

Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2050 Public Comments
Email Comments Received

From: (Name)	Subject	Body
Ann Van Dyke	Public comments about GWSA	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>Thank you for the recent presentation regarding the GWSA. It was well organized and clear. I would like to emphasize the importance of public education about climate change and about solutions. I would advocate for an organized public campaign similar to public health messaging about smoking with an emphasis on alternatives to fossil fuels. Also it would be helpful to have a central source for finding providers of solar panels, heat pumps etc. so that consumers know what is available. Not an endorsement but simply informational. From what I can see, the average citizen who is not an activist is likely unaware of this so there needs to be a massive public awareness campaign. It would help to dispel myths about clean energy and alternative technologies. Maybe public service announcements? Mailings to households? Time to think creatively!</p> <p>As an EV driver, I would also like to see more emphasis on EV charging along local routes such as Route 2. There is a push to have chargers on the Interstates but they are needed even more on these local roads.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention and thanks again for all your hard work!</p> <p>Ann Van Dyke</p>
Bob Higgins Steele	2050 CECP	<p>2050 CECP Comments and suggestions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please pursue the establishment of a Green Bank sooner rather than later. 2. The proposed stretch code is a good start. However, there should be no exemptions for additions of any size. Prescriptive codes at end of envelope service life e.g new windows, roofs, and siding should be added. We are omitting a large portion of potential building stock emissions by allowing these exemptions 3. In the building sector, the focus seems to be mainly on electrifying buildings. There needs to be more emphasis on reducing the electrical loads, through deep energy retrofits as well specific steps, incentives and financing to reach the stated goals. MAssSave can't do it all. 4. DERs , microgrids and grid modernization/upgrades need to be included especially if the prediction that electrical demand will double by 2050 (2050 Decarbonization Roadmap) 5. Please include more outreach to, and education of, municipalities I as to what is expected of them. It is largely absent, at least on the Outer Cape. I've checked. <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Bob Higgins-Steele Truro, Ma 02666</p>
Bob Persons	Clean Energy & Climate Plan for 2050	<p>My name is Bob Persons and I am a resident of Auburndale, MA. I am writing today to offer comments on the draft Clean Energy and Climate Plan (CECP) for 2050. For the final draft of the 2050 CECP, I encourage the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Direct DOER to revise the current (2022-2025) Mass Save plan to enable existing single-family homes to become viable "whole-home" heat pump buildings by providing these rule changes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Allow ceiling insulation in unfinished basement areas, to isolate the heat-pump-conditioned space from the unconditioned space. This is currently prohibited because, Mass Save says, "the heat source is in the basement" – which no longer applies when a boiler or furnace system is replaced by a heat pump. B. Establish a more generous reimbursement scale for Mass Save subcontractors who can accomplish multiple, small air sealing and insulation projects per day, e.g. in unfinished parts of partially-finished basements. C. Allow insulation and air sealing measures in homes that Mass Save has already deemed "Energy Star Homes". Such buildings can have infiltration and insulation problems that prevent an appropriately-sized heat pump system from keeping the home comfortable under severe temperature and wind conditions.

