to be less impacted by the Project compared with the previous report. The annual green and yellow glare for R1 to R4 has decreased. R5 is now predicted to experience green glare, while it was previously predicted to see no glare. This change in predicted glare is due to the expanded Project area in the southwest. As noted in **Section 6.2**, glare at this level is not expected to create a hazardous situation or affect a resident’s use of their home.

Table 6-8 – Comparison of Annual Glare Levels for Dwellings near the Project (0° Resting Angle)

Receptor	Previous Assessment			Current Assessment		
	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)
R1	946	5	15	340	2	12
R2	1,131	0	15	477	0	13
R3	932	0	13	522	0	15
R4	2,094	8	15	1,180	1	12
R5	0	0	0	2,179	0	17

The two flight paths approaching the unregistered aerodrome were modeled in both SGHARs. **Table 6-9** compares the predicted glare in the previous report and this current report for flight paths from the unregistered aerodrome in the

±50° FOV. No glare was predicted in the ±25° FOV in this current report or the previous report. The predicted glare has changed minimally and has not changed the conclusions of the previous report. Green glare is not generally considered a hazard, and the ±50° FOV represents a conservative region where a pilot will not necessarily be adversely impacted by glare.

Table 6-9 – Annual Glare Levels for Flight Paths from Unregistered Aerodrome (±50° FOV, 0° Resting Angle)

Receptor	Previous Assessment			Current Assessment		
	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)
FP1 (north bound)	382	0	14	371	0	14
FP2 (south bound)	1,088	0	28	1,178	0	29

6.5 Mitigation

Drivers travelling along Township Road 124 and Township Road 130 are predicted to observe minimal to moderate levels of green and yellow glare from the Project. If glare is determined to be an issue after the Project is built, specific mitigation measures can be developed in consultation with the affected stakeholder. Potential mitigation measures for glare to road users include: modified backtracking behaviour; installing road signs to warn motorists of the potential glare at particular times of day and year; or, installing a sufficiently tall and opaque visual barrier along the route at impacted points. Due to the predicted duration and level of glare, mitigation is not expected to be required. If mitigation were to be required, then it is expected that any glare could be completely mitigated by altering the backtracking behaviour of the arrays. None of the route receptors are predicted to observe glare at any level from the Project in the models that used a resting angle of 4° or steeper. Given the minor nature of the route, it is suggested that barrier mitigation would be an unnecessary intervention. Overall, glare mitigation is not being proposed or recommended for the evaluated roadways.

Moderate green glare and/or minimal yellow glare have been predicted for the evaluated dwellings; however, glare at the predicted levels and durations are not expected to create a hazardous situation or negatively affect a resident’s use of their home. Furthermore, the results of the assessment are conservative as the models do not account for sun-masking, changes in weather patterns, or existing visual obstructions. Thus, glare mitigation is not being proposed or recommended for the evaluated dwellings.

Both assessed flight paths, FP1 and FP2, are only predicted to observe short to moderate annual and daily durations of green glare within the extended ±50° FOV. The predicted glare is completely within the green level, which is not generally considered a hazard. The green glare is only predicted within a viewing range outside the critical ±25° FOV, which will not necessarily have an adverse impact on a pilot’s vision or ability to safely operate their airplane. Glare at this level has a low potential to temporarily affect an operator’s vision, but it is not expected to create a hazardous situation. Glare mitigation is not being proposed or recommended for the evaluated for the evaluated flight paths.

If glare is determined to be an issue during the Project’s operation, specific mitigation measures may be designed to reduce or eliminate its impact on an observer, which may be developed in consultation with affected stakeholders. Potential mitigation measures may include installing blinds over windows, modified backtracking behaviour, or planting vegetation like trees or hedges. Any mitigation being contemplated should be based on the final or constructed project design to ensure the measures effectively address predicted or observed glare.

7 Summary

Solar modules are specifically designed to absorb light rather than reflect it. Moreover, most modules are now manufactured with anti-reflective coatings that help further mitigate the intensity of reflections, as is the case with the modules considered for the Project.

The assessment of the Dunmore Solar Power Plant was undertaken using GlareGauge software. The results are based on the assumptions and limitations set out in previous sections of this report. The SAT systems were modelled at their centroid heights with a maximum tracking angle of 60°. The assessment included models using resting/minimum backtracking angles of 0°-10°. Glare was only predicted by the models using resting angles between 0° and 8°, with the 0° resting angle model resulting in the most potential glare.

