

Western Massachusetts Solar Forum, Part II - Attendee Comments

The following are comments and questions received from attendees during Part II. These comments have been shared with the speakers for their information. We are not asking or expecting the speakers to offer direct answers to any questions. Thank you to all who have provided these comments.

#	Question/Comment	Name
1	Just curious. How many people are attending today?	Anonymous Attendee
2	How can you assure that this great Federal funding such as Solar for all is distributed to some of the very poor western mass hilltowns that have no industry and high taxes?	Anonymous Attendee
3	Please describe the reasoning behind eliminating the breakout sessions	Don Ogden
4	I am wondering, just as others are. is Massachusetts asking people to do anything? such as using less energy altogether rather than contuning our continued expansion of energy use while supporting an endless energy buildout. there are so many examples of consumption such as bitcoin, AI and even cannibis growing. May I be one to say I would rather deal with rolling brown outs than the endless degradation of nature. Frankly if we do not understand that we are a supremely selfish species, we cannot really deal with the global warming issues. The law to reduce emissions is not tenable--how much damage will you force upon the public.	Janet Sinclair
5	And please stop funding biomass as "clean" energy. It's pretty crazy to fund that, don't you agree?	Janet Sinclair
6	Given the Global Warming Solutions Act requirements don't you understand that our forests are critical for natural carbon capture and that science has shown clearcutting such forests for solar is selfdefeating?	Don Ogden
7	What can be done to reject obviously inappropriately sited battery energy storage systems, such as the 105 MW system proposed for the Town of Wendell? This is an example of what is wrong with State energy planning efforts. How can you get this right?	Glen Ayers
8	What about geothermal?	Sandra Martin
9	In what ways and to what extend are our state processes, funding, etc. entangled with federal policy, etc.? How might the outcome of the presidential election affect MA goals?	Anonymous Attendee

10	<p>Question 1 for Michael Judge. Regarding Constructive Approval (automatic approval when permitting body does not act). If there is a state permitting agency established to manage permitting of these complex projects from 351 communities, it seems there is a likelihood that this agency might not have the capacity and throughput to act by the many applications it receives within the 12 month plus period allowed. This might seem like a reasonable period of time but dubious given a likely volume. This would mean that projects would be automatically approved, AS PROPOSED, meaning poorly sited or designed projects will be allowed forward with no action. It seems like a presumption that a state agency can handle these many applications looking a turnaround times for existing permits for EFSB. The volume would be increased based on Commission's recommendation but even greater based on H4501 threshold for state only permitting. I think policy makers need to be clear eyed about likelihood of constructive approvals.</p>	MICHAEL DECHIARA
11	<p>Question 2 for Michael Judge regarding consolidated local permitting. Most of the local boards/committees are guided, in whole or in part, by statute. And each local board/committee has different focus of interest and responsibility - again established by statute. So it seems conceptually convenient to say local boards should have a consolidated permit but I would suggest the heavy lift is to change statute for all these boards to create a process for consolidation. There is also the Open Meeting Law which many folks at the state level don't need to think about but which local folks deal with constantly. Even if statute addresses the content issues for local boards, there needs to be change in statute regarding OML process. How and when a quorum among coordinating boards is reached and managed must be addressed. This is a huge issue that I believe is being overlooked. Not complying with OML will legally endanger any permits, thereby slowing rather than speeding things up</p>	MICHAEL DECHIARA
12	<p>In looking at supporting communities, were issues of enforcement discussed? If construction problems arise, as we've seen in some of the solar construction, how can harmful events be mitigated before things get really disastrous, without depending on small towns to enforce environmental regulations, but help from more resourced-entities?</p>	Anonymous Attendee
13	<p>How will new EFSB process speed up deployment of solar if only managing process for projects over 25MW. To date there are only a handful of renewable projects over 25 MW - these were onshore wind. It;s this class of less than of 25MW solar facilities that will determine whether we meet our CECP targets?</p>	john pepi
14	<p>Incentives guide action. Having a 25MW threshold to avoid local permitting will likely fuel development of projects 25MW+. as developers seek to go to a state permitting agency. I offer the SMART program as an example where the 5MW ceiling for subsidies resulted in many/most solar projects being just under 5MW. This would result in greater siting pressures for larger projects</p>	MICHAEL DECHIARA
15	<p>Is there a way to evaluate siting within larger contexts? For example, what is approved in one town may affect the overall footprint of several towns in aggrigate. And also neighbor state or bio-regional contexts?</p>	Anonymous Attendee

