From: noreply@noreply.mass.gov
To: SitingBoard Filing (DPU)
Subject: EFSB Permitting Reform Comment Form
Date: Thursday, May 15, 2025 1:26:11 PM

Name

Robert Cherdack

Email

[redacted]

I am a...

Representative of a municipal agency

Are you commenting on a straw proposal?

Yes

If yes , which one?

Standard Conditions

Comment/Question

I have 4 comments:
1) It is well established that natural beauty and access to forests adds substantially both to the enjoyment of living in area and the monetary value of a location. Any analyses of the net value of a project should take this fact into account. Replacing a forest or meadow with a sea of black glass, inverters and batteries would be highly detrimental to the "spiritual and financial value of surrounding lands and residences.

2) As the conditions straw proposal currently reads, the siting board does not choose the site for an energy facility, it responds to the offering of a developer. While the EFSB can use scoring to push a developer to a class of locations, this is still very different from the EFSB identifying those locations where a facility should be built. Also, the process seems to be oriented to accommodating developers. Developers are short term profit driven entrepreneurs who may have little concern for long term viability of a project or the effect on the community.

3) The consolidated permit for smaller energy facilities should be flexible enough to recognize the different nature of the affected municipalities. Traffic congestion and heat island effects may be a key consideration for one town while preserving viewsheds is vital to another.

4) Under no circumstances should biomass combustion be considered a clean energy source.