		<p>2. Delineate how much of the 88.6% in expected greenhouse gas emissions reductions by 2050 each suggested strategy or policy is responsible for, to allow for better tracking and course adjustment as needed;</p> <p>3. Require emissions reductions from large buildings (instead of just energy reporting);</p> <p>4. Increase the Clean Energy Standard to 100% by no later than 2035;</p> <p>5. Track pollution levels in addition to clean energy investments in environmental justice communities;</p> <p>6. Maintain the focus on expanding workforce development;</p> <p>7. Aim to reduce vehicle miles traveled instead of just “stabilizing” total driving; and,</p> <p>8. Reconsider the impact of federal developments resulting from the Inflation Reduction Act.</p> <p>These changes will result in a stronger, more transparent final CECP for 2050. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Robert W. Persons, PE Auburndale, MA</p>
Carol Ellerbeck	Public comment on draft Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2050	<p>Good day,</p> <p>My name is Carol Ellerbeck and I am a resident of Northborough, MA. I am writing today to offer comments on the draft Clean Energy and Climate Plan (CECP) for 2050. For the final draft of the 2050 CECP, I encourage the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs to:</p> <p>1. Delineate how much of the 88.6% in expected greenhouse gas emissions reductions by 2050 each suggested strategy or policy is responsible for, to allow for better tracking and course adjustment as needed;</p> <p>2. Require emissions reductions from large buildings (instead of just energy reporting);</p> <p>3. Increase the Clean Energy Standard to 100% by no later than 2035;</p> <p>4. Track pollution levels in addition to clean energy investments in environmental justice communities;</p> <p>5. Maintain the focus on expanding workforce development;</p> <p>6. Aim to reduce vehicle miles traveled instead of just “stabilizing” total driving; and,</p> <p>7. Reconsider the impact of federal developments resulting from the Inflation Reduction Act.</p> <p>These changes will result in a stronger, more transparent final CECP for 2050. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Carol Ellerbeck Northborough, MA</p>
Celeste Venolia	Comment letter climate plan	<p>My name is Celeste Venolia and I am a resident of Watertown, MA. I am writing today to offer comments on the draft Clean Energy and Climate Plan (CECP) for 2050. For the final draft of the 2050 CECP, I encourage the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs to:</p> <p>1. Delineate how much of the 88.6% in expected greenhouse gas emissions reductions by 2050 each suggested strategy or policy is responsible for, to allow for better tracking and course adjustment as needed;</p> <p>2. Require emissions reductions from large buildings (instead of just energy reporting);</p> <p>3. Increase the Clean Energy Standard to 100% by no later than 2035;</p> <p>4. Track pollution levels in addition to clean energy investments in environmental justice communities;</p> <p>5. Maintain the focus on expanding workforce development;</p> <p>6. Aim to reduce vehicle miles traveled instead of just “stabilizing” total driving; and,</p> <p>7. Reconsider the impact of federal developments resulting from the Inflation Reduction Act.</p> <p>These changes will result in a stronger, more transparent final CECP for 2050. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Celeste Venolia Watertown, MA</p>
Charles Schuerhoff	Comment on draft CECP	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am a resident of Boston. These are my comments on the draft Clean Energy and Climate Plan (CECP) for 2050:</p>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop and execute a wide-ranging, sustained public relations campaign to educate and motivate the public in why it should support these measures, adopt their own where feasible and accept the costs and inconveniences that they may entail for each individual. 2. Push hard for widespread installation of EV charging stations, especially in urban areas. 3. Specify how much of the 88.6% in expected greenhouse gas emissions reductions by 2050 each suggested strategy or policy is responsible for, to allow for better tracking and course adjustment as needed; 4. Require emissions reductions from large buildings (instead of just energy reporting); 5. Increase the Clean Energy Standard to 100% by no later than 2035; 6. Track pollution levels in addition to clean energy investments in environmental justice communities; 7. Maintain the focus on expanding workforce development; 8. Aim to reduce vehicle miles traveled instead of just “stabilizing” total driving; and, 9. Reconsider the impact of federal developments resulting from the Inflation Reduction Act. <p>These changes will result in a stronger, more transparent final CECP for 2050. Thank you for your consideration and keep up your good work.</p> <p>Sincerely, Charles Schuerhoff Boston, MA</p>
Christine Roane	Clean Energy and Climate Plan (CECP) – Draft Comments	<p>My name is Christine Roane and I am a resident of Springfield, MA. I am writing today to offer comments on the draft Clean Energy and Climate Plan (CECP) for 2050. For the final draft of the 2050 CECP, I encourage the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delineate how much of the 88.6% in expected greenhouse gas emissions reductions by 2050 each suggested strategy or policy is responsible for, to allow for better tracking and course adjustment as needed; 2. Require emissions reductions from large buildings (instead of just energy reporting); 3. Increase the Clean Energy Standard to 100% by no later than 2035; 4. Track pollution levels in addition to clean energy investments in environmental justice communities; 5. Maintain the focus on expanding workforce development; 6. Aim to reduce vehicle miles traveled instead of just “stabilizing” total driving; and, 7. Reconsider the impact of federal developments resulting from the Inflation Reduction Act. <p>These changes will result in a stronger, more transparent final CECP for 2050. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Christine M. Roane Springfield, MA 01108-2626</p>
Danielle Lochhead	2050 climate plan comment	<p>We use heat pumps in our 3000 square foot farmhouse in Conway, MA. They work great for cooling in summer and well for heat in the shoulder seasons, but they just don't cut it in deep winter (as we were forewarned by our installer). In the winter we use wood heat and/or space heaters to supplement the mini splits.</p> <p>Therefore we have to question sole use of heat pumps in the future planning. Also what about power failures?</p> <p>Danielle Lochhead Conway, MA 01341</p>
Daphne Lowell	Comments on the Draft Massachusetts' 2050 Climate Plan	<p>My name is Daphne Lowell and I am a resident of Amherst, MA. I am writing today to offer comments on the draft Clean Energy and Climate Plan (CECP) for 2050. For the final draft of the 2050 CECP, I encourage the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delineate how much of the 88.6% in expected greenhouse gas emissions reductions by 2050 each suggested strategy or policy is responsible for, to allow for better tracking and course adjustment as needed; 2. Require emissions reductions from large buildings (instead of just energy reporting); 3. Increase the Clean Energy Standard to 100% by no later than 2035;