16	I would suggest that Michael Judge is wrong. DOER regs allowing municipal regulation of solar cannot trump the Dover Amendment since that is statute. Without the Climate legislation removing solar exemption, this will create more confusion rather than clarity. I cite DOER's 2014 model solar bylaw which says the right things but cautions that its advice cannot avoid the issue of Ch40A Sec3 para 9 - solar exemption	MICHAEL DECHIARA
17	the dover amendment is irrelevant if you look at the history and intent of that law. You should all support making that language go away. It is now being abused by developers. If you are not understanding this, I think you are being disingenuous.	Janet Sinclair
18	How can the state or local authorities begin processing energy projects without having in place first site suitability standards. Will the state produce a statewide map to prevent developers from going after sites that the state determines is low suitability, This would save time and money spent on problematic sites.	Al Norman
19	This addresses state and local permitting, to what extent will the investor-owned interconnection approval process be altered as a result of proposed reforms?	Andrew Smith
20	Why don't you just repeal the Dover amendment? dsection 7 of H 4501 already prohibits any municipality from having any power of permitting,	Al Norman
21	Is there any discussion in all of this having us all use less energy?	Arlen Gould
22	people are asking a lot of questions about H4501 and H4503. It would be great for that to be explained, understanding that of course these are bills, not laws	Janet Sinclair
23	Will Gov./Admin new legislative draft proposal to provide funding for munis under 7,500 population to intervene in EFSB proceedings - also allow them to get intervenor funding when an applicant appeals to EFSB a permit decision made in muni where muni has jurisdiction (i.e. <25 MW solar).?	john pepi
24	You mentioned zoning authority and the Dover Amendment. What role will local Boards of Health play in protecting public health, welfare, and community safety as this siting and permitting process unfolds? How does this jurisdiction/authority interact with DEP and DPH, and what part will these two state agencies play in addressing the possible impacts to public health and the environment, such as air quality, water quality, and groundwater protection?	Glen Ayers
25	If cities and towns have no guaranteed intervenor funding, they will not have the capacity to review and comment on any energy projects, large or small. Every report submitted by developers must be reviewed by independent subject matter experts?	Al Norman
26	The expansion of wind, solar, and storage is needed, but it must be linked to actual reduction in GHG emissions. Storage must prioritize clean energy and subsidies must be linked to emission reduction and not only growth of overall energy supply.	Bill Stubblefield
27	from my review of the Commission membership, there was no formal representation from rural communities nor small western Mass municipalities.	MICHAEL DECHIARA

