

APPENDIX F

Glare Analysis for Ground Traffic



April 11, 2011

Good Company
65 Centennial Loop, Suite B
Eugene, Oregon 97401

Mr. Thomas Buttgenbach
88FT 8ME LLC
10100 Santa Monica Blvd, Suite 300
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Dear Mr. Thomas Buttgenbach:

The purpose of this technical memo is to augment the *Potential Impacts from Reflection of Proposed Calexico Solar Farm I* report. The *Potential Impacts from Reflection of Proposed Calexico Solar Farm I* report analyzed the 88FT project as being constructed in one phase and under one conditional use permit. However after completing the *Potential Impacts from Reflection of Proposed Calexico Solar Farm I* report, the project's construction plan was modified to reflect a second conditional use permit that would allow the project to be constructed in more than one phase. We have reviewed and analyzed this modification and have determined that the conclusions in the *Potential Impacts from Reflection of Proposed Calexico Solar Farm I* report remain unchanged. In other words, the development of the project in more than one phase or CUP does not change the conclusions in the *Potential Impacts from Reflection of Proposed Calexico Solar Farm I* report. Please call me if you have any questions.

Joshua Skov

Principal, Good Company

Potential Impacts from Reflection of Proposed Calexico Solar Farm I

Draft Date: July 8, 2011

KEY FINDINGS

- Flat-plate photovoltaic solar panels are engineered to absorb, not reflect, sunlight. A panel with a single layer of anti-reflective coating reflects less than 10% of the sunlight striking it. By way of comparison agriculture vegetation reflects between 18 and 25% of solar radiation.
- In order to maximize electricity production, panels are oriented toward the south and facing the sun, resulting in angles of reflection above the built environment and nearby traffic corridors.

8minutenergy, LLC asked Good Company, a sustainability research and consulting firm, to prepare a high-level analysis of the potential for hazardous glare conditions at the proposed site for the Calexico Solar Farm I, which is located 5 miles west of Calexico in Imperial County, California. The project site is comprised of seven parcels of land with a total area of 1,333 acres. See Appendix A for aerial photographs of the site.

The proposed project is a ground-mounted photovoltaic array that would make use of flat-plate, monocrystalline silicon photovoltaic modules. In conducting the reflection analysis, Good Company considered two design alternatives: 1) a south facing fixed-axis array and 2) a single-axis polar mounted array that partially tracks the path of the sun from east to west.

This analysis focused on the direct reflection impacts from the proposed Calexico Solar Farm I on nearby roads, buildings. The reflection impacts on aircraft using Calexico International Airport are addressed in a separate Reflectivity Analysis completed by Aztec Engineering in April 2011. See that report for details.

Reflectivity of Flat-plate Photovoltaic Solar Panels

Flat-plate photovoltaic solar panels are designed to absorb sunlight in order to convert it into electricity. Monocrystalline silicon wafers, the basic building block of most photovoltaic solar modules, absorb up to seventy percent of the sun's solar radiation in the visible light spectrum¹. Solar cells are typically encased in a transparent material referred to as an encapsulant and covered with a transparent cover film, commonly glass. The addition of these protective layers further reduces the amount of visible light reflected from photovoltaic modules. Photovoltaic panels are using the absorbed energy in two ways; 1) the panels generate electricity, and 2) the mass of the panels heat up.

In order to maximize the efficiency of electricity production, photovoltaic manufacturers design their panels to minimize the amount of reflected sunlight. The most common methods to accomplish this are the application of anti-reflective coatings and surface texturing of solar cells. Combined, these techniques can reduce reflection losses to a few percent.² Most solar panels are now designed with at least one anti-reflective layer and some panels have multiple layers.


¹ Luque and Heeds. 2003. *Handbook of Photovoltaic Science and Engineering*. Wiley and Sons, New Jersey.

² Ibid.