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Track pollution levels in addition to clean energy investments in environmental justice communities; 5. Maintain the focus on expanding workforce development; 6. Aim to reduce vehicle miles traveled instead of just “stabilizing” total driving; and, 7. Reconsider the impact of federal developments resulting from the Inflation Reduction Act. <p>These changes will result in a stronger, more transparent final CECP for 2050. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Daphne Lowell Amherst, MA</p>
David Butz	Written response to today's presentation on the 2050 Clean Energy Plan	<p>Public Hearing on the Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2050 #2 October 7, 2022</p> <p>With respect, after attending today'd presentation:</p> <p>Thank you for your hard work on behalf of the Commonwealth and our environment. Without expanding in great detail, I am writing with basic concern about our proposed direction.</p> <p>Other states, other countries, and international energy organizations are starting to include nuclear energy in the mix of necessary sources for a clean-energy future. As a matter of due diligence, Massachusetts needs to take a careful look at this zero-carbon energy-dense source as well. This is an unpopular choice today, but, given our academic, industrial and work-force expertise, we could be world leaders in developing this option.</p> <p>Providing the majority of our electric power from Renewables-only is not a practical or reasonable possibility. Solar and Wind represent an undependable, erratic harvest of diffuse energy flow. They require too much land and too much material, thus generating too much waste. We need increased and dependable base load power, especially if we are going to further electrify more sectors including heating and transportation.</p> <p>I have done deep research on these matters over a period of several years and would be happy to engage in a more detailed discussion.</p> <p>David Butz Groton, MA 01450</p>
David Holzman	Massachusetts' 2050 Climate Plan	<p>To Whom it may concern:</p> <p>My name is David Holzman and I am a resident of Boston, MA. I am writing today to offer comments on the draft Clean Energy and Climate Plan (CECP) for 2050. For the final draft of the 2050 CECP, I encourage the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delineate how much of the 88.6% in expected greenhouse gas emissions reductions by 2050 each suggested strategy or policy is responsible for, to allow for better tracking and course adjustment as needed; 2. Require emissions reductions from large buildings (instead of just energy reporting); 3. Increase the Clean Energy Standard to 100% by no later than 2035; 4. Track pollution levels in addition to clean energy investments in environmental justice communities; 5. Maintain the focus on expanding workforce development; 6. Aim to reduce vehicle miles traveled instead of just “stabilizing” total driving; and, 7. Reconsider the impact of federal developments resulting from the Inflation Reduction Act. <p>These changes will result in a stronger, more transparent final CECP for 2050. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, David Holzman, Boston, MA</p>

