



July 29, 2026

**Honorable York County Council
P.O. Box 66
York, SC 29745**

Dear Members of York County Council:

On behalf of the employees at our Fort Mill site, their families, suppliers and customers we support across the country, I am writing to update you on the status of our operations and respond to efforts directed at you and other officials to restrict our operations.

Silfab Solar is a leading North American solar panel and cell manufacturer, providing more than 1,200 family-sustaining jobs, including more than 700 jobs in Fort Mill, to advance energy security and independence and support the rebirth of U.S. manufacturing. We are one of the largest private employers in York County and a major economic engine.

As you know, the Circuit Court recently issued an order in an ongoing zoning case that has led to confusion. The case was brought by Silfab to protect our ability to fully utilize our property and strengthen our operations in the future (beyond the uses listed in our current certificate of occupancy).

The decision involved a zoning interpretation and did not address the safety, quality or regulatory compliance of our existing operations, nor does it affect ongoing operations at the facility.

We operate in a safe manner consistent with state, federal and local regulations and requirements. Our operations have never caused any off-site injuries, and we have never been cited by any regulatory body, including OSHA, for any violations stemming from workplace injuries.

To the contrary, our rate of workplace-related incidents is below industry standards, and we have undergone voluntary certification to meet ISO 9001:2025 Quality Management System Standards, a process that reflects our commitment to continuously improve our work environment.

We continue to invest in our Fort Mill site with a focus on ensuring we are best-in-class from a health, safety and environmental standpoint, and we have also sought to increase our engagement with the community, including Fort Mill School District following its construction of new middle and elementary schools near our site.



We regularly update our website to share information with the community about our operations, established an on-demand communication system with key stakeholders to keep them informed, engaged a third-party engineering firm to guide further advancement of our operations and created specialized new positions for enhanced safety and compliance.

This work is part of the commitment we made to the York County community and our partners, including County and state governments, during the recruitment process that led Silfab to place our facility in Fort Mill.

As we follow through on our commitments, we respectfully ask our partners to follow through on the commitments they made to us, as well. This includes fostering an environment in which our employees can safely and confidently come to work each day knowing that decisions affecting their workplace will be guided by facts, law and a commitment to the well-being of York County residents.

While there have been challenges as we have ramped up operations, there is no legal or public safety basis for any action that would limit our ability to operate.

Doing so would cause serious harm to Silfab, our customers, our employees and their families. It would also have negative implications for the York County community and state, force unnecessary litigation regarding a taking of our property rights, jeopardize the significant investment the state and York County have made to recruit Silfab to come to South Carolina, have a chilling effect as other companies weigh business opportunities here and establish a concerning precedent that could allow zoning boards in other communities to reverse course and terminate business operations after businesses have been built and began operations.

Going forward, we welcome the opportunity to continue working collaboratively with you and other partners and look forward to constructive dialogue about how we can improve the future of our community, our state and our nation.

Thank you,

Paolo Maccario
President and CEO

CC: Governor Henry McMaster, Myra Reece (SCDES), Attorney General Alan Wilson, Fort Mill School District Board, Superintendent Grey Young, Sen. Mike Johnson, Rep. David Martin



Appendix

Please find below a list of answers to questions and concerns raised about Silfab Solar operations.

Claim: Public officials should immediately revoke permits or otherwise take steps to shut down or limit Silfab operations.

Fact: There is no legal or community safety reason for any action that would limit Silfab's ability to operate or otherwise impact our operations. County, state and federal agencies have found the facility does not present a threat to public health or safety.

Silfab operates in a safe manner consistent with state, federal and local regulations and requirements. There have never been any off-site injuries as a result of Silfab operations, and the company has never been cited by any regulatory body, including OSHA, for any violations stemming from workplace injuries.

Claim: The facility is harming the public through emissions.

Fact: The facility uses state-of-the-art emissions control systems and operates under permits issued by the state's environmental regulator. State law prohibits the state from issuing environmental permits unless SCDES determines facility operations would not harm public health and the environment. There has never been evidence of emissions exceeding regulatory standards. As part of its commitment to the community, Silfab has voluntarily installed air monitoring equipment between its facility and the nearby elementary and middle schools and provided the district with access to the data.

Claim: The company has failed to engage with the surrounding community.

Fact: The company has conducted extensive community outreach, including hosting onsite visits for elected officials, school district representatives, school staff and other stakeholders. It also established an on-demand message notification system to provide nearby schools with timely information regarding facility activities, among many other efforts. As part of its commitment to the community, Silfab has voluntarily installed air monitoring equipment between its facility and the nearby elementary and middle schools and provided the district with access to the data.

Claim: The company caused two evacuations of a nearby elementary school in March.

Fact: The school district evacuated its facilities after unplanned releases from the Silfab site in March that, according to emergency responders, did not pose a risk to health and safety. The decision to evacuate occurred after the school district was notified by responders the releases posed no threat to health and safety. Silfab is committed to working collaboratively with Fort Mill School District in support of the district's construction of new middle and elementary schools near the Silfab site.



Claim: The company created the current land-use conflict.

Fact: The facility was recruited to the area through economic development efforts by the state and county, and the site's zoning was reviewed and confirmed during the approval process. Silfab is committed to working collaboratively with Fort Mill School District in support of the district's construction of new middle and elementary schools near the Silfab site.

Claim: Regulators should refuse future permits or approvals at the site.

Fact: State law establishes a permitting process requiring environmental regulators to issue permits when statutory requirements are satisfied following public review and comment. The law also provides regulated entities with procedural protections, including notice and an opportunity for a hearing before permits may be revoked.

Claim: Regulators should issue additional enforcement orders against the facility.

Fact: Operations were temporarily halted for several days in March to allow comprehensive inspections by federal and state environmental agencies. Those inspections found the facility in compliance with applicable regulations governing regulated substances and risk management. Regulatory reviews continue to evaluate emergency response procedures and preventive measures.

Claim: Regulators should investigate or reverse approval of the facility's 50-foot exhaust stack.

Fact: The exhaust stack was reviewed and approved as part of the facility's comprehensive air permit following the required public notice and comment process. Environmental regulators and the administrative law court have reviewed and supported that permitting decision during litigation in defense of the established permitting process. We take seriously the obligation of SCDES to follow established permitting rules, ensure "maximum employment [and] industrial development of the State" as prescribed by the Pollution Control Act and prevent unwarranted delays to future permits after they are issued in accordance with S.C. Code Ann. 48-1-100(A).

Claim: Public health and safety justify immediate closure.

Fact: County, state and federal agencies have stated that the facility does not present an existing threat to public health or safety. Those findings do not provide a factual basis for suspension or revocation of operating approvals.

1. By law, SC DES cannot "[d]ecline to enter into any...arrangement that would authorize or expand Silfab operations." This would violate express provisions of the Pollution Control Act and established administrative procedures developed to prevent government overreach. "If, after appropriate public comment procedures, as defined by department regulations, the department finds that the discharge from the proposed outlet or source will not be in contravention of provisions of this chapter, a permit to construct and a permit to discharge must be issued to the applicant." S.C. Code Ann. 48-1-100(A). Statute reserves the guarantee "no permit shall be revoked without first providing an opportunity for a hearing." S.C. Code Ann. 48-1-50(5).