Comparison of the Reflectivity of Solar Panel to the Surrounding Environment

One measure of the reflectivity is albedo — the ratio of solar radiation across the visible and invisible light spectrum reflected by a surface. Albedo varies between 0, a surface that reflects no light, and 1, a mirror-like surface that reflects all incoming light. Solar panels with a single anti-reflective coating have a reflectivity of around 0.10.³ By comparison, sand has an albedo between 0.15 and 0.45 and agricultural vegetation has an albedo between 0.18 and 0.25.⁴ In other words, the solar panels have a lower reflectivity than the area's prevailing ground cover, agricultural crops.

Figure 1: Albedo comparison for various surfaces.



Visibility of a Direct Reflection of Sunlight for South Facing Fixed Mount Panels

In order to maximize electricity production, fixed (non-tracking) solar panels must be oriented toward the sun as much as possible. Per project specifications, this analysis assumes that the panels will face polar south at a tilt of 25 degrees above horizontal.

The position of the sun relative to the solar panels will vary by the time of day and time of year. As a result, the angle of direct reflection from the panels will also vary accordingly. The greatest likelihood of a low-angle of direct reflection that might impact the built environment occurs midday on the summer solstice when the sun is at its highest point in the sky and the angle of reflection is lowest (see Figure 2 below). The potential impact at that moment is the best proxy for maximum impact overall.

During summer solstice at the proposed project's latitude, the sun's solar elevation is approximately 80 degrees⁵. With the sun at this height, the resulting angle of direct reflection is approximately 50 degrees above the horizon. It is unlikely that any objects in the built environment near the project site would be adversely affected by a direct reflection of sunlight from this angle, including vehicles traveling on nearby roads or houses south of the project site.


During the winter months, when the sun travels across the sky at lower angles relative to the horizon, the angle of reflection and the resulting height of the reflected sunlight are higher. At midday on the winter solstice at the proposed project's latitude, the sun's solar elevation is approximately 34 degrees. At this angle of elevation, the resulting angle of reflection is 96 degrees. At this angle of reflection, the height of the reflected sunlight would exceed 190 feet in elevation at a distance of only 20 feet away and the further away from the array the greater the height of the reflected sunlight.

³ Lanier and Ang. 1990. *Photovoltaic Engineering Handbook*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

⁴ Budikova, Dagmar. 2010. "Albedo." *Encyclopedia of Earth*. Washington, D.C.: Environmental Information Coalition, National Council for Science and the Environment. Retrieved July 5, 2010 at <http://www.eoearth.org/article/Albedo>.

⁵ Based on a Sun Path Chart produced using the University of Oregon Solar Radiation Monitoring Laboratory's Sun Chart software available on-line at <http://solar.dat.uoregon.edu/SunChartProgram.php> and assuming a latitude of 32.39 degrees north.

Figure 2: The range of the sun's angle-of-reflection depending on the time of year.



The following narrative provides the height of direct reflection relative to nearby points of concern for June 21st (the date that produces the lowest angles of direct reflection).

At a distance of only 20 feet (the approximate distance from the southern edge of the Calexico Solar Farm I project, array sections Parcel II and Parcel III, to the edge of Anza Road), the height of the reflected sunlight from the array would be nearly 24 feet in elevation, well above the California truck height limit of 14 feet. It's important to note that Anza Road and other roads in the immediate vicinity of the proposed arrays are not major transportation corridors and as such are not expected to support significant passenger or commercial traffic. Additionally the project developer has proposed to construct an 8-foot slatted fence around the perimeter of the project, further obscuring the peripheral view of the project (and any indirect reflection).

There is a house located south of the Calexico Solar Farm I, below the Parcel II arrays. The house is 250 feet south of the proposed arrays. At this distance, the height of direct reflection is 298 feet, the height of a 20-story building⁶.

⁶ This number of floors assumes a height of 15 feet per floor.

Figure 3: Map of the points listed in Figure 4 and the “on the ground” distance from each point to the array.