<p>Denise Presley</p>	<p>Comments on the Climate Plan Public Hearings (Oct 11)</p>	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Thanks very much for giving the public an opportunity to comment on the Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2050. I thought the comments on deforestation, repurposing retired fossil fuel plants, and establishing a climate corps job training program were excellent points. I'd like to memorialize the comment I made, during the October 11, 2022 hearing, about consumer product reliability.</p> <p>I did not find any reference to proposals to ensure that consumer/ residential energy conservation products (heat pumps, stoves, household tools, etc) perform as promised. As I mentioned, in the last four years I've spent tens of thousands of dollars on products that do not. For example, in 2018 I purchased a 24,000 btu heat pump/ mini-split that was sold as providing heat when the outdoor temperatures are as low as -5 degrees fahrenheit. Not true. Fortunately, I purchased a new oil furnace around the same time but while I waited for installation I had to rely on the heat pump. It was November and outdoor temps were in the 30's but it was so cold in my house that my little dog walked around in her pajamas all day. 😊</p> <p>After receiving no satisfaction from the contractor who sold and installed the system, I contacted the manufacturer and learned the contractor was not adequately trained. I also learned the system I bought had been misrepresented and what I really need is a "High Heat -5 degree 24,000 btu" ... at an estimated cost of \$6,394 - \$9,335 more.</p> <p>It seems to me the State should make a particular effort to ensure that any company selling energy efficient products is properly trained and certified by the manufacturer(s). And, if the product doesn't perform as promised the contractor must remove and replace the item, or reimburse the consumer. Otherwise, consumers will be reluctant to invest in these expensive products.</p> <p>Sadly, if I want my house to get warm (70 degrees on the thermostat) I have to turn on my oil burning furnace. That's not right.</p> <p>Denise Presley South Hadley, 01075</p>
<p>Don Ogden</p>	<p>Comments on the 2050 CECF</p>	<p>The 2050 Clean Energy Plan is certainly not a work in progress but rather a work in regression. Of particular note is the creative bookkeeping being applied to "Natural & Working Lands" (NWL) where sleight of hand juggling of numbers regarding carbon capture and emissions reminds this Massachusetts resident of old-school smokey backroom dealings passed off as honest efforts.</p> <p>We are in a Climate Crisis, a threat unlike any we have ever faced and one that threatens to grow worse with time unless all of us tell the truth and follow recent science with regard to natural carbon capture and storage. Business-as-usual is now business-in-peril. We can no longer treat our forests as some candy store of endless "resources" to do with as we please, to enrich ourselves or others putting future generations, including our own children and grandchildren, at extreme risk. Read the science of proforestation rather than falling back on old practices that are no longer viable or old friendships that may actually be toxic.</p> <p>A reconsidered 2050 Clean Energy Plan could hold the potential to be something future generations would point to as the time we decided to be realistic, to stop putting off hard choices and to begin realistically considering our actions with regard to the future. Rest assured, what you do today will be remembered tomorrow.</p> <p>Don Ogden The Enviro Show WXOJ/WMCB/WMNB</p> <p>-- *****</p>

		<p>"Our planet's future climate is inextricably tied to the future of its forests." - Oct. 5, 2018 letter from 40 scientists to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change</p> <p>"A society grows great when old men plant trees in whose shade they shall never sit." - Greek Proverb</p> <p>"It's time for the white-gloved invisible hand of economics to meet the visible fist of physics." - Jag Bhalla</p> <p>http://concertobi.blogspot.com/ *****</p> <p>Checkout The Enviro Show on WXOJ-LP, 103.3fm. Northampton, MA, Tuesdays, 6pm [Webstreaming at: http://valleyfreeradio.org/listen/ Also on WMCB, Greenfield; 107.9, Mondays & Tuesdays at 6pm. Streaming at http://wmc.net/Listen.html [Blog w/links and YOUR comments at: http://envirosho.blogspot.com/] Email: enviroshow@valleyfreeradio.org *****</p>
<p>Donald Henrich</p>	<p>Massachusetts' 2050 Climate Plan</p>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>The Clean Energy & Climate Plan for 2050 should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delineate how much of the 88.6% in expected greenhouse gas emissions reductions by 2050 each suggested strategy or policy is responsible for, to allow for better tracking and course adjustment as needed; • Require emissions reductions from large buildings (instead of just energy reporting); • Increase the Clean Energy Standard (renewable energy requirement) to 100% by no later than 2035; • Track pollution levels in addition to clean energy investments in environmental justice communities; • Maintain the focus on expanding workforce development; • Aim to <i>reduce</i> vehicle miles traveled instead of just "stabilizing" them; • Reconsider the impact of federal developments resulting from the Inflation Reduction Act. <p>These changes will result in a stronger, more transparent final CECP for 2050. Sincerely,</p> <p>Donald Henrich Dedham, MA</p>
<p>Fred Bunger</p>	<p>Testimony Regarding Buildings Sector – Global Warming Solutions Act 10/10/2022</p>	<p>To Massachusetts Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs</p> <p>61% of carbon emissions in my town are from buildings. More than 80% of buildings are more than 40 years old. Building energy efficiency improvements and conversion to renewable, non-emitting energy are central to meeting the 2030 to 2050 climate goals adopted in my town. We have set goals to improve energy use intensity(EUI) between now and 2050 from 69 to 30 kBtu/sq.ft./yr for residential buildings and from 124 to 40 kBtu/sq.ft/yr for commercial/institutional buildings. To meet our goal of all net-zero buildings will require converting all building energy systems to electric. We need State policy and code support to meet those goals. Policies that encourage and provide financial support and incentives will be necessary to support efficiency improvements and conversion to non-emitting heating, hot water and other equipment.</p> <p>The proposed Clean Heat Clearinghouse should be activated as soon as possible to provide the support and incentives to reduce building emissions. Recommendations on process: <u>First, focus on energy efficiency:</u> - Improve energy assessments to become full decarbonization audits that would determine the EUI of the building and compare it to norms and targets.</p>

