

From: [Emily Crawford](#)
To: [SitingBoard Filing \(DPU\)](#)
Subject: Cumulative Impacts Analysis and Site Suitability Criteria
Date: Sunday, May 11, 2025 5:39:12 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.

To members of the EEA, OEJE, EFSB, DPU, and DOER:

I am writing to file my comment, as I was unable to make in-person public comment at the 2024 Climate Act Stakeholder Session #4: Cumulative Impacts Analysis and Site Suitability Criteria last Monday. I stand in solidarity with the demands of **Mass Power Forward**.

It is my hope that, as the state moves forward with siting permits, EJ communities will be not only consulted, but also able to guide proposals for ways forward when considering potential projects and their impacts. EJ communities must not continue to be overburdened with more utility-owned infrastructure sitings. My understanding is that the siting reform law has a broad definition of existing impacts and burdens, and that the regulations should be just as broad.

All community stakeholders should always be fully informed about all potential impacts and have the right to provide directional input *before* an application is submitted. The period for stakeholders to learn about what is being proposed should not be rushed; it should be sure to meet people with different time constraints.

Furthermore, 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,
Emily Crawford