28	Also would be good to try to increase mass transit —no?	Arlen Gould
29	Have you considered replacing distribution utilities with municipal aggregator entities pursuant to chapter 164, section 134, load aggregation programs, to permit and purchase clean energy capacity? Why only investor owned utilities?	Al Norman
30	Unlike the Commission's recommendation, there is no size threshold in H4501 for clean energy projects meaning that the state permitting body would be responsible for ALL projects now being reviewed by municipalities. So I don't understand how it can be said that a local permitting role is being maintained in H4501.	MICHAEL DECHIARA
31	Following up on what Senator Barrett has said about the utilities and their profit motive, I think we should consider buying them out and having them owned by the Commonwealth, thus getting rid of all the profit that ratepayers are providing to the utilities.	David Greenberg
32	What happens when the Conservation Commission review and the ZBA or Planning Board review are not moving along in parallel? Can the project still be kept to the 15 month approval period?	Anonymous Attendee
33	Sen. Barrett - your statement of "proper scale": New England landscape is a smaller scale than the West and thus smaller solar arrays scales (5-10 acres) are more appropriate than megascale 20+ acres solar arrays.	Martha Hanner
34	Speaking of money and cost, H4501 interestingly defines "best practices" as "broadly accepted industry practices". Seems like the best practices definition should explicitly cite scientific and environmental best practices as well.	MICHAEL DECHIARA
35	Very impressed with all speakers so far, however, no one has spoken about actually engaging the public in efforts to reduce energy use and challenge themselves to help themselves and their communities in confronting climate change. Such an effort to bring people together for a common cause might result in some diminishing of projected "expectations for energy need" and give people something to work on rather than simply complain and fight.	Anonymous Attendee
36	Thank you Sen. Barrett for addressing constructive approval. I think we need a stronger safety net beyond the technical tool of a dashboard. This needs serious consideration	MICHAEL DECHIARA

37	<p>For Senator Barrett, I wonder too about over-building of energy infrastructure. There is a simple project that could build resilience and energy capacity with minimal construction and intrusiveness. If all residences had rooftop solar installed with battery back up, within the very local grid, we would be much more energy independent. A local exchange of electricity supply and load protects us from dependence on electricity from a distant source. We should intentionally develop this community resource. I'm very disappointed that this local resource is not part of the discussion.</p>	Sue Butler
38	<p>I want to know whether 4501 will only apply to large projects, as Judge suggests the CESP intends. Or if it would be projects of any size</p>	Jill Buchanan
39	<p>Thank you to Undersecretary Judge, Senator Barrett and Representative Roy!! Terrific to know the level of engagement and discussion.</p>	Sherry Morgan
40	<p>Re: permitting timescale: It has been my experience that delays are often due to short-cuts by developers, who are trying to save \$ by not doing their due diligence in defining wetlands, stormwater/erosion controls, etc. which delays their permitting. (I've listened to numerous local hearings!)</p>	Martha Hanner
41	<p>In the Pope Energy SMART Comment Letter to DOER dated Feb 2, 2024, a 43.6-acre parcel of land covered with solar panels generating 19,320 MWh of electricity, sequesters (242,631.63 mt / project life) 34.65 times the amount of carbon the woods (7,001 mt / project life) would sequester. MA emission reduction policy is to reduce fossil fuels emission reductions, not solar vs. woods choices. What is the new SMART 3.0 policy about the cutting of trees? 1.3 million acres in Massachusetts or 27% of the state's land area. Currently excluded in SMART regulations, are Core Habitat areas 1,242,000 acres and Critical Natural Landscape area of 1,783,000 acres. What will be the new SMART 3.0 policy be about the cutting of trees to reach an annual installation rate of 600 MW of solar to be installed by 2030? We have approached some of the largest landowners in MA to install solar carports on their parking lots. They have rebuffed our proposal by saying " We do not want to tie up our land for 25-years."</p>	Doug Pope
42	<p>people keep thinking that 4501 takes away ALL local control because the bill doesnt explicitly say. I am saying this again because people are getting upset about something that you are not intending. I am trying to be helpful here. people are STILL not getting this part.</p>	Janet Sinclair
43	<p>I'm in a community solar called Syncarpha, I went to a webinar of that company and they said "We've got the message loud and clear" Landfills, brownfields etc... and not on good farm land and soil, and forests so this company at least is aware</p>	Arlen Gould