Figure 4: Elevation of direct reflection for the points shown on Figure 3.

Point on Figure 3	Elevation of Direct Reflection	
	miles	feet
A	0.60	3,147
B	1.19	6,294
C	0.36	1,890

Visibility of an Indirect Reflection of Sunlight

While this analysis focuses on direct reflection in theory, we must also consider the potential for indirect reflections (the visibility of diffused sunlight on the surface of the panels). As with the potential for direct reflections, indirect reflections are not a significant concern⁷. Indirect reflections are by definition significantly less intense— for example, moving just 30 degree off a direct reflection lowers light intensity by nearly 80%⁸. While at certain times of the day an observer would have a view of an indirect reflection, the relative intensity of the reflection would not be significant or a concern. Additionally the project developer has proposed to construct an 8-foot slatted fence around the perimeter of the project further obscuring the peripheral view of the project.

Comparison of Fixed Mount and Single-axis Tracking Mount on Direct Solar Reflection

Like the fixed-axis array configuration, the panels of a single-axis tracking array would also have an angle of inclination of approximately 25 degrees. Since this angle of inclination remains constant between the two configurations, the lowest potential angle of reflection remains the same. As with a fixed-axis array the greatest potential for a low angle of reflection, that might impact the built environment, occurs midday on the summer solstice when the sun is at its highest point in the sky.

The key difference between a fixed-axis and single-axis tracking configuration is the cardinal direction of reflected sunlight. At midday on the summer solstice, the time of year most likely to produce a low angle of reflection, both configurations would be facing south and reflect light back in the same direction. At other times of the year the angles of reflection would be higher and as such the height of direct reflection would increase compared to summer solstice.

⁷ A number of other studies conducted for proposed solar projects have sought to quantify the potential for the diffuse reflection of sunlight from the surface of solar panels and reached similar conclusions. For additional information see “Panache Valley Solar Farm Project Glint and Glare Study” (www.panochesolar.info/app/jun2010/Glint_Glare_Study.pdf) and “Topaz Solar Farm Reflection Study” (<http://www.slacounty.ca.gov/Assets/PL/Optisolar-Topaz+Solar+Farm/Documents/Application+Submittal+232/Attachment+C+-+Topaz+Solar+Farm+Reflection+Study.pdf>).

⁸ TrinaSolar. “Reflection Coefficient of Trina Solar Modules.” Personal communication with Thomas Houghton, June 30, 2010.

Appendix A: Glare Analysis Explanation

Angle of Direct Reflection Off Panels

According to the sun path diagram charting the sun's movement at the proposed project's latitude, the sun is shining at its highest point at 12:00 PM on the summer solstice (June 21).⁹ At this point the sun is shining at an 80-degree angle directly upon the south facing solar panels. Note that the fixed-tilt solar panels are set at 25° above horizon.

Figure 7 to the right depicts this reflection. All angles within a triangle summed equal 180°. From this rule it is simple algebra to obtain that **z** equals 75°. Because

a and **z** are vertical angles, **a** also equals 75°. Once **b** is calculated (a flat plane also equals 180° so subtracting $180^\circ - 2a$ equals **b**) the calculation of the angle of the sun's reflection is easy to complete using the same formula ($180^\circ - (z + x) - 25^\circ$). The angle of the sun's reflection is 50°.

Figure 7: Angle of direct reflection on summer solstice (June 21).





Figure 8: Angle of direct reflection on winter solstice (Dec. 21).



Similar calculations are performed to determine the angle of the sun's reflection when the sun hits the solar panels at a low point during winter solstice on December 21st (see Figure 8, a 34-degree angle). From determining that **x** plus **z** equals 121° ($180^\circ - 34^\circ - 25^\circ$) and looking at the vertical angles ($x = b$) and ($z = a$), it is then possible to calculate that the angle of the sun's reflection is 96° ($r = 180^\circ - z - 25^\circ$).