		<p>- Provide advice, rebates and low interest financial support for air sealing, insulation and other actions to reduce EUI of buildings to target levels</p> <p><u>Second, move to decarbonization:</u></p> <p>- Decarbonization audit should also provide advice, rebates and access to low-interest financial support for conversion to non-emitting equipment. To insure that reducing energy consumption is a primary objective, support for equipment conversion and upgrades should be contingent upon meeting a building's target EUI levels.</p> <p>- It is essential to reduce energy consumption of buildings to avoid overloading the grid as heating, hot water and other equipment is converted from oil, propane and natural gas to electrical.</p> <p><u>Other comments on the GWSA:</u></p> <p>- Assuming MassSave would be the Clean Heat Clearing House, take administration of MassSave out of the hands of the Utilities. Utilities incentives do not align with the State incentives to meet 2030 to 2050 climate goals.</p> <p>Thank you for conducting the Public Hearing on the Global Warming Solutions Act and providing the opportunity to speak and provide written testimony.</p> <p>Fred Bunger Wellesley, MA Town Meeting Member and member of Climate Action Committee.</p>
<p>Gina Sonder</p>	<p>Commenting on the CECP for 2050</p>	<p>Re: Clean Energy & Climate Plan for 2050</p> <p>To: The Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs</p> <p>As a resident and concerned citizen of Arlington, MA. I am writing today to offer comments on the draft Clean Energy and Climate Plan (CECP) for 2050. For the final draft of the 2050 CECP, I commend the committee on all the hard work that obviously went into this draft; however, this document, this plan, is merely a step, an intention, and we need tangible specific actions NOW to get us to 2025 targets, let alone 2030 targets. We are taking steps when we need to sprint. I am not a climate scientist or policy expert, but I wish to offer my thoughts as a long time climate activist, and encourage the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) to consider the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"EEA has modeled an aggressive, yet achievable approach to meet 2050's 85% emission limit and ultimate net zero target." <u>The current plan relies on technologies not yet in existence</u> such as GHG sequestration, carbon sinks through land management, and use of hydrogen as a "greener" fuel in not only heavy industrial applications but residential applications as well, to reach the 2050 net zero target. An 86% reduction from 1990 levels by 2050 leaves 14% of uncertainty in adoption of the CECP 2050 plan targets through the new technologies yet to be, the reduction of energy use by individual citizens, etc. The overall target for 2050 must be set higher with this much uncertainty in the current Roadmap, and the map must have specific actionable means to navigate towards the target to add up to 100%. The current plan relies too heavily on uncertainties to reach the NET ZERO target in 2050.</i> • <u>The Roadmap must be more specific</u> in each sector to be able to reach the sub-limit targets. The destination is laudable, but please spell out HOW we get there from what we know at this point in time, acknowledging that the circumstances are likely to change in the years to come. Solutions must be plotted out to the best of our ability, not hinging on hope, but on what we have at our disposal NOW. • <u>At the State level the Massachusetts State government should lead by example.</u> The current plan strikes me as heavily reliant on the private sector and on individuals taking action at their own initiative and cost. It is like requesting that you - the individual - recycle your waste, but now it is buy your EV car and install a heat-pump. Is there funding for municipal government owned property, especially EJ communities, to implement GHG reducing projects? Other than procuring Federal dollars from Federal programs, funding State programs, and providing Roadmaps, regulations, and standards for businesses and residents, where in these various

sectors is the State itself taking actions to reduce GHGs under its control? State buildings? State transit vehicles? State land/water? State roads & bridges? Etc.