44	Please say it clearly. to calm people down.	Janet Sinclair
45	1.3 million acres in Massachusetts or 27% of the state's land area is held under permanent conservation	Doug Pope
46	If DOER thinks Mass. has been successful in not siting on NWL, I think there needs to be real reflection and ground-truthing. It sounds good but towns with 10+ commercial ground mounted installs or towns that have cut down pine barrens, would beg to differ. The site suitability of criteria a good tool and should be codified	MICHAEL DECHIARA
47	Much more emphasis - and funding - needs to be given to parking lot canopies. There's a huge state-wide potential here, when you consider all the parking lots we have! But installation is expensive and will need funding, so too many politicians are avoiding it.	Anonymous Attendee
48	I think that dual use is extremely counterproductive. Are you paying attention to who helped write that stuff in the SMART program. Its almost like some landowners and developers wrote themselves big fat checks. Why are we giving money to farmers who struggled with flooding in western mass, and then give millions to a farm in Northfield on prime farmland	Janet Sinclair
49	While it is helpful to get the overview of the Commission's recommendations, esp with Mr. Judget and the TUE chairs being part of that, it seems important to note that recommendations are not legislation. What is legislation is H4501 and that was given much less time and focus. In my opinion, H4501 is fundamentally troubling in some regards; worse than the Commission's recs. Wish we would have focused on that today and it is essential going forward. And Senate legislation once that is released	MICHAEL DECHIARA
50	Horray for Ground-truthing. It is the crucial value-add from communities	MICHAEL DECHIARA
51	Community benefit agreements could use the marijuana law as a model. Must be signed off by muni's before application is possible. Should include revenue-based PILOT (marijuana allows up to 3%), siting agreements, and possibly investment in decarbonized municipal infrastructure	MICHAEL DECHIARA
52	I would rather do without than destroy nature.	Janet Sinclair
53	in new SMART regs, the subtractors have to be severe enough so that poor siting cannot occur; adders should be beneficial enough. Currently use of adders counter-balance the negative impact of a subtractor, so there is little that incentivizes developers to change their behavior to reduce expenses, to maximize profit.	MICHAEL DECHIARA
54	For Steve Long: what happens when in the effort to follow the mitigation hierarchy (emphasizing prevention of impacts) in the local permitting process, each muni prevents environ. or safety impacts to a level of 90-100% locally at the price of state of mass. failing miserably to reach our renewable energy targets and fend off climate impacts. Who wins there?	john pepi
55	regional coordinators: Why not use the existing Regional Planning Commissions?	Anonymous Attendee

56	small is beautiful. Can we understand that we are profoundly selfish? And our wealth and consumption does not make people more happy? It makes us disconnected, depressed and physically more ill. These issues need to be dealt with on a different level. It is not wholistic to do the same stuff in a merely different way. This is the crux of the matter. This is a fools errand, and does anyone really think that Massachusetts can save the world? We need to watch and wait before we jump out of the pan and into the fire.	Janet Sinclair
57	thank you John mangiatti for the pushback on ideas in the commission.	Janet Sinclair
58	For John Mangiaratti and others re: shared application. If there is a standard clean energy application process that multiple boards/committees can sign on to. I have not heard anyone address what happens if a board/committee does not approve while others have. One could assume that application is therefore not approved but clarity on this dynamic needs to occur since that scenario is likely. This could be similar to a current building permit which in order to be approved requires ConComm and Board of Health sign on for the same document	MICHAEL DECHIARA
59	John. OPEN MEETING LAW?	MICHAEL DECHIARA
60	I totally agree that site suitability is key, but what happens between now (projects currently or soon to be proposed) and when state regulations and guidelines are ready? I'm very concerned about potential damage before these measures are ready.	Judith Eiseman
61	Steve Long - the Town of Shutesbury has the same approach of land developed v. land protected. It is a point in a law suit.	MICHAEL DECHIARA
62	The siting and permitting commission appears to have been a largely positive process but hardly a democratic one. We also need a far more inclusive process that is genuinely representative of the views of all residents regarding our energy future. I strongly suggest that we explore citizen assemblies chosen by sortition to serve this critical role. Such assemblies need to be suitably empowered to educate themselves and hear from all interested parties, including the power to call witnesses.	Bill Stubblefield
63	I'm concerned that our Attorney General does not recognize environmental impacts/ mitigations in local solar zoning. Please take Steve Long's comments seriously in terms of environmental mitigations.	Martha Hanner
64	Michael Judge said 600 MW of solar needed each year through 2030, and then 1,200 MW or more of solar through 2050. How many MW of solar are expected to be ground-mounted annually in those two time periods?	Anonymous Attendee