⁹ Based on a Sun Path Chart produced using the University of Oregon Solar Radiation Monitoring Laboratory's Sun Chart software available on-line at <http://solardat.uoregon.edu/SunChartProgram.php> and assuming a latitude of 32.40 degrees north.

Determining the Height of Reflection

The lowest potential reflection angle, determined to be 50 degrees, was used to estimate the height of the sun's reflection. Trigonometry calculations are used to project the height of the reflection. It is important to point out that there are no notable elevation rises surrounding the sited Calexico Solar Farm I. Figure 9 to the right shows the basic calculations to determine the height of the sun's reflection. In the visual, A is representative of the horizontal distance. Any distance measurement can be input into the formula to find B, which represents the height of the sun's reflection at the distance input.

Figure 9: Calculation to determine direct reflection.





Figure 10 is an aerial picture of the sited Calexico Solar Farm I from Google Earth (below) has overlaying lines to show clearly the U.S. – Mexico Border (yellow line) as well as the four portions of the project which serve as the boundaries for the panel arrays in this project. Figure 10 also shows distances from the southern edge of the panel arrays to nearby roads and built structures (blue lines). The bullet points below Figure 10 describe the height of the direct reflection at the various distances shown by the blue lines.

Figure 10: Aerial image of the proposed Calexico Solar Farm I and distances to nearby built structures and roads.




- At 20 feet from the solar panels the height of the reflection is already at 24 feet.
- At 250 feet from the solar panels the height of the reflection is 298 feet or higher.
- At 400 feet from the solar panels the height of the reflection is 477 feet or higher.
- See the Reflectivity Analysis conducted by Aztec Engineering for details on potential impacts to aircraft utilizing Calexico International Airport.

Panels On a Single-axis Tracker

The proposed project may also feature panels mounted on single-axis polar trackers enabling the panels to rotate 45° off of due south. The single-axis tracker will widen the area of reflection, but no reflection will fall below the lowest angle of 50°. The visual below depicts this difference with the blue dashed lines representing the reflection from the panels mounted on the single-axis tracker and the orange dotted lines representing the panels at a set tilt.

Figure 11: Direction of direct reflection based from single-axis tracker (blue) and fixed (orange).



APPENDIX G

Glare Analysis for Air Traffic

CALEXICO Solar Farm I (88FT 8ME, LCC)

REFLECTIVITY ANALYSIS

REVISION INDEX

Page/Reason	REV	Date	PROD	CHECK	APRV
All	0	04/13/2010	JDL	JDL	JDL

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Definitions	4
3	Mathematical analysis	6
3.1	Reference coordinate system	6
3.2	Sun position	7
3.3	Reflection equations for fixed tilt system	9
3.4	Flight plane and reflectivity at Calexico runway (fixed systems)	12
3.5	Reflection equations for horizontal axis trackers	16
3.5.1	Backtracking	18
3.6	Reflectivity analysis with horizontal axis trackers at Calexico	20
4	Conclusion	22

1 Introduction

This document analyzes the risk of sun reflectivity due to a series of photovoltaic (PV) power plants being developed by 88FT 8ME, LLC. Project location is nearby the Calexico airport in Imperial County, CA. Reflectivity events due to the presence of PV modules might affect airplane visibility while approaching the corresponding airport runway if reflected sun light beam intersects the approaching flight path.

Fig. 1 shows the location of the future PV plant relative to Calexico airport.




Fig 1.- Location of PV Project and Calexico airport

To evaluate the risk of direct sun light reflection events a mathematical (geometric) model has been developed. The model predicts when in the year there is a possibility for approaching or taking-off airplanes to suffer direct reflection.

