

From: [Judith Eiseman](#)
To: [SitingBoard Filing \(DPU\)](#)
Cc: [Jo Comerford](#)
Subject: Solar Stakeholder Session
Date: Friday, April 25, 2025 10:19:02 AM

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.

Please accept this short comment as evidence of my concern about the potential regulations being contemplated.

First, I generally support the concerns, comments, and recommendations provided by Michael DeChiara of Shutesbury. I have been following the progress of PureSky projects in Amherst and Shutesbury and the company is now proposing an industrial solar project in my town in the Cadwell Forest—in a 63 acre inholding in the Cadwell Forest which is protected by an Article 97 conservation restriction. The Planning Board will have to decide whether to grant waivers to allow it or not. How the state regulations are decided will make a big difference in what happens once the Board makes its decision. We are aware that it is not impossible, as happened in Shutesbury, the town could be sued if PureSky doesn't like our conclusions.

Public engagement and local knowledge is key because among other things, **we are a region**—not just a single community affected by state and/or local decisions. Because of our well-studied and unique situation, what Pelham decides in various situations can affect watersheds in Shutesbury, Amherst, Springfield, Belchertown, and the Quabbin Reservoir as well in Pelham.

Our rural towns' forest and farmlands provide ecological and climate resiliency for the Commonwealth. If EasternMass disregards our essentially collective decision to minimize growth and favor watershed and forest protection, they do so at their own peril. All WMass towns are potentially at risk from this top down notion of how zoning and environmental protection/solar industrialization should work. Guidance from state agencies could work to enhance environmental protections if sufficient decision making is allowed locally, but the folks in Boston seem to have very little notion of what our needs are out here. Some of us had much of our land taken by MWRA to protect the Quabbin watershed so Boston et al, could have clean drinking water. That has resulted in less development, but also in smaller tax bases. We understand both the values and the disadvantage of that 87 year old decision, but we want justice and understanding about the good that has resulted from what was forced upon us then.

It's a complex situation and our needs are many and varied and perhaps not all achievable, but we remain at the mercy of EasternMass unless we can make our concerns about climate, community, and common sense matter to them.

My major concern continues to be that some of state agency goals are in various degrees of conflict with each other and are far too supportive of the profit motive over the reality of the impending disaster of the climate crisis. Massachusetts is too small to ignore potential effects on water supply and pretty much everything else by giving authority to people outside this area without ample and sufficient local input!

Whenever there is a conflict between local knowledge of an area and scientific environmental

knowledge, locals should have clear roles in making decisions—even if it is with state input. Sufficient energy is one thing. Continual increase and environmental destruction is quite another. I see the continued desired expansion of power lines outside of our communities as an example of the Big Brother approach: They build it and then they come—often with towns kept unaware of just what is coming because the preparations and construction is approved and done well outside of the community that will later be impacted. Timing and enough time to reach good decisions based upon local and regional circumstances and issues is important.

How can we use less energy from whatever sources more more efficiently? "Clean energy" is, after all, manufactured from not so clean sources and methods. Not that I think going back to oil and coal makes sense, but the rules should be values-based with longer range goals clearly articulated. The mad rush to have more and more of everything has done obvious harm to the state and the planet. Making decisions and rules because "clean energy" is now seen as the most important item on the agenda misses the point that protecting the planet from short term decisions by people with short term goals is infinitely more important.

Please try to think about this from a slightly different perspective: How can we conserve what we have and use less rather than manufacture more? Who is making the demand for more energy? Is it realistic in the long term for public health and welfare? What will be lost by failing to conserve and manage desires and needs realistically?

Thank you for your consideration.

Judith Eiseman, Chair Pelham Planning Board

