

From: [Miriam](#)
To: [SitingBoard Filing \(DPU\)](#)
Subject: comment for public siting hearing
Date: Monday, May 5, 2025 7:26:23 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from a sender outside of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts mail system. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

We have the following points we would like to share about energy siting:

- We want no cutting forest land for solar
- We would like the board to do everything it can to protect our farms and farmers given the threats of their livelihoods by the trump administration and we should provide them funds to continue their very important service to our state, without requiring them to replace solar for food.
- We believe small locally owned, managed and controlled energy systems should be prioritized.
- We believe localities should be the ones primarily responsible for approving energy siting
- We believe that local towns do want clean energy, but we want smart siting and systems in already destructed lands and rooftops and not in our forests or food farms.
- We want the public to have much more control over energy systems and much reduced control by large corporate entities.
- We do not want false energy solutions that significantly negatively impact the well being of forests, rivers, streams, lakes, air, water, land and climate change.
- We believe that solutions like the Northfield Pump Storage Facility and tearing down forests for solar or wind should not be considered clean and should not be permitted by our state governmental agencies.
- We would like climate and climate justice be significantly considered in clean energy choices and placement
- We would like to see priority placed on local and smaller corporate entities to provide the clean energy systems.
- We believe the board should put energy conservation as a primary strategy to protect our planet from climate change. We believe we need to shrink our use of natural resources and learn to change our thinking to use less instead of use more. Technology that requires more resources should be avoided and technology that requires less resources should be prioritized.
- We prefer that technology for battery energy storage other than lithium should be explored and grown, as lithium batteries have demonstrated several problems for the environment and its inhabitants from its extraction and use. Local communities should be the entities that approve or disapprove these forms of storage.

We need forests, farms, solar, and community empowerment - all of these things at the same time. To heal the climate crisis, we need forests to provide clean air, clean water, rainfall for agriculture, and livable temperatures. We also need clean energy, which in the current national political situation means solar, wind and

geothermal. Community stakeholders should be fully informed about all potential impacts and have the right to provide directional input *before* an application is submitted.

The state must enact siting reforms and also prevent damage to our critical green and natural infrastructure and prevent extraordinary burdens on EJ and rural communities. Reforms needed include making it easier to build small-scale distributed solar projects and resolving interconnection issues. In other words, the state should require battery storage and solar siting to be environmentally responsible, with incentives and subsidies to prioritize sites in the already built and disturbed environment and also with fees and mitigation requirements and in some cases outright prohibitions for greenfield sites.

Thank you for accepting our comments,
Miriam and Mike Kurland

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]