2 Definitions

The following definitions and descriptions are key to understanding the methodology and results of the study:

Photovoltaic Module – Photovoltaic panels, also known as PV modules. By nature, PV panels are designed to absorb as much of the solar spectrum as possible in order to convert sunlight to electricity. Reflectivity levels of solar panels are decisively lower than standard glass or galvanized steel, and should not pose a reflectance hazard to viewers. The next graph relates the reflectivity properties of solar modules in function of the incidence angle, and compares with other common reflecting surfaces in an airport environment:



Reflected light from PV modules' surface is just between 10% - 20% of the incident radiation, as low as water surfaces, while galvanized steel (used in industrial roofs) is between 40% and 90%. It should also be noted that high incidence angles are always related to low sun elevation angles (i.e, the sun beams are close to be tangent to the reflecting surface) and, in this case, the intensity of incident light is much lower than -say- noon time.

Glint – Also known as a specular reflection, produced by direct reflection of the sun beam in the surface of the PV solar panel. This is the potential source of the visual issues regarding viewer distraction. Glint is highly directional, since its origin is purely reflective.

Glare – Is a continuous source of brightness, relative to diffused light. This is not a direct reflection of the sun, but rather a reflection of the bright sky around the sun disk. Technically this is described as the

reflection of the circumsolar diffuse component. Glare is significantly less intense than glint and have negligible effects. As Glare is the reflection of diffuse irradiance is not directional. Other glare sources in the nature (often called Albedo reflectance) are much more intense that glare from PV modules, for instance agricultural environment has higher Glare effect than PV modules.

Key View Point (KVP) – KVPs are viewpoints used in the glint and glare study. In this analysis, KVP can be any point in the most probable airplane approaching path to the airport runway.




Fig 2 .- Glint and Glare identification from a PV installation

3 Mathematical analysis

3.1 Reference coordinate system

Solar reflection from flat surfaces is a mathematical problem that can be solved by means of 3D geometry concepts. In order to properly relate sun position, PV modules position and orientation, and KVP location; is necessary to define a global coordinate system to which the previous position and orientation will be referred to.

In this analysis, the 3D Cartesian coordinate system is defined as follows:

Positive X-Axis	Pointing South
Positive Y-Axis	Pointing East
Positive Z-Axis	Pointing upwards

Origin of the coordinate system is chosen at the future PV plant location, as shown in Fig. 3 below:



Fig 3 .- Reference coordinate system

Next image shows a 3D rendering of the future project



3.2 Sun position

Instantaneous sun position is defined by two angular (spherical) coordinates. These angles are Azimuth (φ) and Elevation (θ). Azimuth is the deviation of sun's horizontal projection from South, while elevation is the angle between the horizontal plane and sun's position. The following graphs illustrates above definitions, and criteria for positive values:




Fig 4.- Sun position coordinates

Sun position can be also defined by a unit-length pointing vector $s = (A, B, C)$. Cartesian coordinates of the sun position vector are written in terms of the azimuth and elevation angles as follows:

$$A = \cos \theta \cos \varphi$$

$$B = -\cos \theta \sin \varphi$$

$$C = \sin \theta$$

Azimuth and elevation angular coordinates (φ, θ) are both function of:

- Earth latitude (L) at the origin
- Time: Day of the year (i) and hour of the day (H)

and can be calculated as per the following equations:

Earth declination:

$$D = 23.45 \sin(0.986[284 + i])$$

Azimuth and elevation angles:

$$\sin \theta = \sin D \sin L + \cos D \cos L \cos H$$

$$\cos \varphi = \frac{\sin D \cos L - \cos D \sin L \cos H}{\cos \theta}$$

In the above expressions the day of the year (i) is following a Julian day convention (January, 1st is i=1; February, 1st is i = 32,... until i =365). The hour of the day (H) is referred to noon time (12:00 is H = 0; 10:00 is H = -2; 14:00 is H = +2; ... etc).