65	Community Engagement is simply coded language for NIMBY. Let's just acknowledge that there will never be a site for clean energy infrastructure that does not offend anyone. We are more than a day late and a dollar short in trying to head off the catastrophic impacts of climate change. The wheels are starting to come off the bus of the comfortable existence we've all become accustomed to. The inability to afford or even obtain home insurance may be the canary in the coal mine that starts to open all of our eyes. Here in Amherst, a solar project on a landfill - clearly a brownfield - was shut down by local NIMBY opposition. Even rooftop solar has been curtailed by 20% due to the random requirements of fire departments shouting safety with no data supporting their claims. If there is local control, we will fall sadly short of the goal and we will all suffer for it. There must be a state mandated default of yes to any reasonable renewable project and the NIMBY impulse Community Engagement needs to go sit down.	Bill Killough-Hill
66	RE: avoid impacts and if you can't then compensate say by protecting why doesn't any of the anti-solar in forests perspective acknowledge the minimum 5/1 carbon mitigation advantage of an acre of solar over an acre of forest?	john pepi
67	I think the towns often do a great job--of saying "no" when people don't want a project. The problem is that the developers take us to court if we say no, and then the judges use the dover amendment to shut us down. My PB is awesome and smart. People are smart. We are capable. We feel overpowered, not incapable.	Janet Sinclair
68	People are still not seeing how the commission is related to local siting in H4501 and H4503. I am just giving you feedback. Sad that you won't just say.	Janet Sinclair
69	contin./clarify earlier question re: compensate if can;t mitigate: I meant to write " protect say 4 addl acres of forest/biodiverse lands for each acre of forest dedicated to ground mount solar?"	john pepi
70	Regarding folks who believe in engaging the public is needed, the attendees here are part of a choir and the choir needs more members! We must try to get more of the public involved—it's similar to getting people informed enough to vote, a political exercise.	Judith Eiseman
71	Regarding the poll question, I feel reasonably clear about the commission process and its recommendations but profoundly unclear as to the dark hole that is the legislative process and how it interacts with the executive branch.	Bill Stubblefield
72	Would municipalities be required to use the standard municipal application provided by DOER?	Anonymous Attendee
73	Shout-out to the PVPC and their useful Solar Best Practices Guide!	Anonymous Attendee

74	RE: Community Benefit Agreements. Outside of EJ communities WHY should there be community benefit agreements which will drive up the cost of (and even slow) of renewable energy supplied to grid? Why isn't this framed as - what can my community do to finally take responsibility (offset) for our own energy consumption and lessen the impact on those currently bearing that burden? Many communities don't need community benefits. Maybe they need the intervenor funding support only.	john pepi
75	Jon Abe's deeply ethical approach to solar development is exemplary! How can we build that sensitivity into our approach to expanding renewable energy development? Sue Butler	Sue Butler
76	If a town vetoes a project through its boards or public opinion, will the EFSB accept the veto and cancel the project? If not, then there is no local control.	Anonymous Attendee
77	Recommend this UCS analysis conducted in collaboration with ACE, CLF and GreenRoots including key recommendations to improve the siting process. We found that more than 80% of polluting fossil-fueled or waste generation units are concentrated in or within one mile of an environmental justice population. https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/2024-03/MA-infrastructure-fact-sheet-3-21.pdf	Paula Garcia
78	Our interest is in how does the DPU protect the utilities, and how do the utilities thwart the development of alternative energies? Is the DPU a political appointed commission? Our town would like to extend 3 phase line but the is exorbitant.	Anonymous Attendee
79	I also raised this point in the Q&A earlier so apologies if it was addressed. I don't believe it was. Given the needs of the Global Warming Solutions Act I believe it is totally self-defeating to move to deforestation for solar given the critical natural carbon capture provided by forests. Prof. Moomaw et al. have done the science on this. Deforestation for solar is the wrong way to go.	Don Ogden
80	Why should people of fishing towns of eastern seaboard or natural gas processing/handling locations disproportionately shoulder the burden of fishing/fish packing or gas storage facilities compared to the people of western and central mass.?	john pepi
81	RE: Michael Dechiara comment. There are EJ rural communities. Shutesbury and Levert are not among them.	john pepi
82	A commentor asked why are forests being cut down, and said they do so because it's lower cost. This is because of capitalism. As long as for profit companies are creating the solar projects it's profits over people. Not the good of the community.	Anonymous Attendee
83	I was asking your panel to answer. I cannot tell you how much confusion is going on here. I feel strongly that YOU MUST answer this. I am clear on this question. But I fear others are not. So much of what you are hearing today is based on not understanding this.	Anonymous Attendee