The ground-based route paths assessed for glare impacts included both directions of travel on sections of Highway 41, Range Road 42, Range Road 44, Township Road 124, and Township Road 130 at passenger, truck, and commercial vehicle heights. The routes were evaluated with a horizontal viewing angle of ±15° to capture potential glare within a vehicle operator's critical visual range, as well as ±25° to identify routes that may observe peripheral glare. Drivers travelling along the evaluated sections of Highway 41, Range Road 42, and Range Road 44 are not predicted to observe glare at any level from the Project, while Township Road 124 and 130 are predicted to observe minimal to moderate green and yellow glare from the Project. None of the route receptors are predicted to observe glare at any level from the Project in the models that used a resting angle of 4° or steeper.

In the worst case (0° resting angle), the assessed portion of Township Road 124 is the ground route predicted to observe the most glare from the Project. The results indicate that taller vehicles may see more glare than shorter vehicles. Along this route, observers are predicted to see yellow glare in the more critical ±15° FOV for a maximum of 850 minutes/year. The glare is predicted around sunrise and sunset between late March and late April, as well as mid-August and mid-September. The actual impact is expected to be less because vehicle operators will be travelling past the affected areas, not standing still while looking at the solar PV arrays. Satellite imagery shows that this is a remote road that is likely to experience minimal traffic, which further reduces the likelihood that there will be observers to see glare from the Project.

There is a minimal increase in predicted glare along the assessed sections of Township Road 124 and Township Road 130. The increase in predicted glare is not likely to increase the glare hazard in comparison to the previous report. Both reports concluded Highway 41, Range Road 42, and Range Road 44 are not predicted to experience glare from the Project. The previously approved conclusion that the Project is not expected to present a hazard to drivers along nearby roads still applies to the updated Project. Therefore, mitigation is not being recommended for the evaluated roads.

Five dwellings were evaluated in this assessment. Only one is within the 800m required for Rule 007, while the other four were included for consistency with the previous assessment. Dwellings were modelled at 4.5m above ground to conservatively represent two-storey buildings. Dwellings R1 and R4 are predicted to observe moderate annual durations of green glare from the Project and minimal yellow glare from the Project. R2, R3 and R5 are predicted to observe moderate annual durations of green glare from the Project and no yellow glare. In the worst-case models using 0° resting angle, R5 is the dwelling predicted to be the most impacted by glare from the Project. Observers are predicted to see green glare for a maximum of 2,179 minutes/year. The green glare is predicted at sunrise for up to 17 minutes per morning in March to September. The glare impacts experienced at R5 may be eclipsed by sun-masking.

The updated results predict that R1-R4 are to be less impacted by the Project compared with the previous report. The annual green and yellow glare for R1 to R4 has decreased. R5 is now predicted to experience green glare, while it was

previously predicted to see no glare. This change in predicted glare is due to the expanded Project area in the southwest. Glare at this level is not expected to create a hazardous situation or adversely affect a resident's use of their home. Therefore, mitigation is not being recommended for the evaluated dwellings.

Two flight paths approaching a private, unregistered aerodrome 3,900m northwest of the Project were included in this glare assessment. The flight paths were evaluated with a horizontal viewing angle of $\pm 25^\circ$ to capture potential glare within a pilot's critical visual range, as well as $\pm 50^\circ$ to identify routes that may observe peripheral glare. Both flight paths, FP1 and FP2, are only predicted to observe short to moderate annual and daily durations of green glare within the extended $\pm 50^\circ$ FOV and outside the $\pm 25^\circ$ FOV, but green glare is not generally considered a hazard. No glare is predicted on either flight path within the more critical $\pm 25^\circ$ FOV, so the predicted green glare has less potential to adversely affect a pilot's vision. FP1 and FP2 are not predicted to experience yellow glare within the $\pm 25^\circ$ FOV or $\pm 50^\circ$ FOV. FP2 approaches the unregistered aerodrome while heading south and it is the flight path predicted to observe the most glare from the Project. Along this flight path, pilots are only predicted to see green glare around sunrise from mid-November to mid-January for up to 29 minutes per morning. Pilots will only see a fraction of the predicted glare since they will be travelling past the affected portion of the flight path, not standing still while looking at the solar PV arrays, and sun-masking may also reduce potential glare impacts. The predicted glare is not expected to create hazardous conditions. The predicted glare has changed minimally between this current report and the previous report. Therefore, mitigation is not being recommended for the evaluated flight paths.