As an example, the calculated values for azimuth and elevation angles for the equinox (March, 21st, i = 80) are plotted in function of the hour of the day in the next graph:




Fig 5.- Sun position coordinates in function of hour of the day

Negative values of the elevation angle means night time (the sun is below the horizon). In the above example the daylight period is 12 hours and the azimuth at sunrise is -90° (pure East), as expected for the equinox. Maximum elevation angle (at noon) is 56.88° for this latitude and particular day.

For the purpose of geometric calculations later in this report, the relevant results are the Cartesian coordinates of the sun position vector (A, B, C). For the sample day above, these are plotted in Fig. 6:




Fig 6.- Sun position Cartesian coordinates in function of hour of the day

3.3 Reflection equations for fixed tilt system

PV modules are considered reflecting planes located at the origin of the coordinate system (O). A plane is geometrically defined by its perpendicular (normal) unit vector [n].

Notation for Cartesian coordinates of this fixed vector is $n = (A_p, B_p, C_p)$. From the PV plant optimum design, the PV modules are facing South with a tilt angle of 25° , as shown in Fig. 7.

Then the fixed coordinates of this normal vector for the reflecting plane are given by:

$$A_p = \sin 25^\circ = 0.42262$$

$$B_p = 0$$

$$C_p = \cos 25^\circ = 0.90630$$





Fig 7.- Reflecting surfaces – Coordinates and typical PV design

Reflection of sun beams by a given surface can be calculated once the direction of the incident beam and plane orientation is known.

Instantaneous solar beam direction vector $s = (A, B, C)$ and reflecting plane normal vector $n = (A_p, B_p, C_p)$ intersects at the origin, and both defines a new plane in the space. From reflectivity laws, the reflected beam vector $r = (A_r, B_r, C_r)$ will be contained in this plane and symmetric to the incident beam with respect to the reflecting surface vector, as shown in the next figures:




Fig 8.- Reflecting surfaces – Notation for reflected beam vector

A relevant variable in this figure is the incidence angle [γ], which measures the angle between the incident sun beam vector and the surface normal. No reflection can occur when the incidence angle is equal or larger than 90° . This situation will occur whenever the sun is behind the PV modules surface. The incidence angle can be calculated as per the dot product of unit vectors [s] and [n]:

$$\cos \gamma = \vec{s} \cdot \vec{n} = A A_p + B B_p + C C_p$$

The symmetric-reflected vector [r] is calculated as

$$\vec{r} = 2 \cos \gamma \vec{n} - \vec{s}$$

and its Cartesian coordinates given by:

$$A_r = 2 \cos \gamma A_p - A$$

$$B_r = 2 \cos \gamma B_p - B$$

$$C_r = 2 \cos \gamma C_p - C$$

For example, for the equinox day chosen the results for (Ar, Br, Cr) are plotted below in function of the hour of the day. Incidence angle cosine also included.




Fig 9.- Reflected vector coordinates and incidence angle

3.4 Flight plane and reflectivity at Calexico runway (fixed systems)

To define the location of relevant KVP it is hereby assumed that the approaching airplane follows a straight line contained in a vertical plane (the “flight plane”) that also contains the runway axis (Fig. 10).




Fig 10.- Geometry of approaching path

The vertical flight plane, containing the approaching path, is defined by the following equation in the reference Cartesian axis system:

$$\Pi \equiv 0.9997 x - 0.0239 y = 0$$

The flight plane contains the PV plant, as shown in Fig.3. Several days along the year and at certain hours, a reflected beam vector will be contained in the flight plane, but relevant glint might occur only if the elevation angle of the reflected beam is coincident with the flight approaching angle, in either East or West directions.

Runway azimuth is 88.63°. Cartesian coordinates for any reflected beam $r = (A_r, B_r, C_r)$, if contained in the flight plane, shall satisfy the following condition (beam azimuth):

$$\frac{B_r}{A_r} = \tan 88.63^\circ = 41.814$$

The angle between the horizontal plane and the reflected vector (reflection elevation angle) is given by

$$\tan \theta_r = \frac{C_r}{\sqrt{A_r^2 + B_r^2}}$$

Fig. 14 shows the hourly evolution of the above functions for a sample day (March, 2nd)





Fig 14.- Angular coordinates of reflected beam (March, 2nd)

It can be seen that the reflected beam will be contained in the flight plane at 07:30h (after sunrise) and at 15:45h (before sunset). The reflected beam will be pointing upwards with an angle of 23.9° and 34.6° respectively.