84	To answer numerous participants who don't see logic of solar replacing some forest, please immerse yourselves in the numbers and see that there is arguably (some factors are unknown/debatable) a minimum 5/1 carbon mitigation advantage of solar over forest carbon mitigation on an equivalent sized piece of land. In addition, there are serious unaddressed flaws in the Tech. Pot. of Solar study which led them to over-estimate rooftop solar potential by at least 100%. Audubon's Growing Solar... report acknowledged this silently by dropping rooftop estimates to 21 GW and they have not yet addressed the estimated 25% loss of suitable rooftop solar area from implementation of national fire prevention code.	john pepi
85	Kathy is building on what I was trying to say: Circuit riders would be helpful in ways we did for wetlands—Planning Boards and ZBA need this kind of help, too.	Judith Eiseman
86	Here is the case study on a community-led solar process that involves the community from the beginning: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Kdk-jcOUxUGZEnQVaub21cP8TSrurlHT/view?mc_cid=9dbeb9c364&mc_eid=7c0185d248	Diana Eddowes
87	Can the person who spoke from a non-profit in eastern Mass post her website and/or info about creating community involvement? Thanks	Jane Urban
88	we need to repeal Dover, to delete section 7 of H. 4501, allow virtual power plants, and full intervenor funding. these factors will increase community engagement	Al Norman
89	In terms of community engagement - geographic access is also crucial. Although the Commission or H4501 requires public hearings, being able to get to the hearing or community engagement sessions is undeniably important. I recommend that any public hearings be held online or within 30 minutes by public transportation from the site of a development. Currently with EFSB people have to go to Boston which means people cannot truly engage	MICHAEL DECHIARA
90	Congrats to Dwayne and team on figuring out how to get our voices into the mix in realtime despite the technical limitations of webinar mode on Zoom. Thanks for the creative solution	MICHAEL DECHIARA
91	3 questions for Heidi Ricci:	john pepi
92	Three questions for Heidi: 1) How will Mass audubon incorporate the effects of fire code implementation on available rooftop for solar (25% less according to several sources)? 2) What is Mass audubon doing to prevent the commercial and other non-solar development that has accounted for 3/4 of forest loss to date, 3) What about the mcuh greater number of MMTCo2e that forest solar mitigates (than forest sequesters)	john pepi
93	and which will help us prevent Mass from exceeding it's carbon budget as rooftop stagnates and offshore wind is challenged and delayed.	john pepi
94	Roofs comments at this moment are unfair. I've personally been working on these issues for forty years and fully understand the problems with fossil fuels.	Judith Eiseman