All glare results in this assessment are conservative predictions due to modelling assumptions and limitations. Obstructions blocking sightlines between observers and glare spots are not considered in the models, nor are reductions in glare due to changing weather conditions. The glare predicted in this assessment occurs around sunrise and/or sunset when sun-masking is also likely to reduce the perceived impact of glare from the Project as direct sunlight is expected to have a much greater effect. Thus, a lower likelihood of encountering hazardous glare is expected due to the conservatisms included in the models.

There were no railways identified within 800m of the Project, so none were evaluated in this assessment.

8 Conclusion

In conclusion, the Dunmore Solar Power Plant is not likely to have the potential to create hazardous glare conditions for the dwellings, roads, or flight paths that were assessed. The conclusions from this current report are in line with the conclusions of the previous report. The Project has the potential to create green and/or yellow glare conditions for some of the ground transportation routes, dwellings and flight paths that were assessed.

The actual glare impacts that will be experienced in the field along transportation routes are anticipated to be only a fraction of the results presented in this report. The actual impact is expected to be less because vehicle operators will be travelling past the affected areas, not standing still while looking at the solar PV arrays. The impact of the glare on affected receptors is expected to be reduced by sun-masking as the glare occurs around sunrise/sunset when the sun aligns with the glare spot and observer, and the sunlight glances across the arrays at a shallow angle. The results are also conservative because the models assume conditions are sunny and clear at all times, and they do not consider obstructions blocking sightlines between observers and glare spots.

Based on the assessment results, glare from the Dunmore Solar Power Plant is not expected to present a hazard to drivers along nearby roads, or pilots landing at the unregistered aerodrome. Glare is not expected to have an adverse effect on a resident's use of their home either.

9 Glare Practitioners' Information

Table 9-1 summarizes the information of the author and technical reviewer of the solar glare hazard analysis.

Table 9-1 – Summary of Practitioners' Information

Name	Laura Essak	Jacqueline Gallagher	Jason Mah
Title	Renewable Energy EIT	Project Manager	Senior Renewable Energy Engineer
Role	Glare Analyst, Author	Technical Reviewer	Technical Reviewer and Approver
Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSc Renewables Energy Engineering 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyst/reviewer on 15+ glare assessments in Alberta and the UK • BSc Chemistry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyst/reviewer on 50+ glare assessments in Alberta, BC, Nunavut, the USA, and the UK • Technical support for AUC information requests and hearings • Expert witness experience in technical solar development for the Sollair Solar Energy Project and Three Hills Solar Project • BSc Chemical Engineering • P.Eng. (APEGA)

Appendix A – ±50° FOV Results for Highway 41

Results in **Table A-1** used a ±50° FOV to assess the potential for peripheral glare observations along Highway 41. Glare predictions within this extended FOV do not necessarily represent an adverse impact on an observer, but they have been included to align with the AUC’s suggestion that evaluating a peripheral range may help provide additional broad context.^{38,39} The results of the very broad ±50° FOV models show that drivers travelling along Highway 41 are only predicted to experience minimal green glare. The predicted glare is not expected to impact drivers travelling along Highway 41 and does not change the conclusions of this assessment.

Table A-1 – Annual Route Path Glare Levels for Passenger Vehicles, Trucks/Buses, and Commercial Vehicles (±50° FOV)

Receptor	Green Glare (min/year)	Yellow Glare (min/year)	Red Glare (min/year)	Max Daily Glare (min/day)
Highway 41 (Passenger)	387	0	0	11
Highway 41 (Truck/Bus)	414	0	0	11
Highway 41 (Commercial)	373	0	0	11

³⁸ Decision 27842-D01-2024, Aira Solar Project and Moose Trail 1049S Substation (AUC, March 2024).

³⁹ The AUC decision suggesting the assessment of a ±50° FOV for highways was released in March 2024, after the previously submitted 2023 assessment. As such, corresponding results were not included in the previous glare assessments for the Project, but their inclusion in this report does not change any of the SGHA conclusions.



Registered Office

Green Cat Renewables Canada Corporation
855 – 401 9th Avenue SW
Calgary, Alberta
T2P 3C5

+1 866 216 2481

info@greencatrenewables.ca
www.greencatrenewables.ca