Obviously, the reflection held at 07:30 would affect airplanes landing Calexico from West, while the reflection held at 15:45h would affect airplanes landing or launching from East. In both cases, a long-term glint exposure would only occur if the airplanes were landing at the same particular angles (i.e., 23.9° and 34.6° respectively). It should be noted that normal landing angles are within the range of 3° and 6°, so in this particular day no risk of prolonged glint is possible.

The same procedure is repeated for all days in a year. Results in Fig.15 shows the elevation angle of the reflected beam in function of the day, whenever the in-plane condition occurs. Bandwidth between estimated minimum and maximum airplane landing angles (3° and 6°) is superimposed :




Fig 15.- Reflected beam elevation angle and landing angles – Runway 29

There are a few days in the year where there is an eventual risk of glint from the PV modules to landing airplanes. These particular days are 72 to 75 (2nd week of March - morning time) and 80 to 83 (3rd week of March - evening time). Because of yearly symmetry, the same occurs in mid-October.

Fig. 16 shows sun coordinates for a typical day in these periods (day 73). Interference with landing path occurs at around 07:37 hours, sun azimuth is -84° and elevation only 3°. Therefore airplanes reaching Calexico airport runway from the West end will have the sun disc just in front of them. It is considered that glint effect is negligible when compared to direct sun light exposure, as in this case.

Similarly, planes landing or launching from the East at day (say) 82, will be facing the sun disc at sunset, and again the risk of glint is negligible when compared to the light intensity of direct sun.





Fig 16.- Sun position for selected typical interference day – Green vertical line shows time of interference with airplane landing path.

3.5 Reflection equations for horizontal axis trackers

Tracker systems are mechanical devices that continuously change the PV modules orientation with sun position, so to obtain the maximum irradiance at any time during the day. In particular, the horizontal axis trackers are oriented in North-South direction, so the modules attached to the horizontal rotating axis are inclined towards East during sunrise and are rotated towards West as the earth rotates.

Vector coordinates for the reflected beam are the same as described in paragraph 3.3, but in this case the vector perpendicular to the modules is not constant along the day, but rotating with the horizontal tracker axis. Target is to keep the incidence angle as close a zero as possible.






Fig 17.- Normal vector to PV modules in an horizontal axis tracker

Given the instantaneous rotation of the tracker as an angle (β), the normal vector $n=(A_p, B_p, C_p)$ perpendicular to the plane of the modules is

$$\begin{aligned} A_p &= 0 \\ B_p &= -\sin \beta \\ C_p &= \cos \beta \end{aligned}$$

The objective is to track for the minimum incidence angle (γ). This will occur also if the cosine of the incidence angle (γ) is a maximum:

$$\cos \gamma = \vec{s} \cdot \vec{n} = A A_p + B B_p + C C_p$$

this can be written as

$$\cos \gamma = -B \sin \beta + C \cos \beta$$

The minimum incidence angle occurs when

$$\frac{d(\cos \gamma)}{d\beta} = -B \cos \beta - C \sin \beta = 0 \quad \tan \beta = -\frac{B}{C}$$

Which describes the rotation angle of the tracker in function of sun position, and hence the coordinates for the vector perpendicular to the plane of the PV modules.

3.5.1 Backtracking

At low sun elevation angles (i.e., sunrise and sunset), the trackers would be fully deployed and mutual shading between successive rows of modules will occur. To avoid this situation, the tracking control system has the so called backtracking algorithm, which defines the tracker rotation angle so to avoid this mutual shading. When the backtracking is active, the tracker will not rotate to follow the sun path, but to avoid mutual shading between rows. This occurs every day early in the morning and late in the evening, and depends on the PV plant geometry, day of the year and latitude.