95	What matters is where the ground mounted solar goes and right now it is not being placed in appropriate places. That will continue for another few years apparently.	Judith Eiseman
96	I'm of the opinion that Steve is underestimating the threat of deforestation. Has he really looked into science behind this?	Don Ogden
97	So far, solar development has been additive, and has not replaced fossil fuel use. There is no direct connection between the two, and yet the myth of substitution is used to argue that we need more solar to replace fossil fuels. Until there is a one-for-one direct replacement that is verifiable, this is just more smoke and mirrors. Otherwise this is the same as the "Offsets" scam that is being used to greenwash corporate climate plans.	Glen Ayers
98	What are the plans for the pollution of solar? Also, the unknown unknowns are operating here. Do we really know the harm. If solar arrays harm ground water that will kill people too. Any tech at the scale to power our endless need for electric power is going to create pollution that will impact us all. All the solar panels will need to be disposed of, the metals needed to make them is not all the great for the environment. The mining needed to make them are harming communities in another part of the world. It's all so complicated.	Anonymous Attendee
99	No one is talking about requiring commercial building codes to transition black, flat roofs to bring commercial rooftop solar to scale. Maybe it is part of the building sector efforts but it offsets the demands to look at land use	MICHAEL DECHIARA
100	At the \$1.50/watt advantage of utility scale solar over small rooftop and given MasS audubons proposal to shift 10GW from ground mount to rooftop solar, we are talking about a cost premium of \$10 billion extra dollars to force the rooftop solar strategy. This higher cost of rooftop represents an opportunity cost for the state. What else to fight the climate battle can we do with that \$10 bil. The \$940 mil savings of the Mass audubon low impact plan (over the Current siting scenario) attributed to the avoided cost of future carbon removal does not come close to that figure.	john pepi
101	We are worried about solar development because of what has been proposed in Amherst, Shutesbury and Pelham—poor locations environmentally with profit motive first and foremost, not the big picture.	Judith Eiseman
102	how many people took part in survey?	john pepi
103	Thank you Steve Roof for putting this into the bigger perspective. It is a life and death matter and we do not have any privilege to continue the status quo without causing further death and destruction.	Bill Killough-Hill
104	NIMBYism is a loaded & misused term that only serves to create confrontation. Do such weaponized words really belong in this forum?	Anonymous Attendee
105	is it one size fits all ? or all sizes fit none?	john pepi
106	I strongly support Josie's "on-ramp for municipal permitting" It's very scary to allow a bureaucracy in Boston to decide what developers are free to do in our communities. To achieve our overall climate goals, we need everyone's active participation and that requires not shutting communities out of important decision-making.	Anonymous Attendee

107	Thank you Catherine! I've been saying since the 80's that "balancing the interests" has generally resulted in less environmental protection and fewer environmental resources to balance the next time. That does not have to continue to be the case: money can be made and jobs created and good plans made by insisting upon doing the right thing, not just satisfying the easy short term goal. I agree with everything you've said!	Judith Eiseman
108	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local governments know their community needs and know the suitable siting locations first-hand 2. Local permitting harnesses the power of people invested in the outcome 3. Local permitting requires developers to submit complete, well-thought-through plans in advance, thereby expediting the actual construction 4. Local regulations and oversight will minimize construction delays 5. Local permitting is necessary to minimize risks to the community from the siting of battery energy storage systems that can cause thermal runaway, fires, and toxic gas release 6. Local permitting and siting promote environmental justice 7. Local permitting will protect our natural resources: wetlands, forests, farmland 8. Local communities need the right to protect their watersheds and private wells 9. Local permitting allows flexibility to experiment with agrivoltaics while protecting productive farmland 10. Local permitting allows communities to protect the health, safety, and welfare of their residents. 	Martha Hanner
109	Thank you Dwayne. The Commission was only represented by an eastern Mass muni and an eastern Mass regional planning commission. None from western Mass.	MICHAEL DECHIARA
110	Katherine Ratte seems to believe we have hundreds of years to wait for destroyed forests to return after they've been trashed for corporate solar? We do not. The Climate Crisis waits for no one.	Don Ogden
111	We are not scared of change! We need change. It is HOW we change. Saying we are scared of change is patronizing	MICHAEL DECHIARA
112	Thank you	Don Ogden