Fig 18.- Above: Mutual shading without backtracking.
Below: Backtracking corrected incidence angle to avoid mutual shading

The tracker angle when the backtracking is active is given by the following equation:

$$\tan \theta = \frac{L \sin \beta}{p - L \cos \beta}$$

Where [L] is the length of the modules (6.46 ft) and [p] is the pitch between tracker rows (19.6 ft). Maximum tracker angle is $\pm 45^\circ$ for mechanical and constructive reasons.

Fig. 19 shows the tracker angle, together with sun elevation angle for a sample day (March, 21st).




Fig 19.- Tracker angle on a sample day

Cartesian coordinates of the reflected beam, and incidence angle are shown in Fig. 20,




Fig 20.- Cartesian coordinates for reflected beam on a sample day. Incidence angle is very low, thus optimizing irradiance on PV modules with trackers.

3.6 Reflectivity analysis with horizontal axis trackers at Calexico

The procedure described in 3.4 is repeated now for the moving reflecting surfaces. The flight plane contains the PV plant, as shown in Fig.3. Several days along the year and at certain hours, a reflected beam vector will be contained in the flight plane, but relevant glint might occur only if the elevation angle of the reflected beam is coincident with the flight approaching angle, in either East or West directions.

As an example, Fig. 21 shows the azimuth and elevation angle of the reflected beam. The green line defines the flight-plane azimuth condition for Calexico, thus the reflected beam will be contained in this particular plane at 8:45am and 3:00pm, but in both cases the beam elevation angle is well over 40°, so there is no risk for glint.




Fig 21.- Angular coordinates for reflected beam (day 172)

The same calculation is repeated for a complete year and results shown in Fig. 22.

It can be seen that whenever the reflected beam is contained in the flight-plane, its elevation angle is very far from the usual approaching or launching angles to the airport, so there is no risk of glint with trackers.




Fig 21.- One year results for elevation angles of reflected beam when contained in the flight plane. For the six month period from October to March the reflected beam is never contained in the flight-plane.

4 Conclusion

PV installations are based on photovoltaic modules with low reflectivity characteristics. Just 10% of the incident radiation is reflected, but this might produce some glint to KVPs. For this Project, it is considered that airplanes landing at or taking-off from Calexico airport might be exposed to glint.

To determine the glint risk, a geometric analysis is done for both scenarios: Fixed tilt PV modules and Horizontal Axis trackers. The analysis is conducted for a complete year in intervals of 15 minutes (that is 35040 points). All mathematical expressions hereby described are implemented in a computer routine.

In the case of fixed tilt PV fields it has been demonstrated that, in the few cases when there is some risk of glint by PV modules, the airplane will also be directly facing the sun disk, so it can be concluded that glint from PV modules will not have any relevant effect on airplanes' visibility, nor deteriorate the actual approaching or launching flight conditions.

If the PV plant is built with horizontal axis tracking technology, the eventual reflected beam would have a high elevation angle (that is, pointing upwards), so no interference with approaching or launching airplanes from Calexico airport will ever occur.

The same conclusions can be extended to other tracking technologies (single inclined axis or double axis trackers). With these devices, the tracking efficiency is higher than with horizontal axis trackers, therefore the incident angle is even lower, and the reflected beam will be pointing the sun disk more closely. Risk for glint when landing or launching might theoretically occur only at low sun elevation angles (i.e., sunrise or sunset); however, during these particular hours the backtracking technology modifies the tracking algorithm to avoid mutual shading thus re-orientating the reflected beams upwards, far from the flight path.

It is concluded that this Project will not have any relevant glint effect for airplanes landing at or taking-off from Calexico airport. This is also applicable regardless of whether the Project is built in one, two or more phases.