- Transportation Sector key targets and metrics seem to rely heavily on more EV charging stations to accommodate thousands of individuals transitioning to personal EV passenger cars and companies buying EV trucks, making this a consumer driven (excuse the pun) mitigation effort, with benefits to the car manufacturing industry and rare earth metals extraction. This also necessitates continued reliance, upgrade, expansion, and maintenance of roadways! Where is the upgrade, expansion, and maintenance of reliable & efficient State Subsidized affordable attractive (electrified) Mass Transit? Where is the "Park & Ride" program for commuters to pool drivers together, turn drivers into riders, keep cars out of congested metropolitan areas and off of the highways? It is a priority to get personal vehicles that are not shared vehicles off of the road as much as possible and reduce VMT. Where is the light (electrified) rail that replaces the highways? Ride sharing is currently the alternative to an unreliable, underfunded, limited Mass Transit System. Vehicle ownership is not universal, affordable, or practical, especially for people living in urban areas. Mass Transit is a public good, not a profit-making business. Fund regional Mass Transit throughout the Commonwealth.
- Encouraging use of alternative transit, does the plan propose Multi-modal roadways or the Danish model of giving each class of transit it's own safe path of travel? Bicycling on a roadway shared with cars, trucks, buses, pedestrians, and motorized scooters OR separate pathways for each class?
- Building Sector - The two utility companies in MA have slowly "started" pilot programs to provide community heating & cooling. Where in this plan is the community micro-grid prioritized? Community Geothermal Heating and Cooling Design and Deployment Funding is available, and would both benefit MA communities with more efficient heating/cooling and give union labor currently expanding and maintaining our fossil fuel infrastructure opportunities for employment, all while reducing GHG emissions in those communities as the electric utilities reduce their reliance on FF produced energy.
- Power Sector - If Ma is going to Electrify Everything the plan must increase the Clean Energy Standard (CES) to 100% by 2035, predominantly using local wind, solar, and storage technologies, and share redundancies across State and local boundaries to ensure reliability in an environment of climate disruption and increased intense weather events. Above-ground power infrastructure will need to be relocated below ground and redundancies on a local level must be created as back-up systems. The role of fossil fuels as the fall-back option is not the solution for 2050.
- Hydrogen as an alternate fuel can be appropriate to supply industrial use for heavy manufacturing and aviation in some cases. Hydrogen should not be a part of the renewable power planned for residential use, nor should it be a factor in building out or extending the use of gas utility infrastructure. It is neither safe nor environmentally beneficial.
- "Natural Gas" Non-Energy Gas Infrastructure Sub-limit "*2030 values are now estimated at 0.7 MMTCO_{2e}*" This is totally unacceptable, and must be addressed to lower emissions below the .5MMTCO_{2e} target, even if it means shutting off the pipelines! MA must transition off of methane-producing gas and must cease the import of fracked fossil fuels altogether by 2050.
- Natural and Working Lands need to be preserved and increased, and old growth forests, wooded parcels, & urban trees need protection from development plans that promise to plant a young tree in replacement of a mature bio-diverse forest or parcel.
- Site the solar arrays alongside the highways (in locations that are not currently acting as carbon sinks) and use the solar panel systems both as energy sources and as shading canopies over parking lots and other paved areas prone to heat-island effects. Do not on replace land that is a natural carbon sink or a natural habitat with solar arrays.

Lastly, I write these comments in late October of 2022, meaning that **in just 2 years and 2 1/2 months the year will be 2025, so it is high time to put plans into action! There is no time left.**

		<p>Sincerely, Gina Sonder Arlington, MA 02474</p> <p>--</p> <p><i>"The human race is challenged more than ever before to demonstrate our mastery - not over nature but of ourselves."</i></p> <p>- Rachel Carson, biologist, writer, conservationist (1907-1964)</p> <p>Please note: messages sent via e-mail do not remain confidential.</p>
<p>Glen Ayers</p>	<p>Comments on the 2050 CECP</p>	<p>Dear EEA Undersecretary Chang,</p> <p>Please accept these comments on the 2050 Clean Energy Climate Plan. My comments focus on the "NWL" section and the role of forests in addressing the Climate Emergency, especially our state-owned forests and parks.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The CECP fails to list, disclose, quantify, or address the GHG emissions from the logging sector in the Commonwealth, even though such accounting has been repeatedly requested during the EEA's planning and public participation process. This issue has been raised numerous times by the public, and EEA even supposedly hired a "Carbon Modeler" to conduct some sort of analysis, but the actual numbers have never been shared with the public. This is a glaring omission in the CECP and skews all of the other GHG numbers and goals listed in the CECP. Therefore, the final reductions that are claimed as goals in the CECP are simply not accurate, since the calculations ignore this significant source of GHG emissions as if it were zero. The carbon removal and storage capacity of approximately 65,000 acres of forest land in the state is significantly degraded every year by logging. This is a cumulative impact, and the associated road building, damage to wetlands and streams, and the ongoing emissions continue, but EEA refuses to account for a single CO2 molecule. This complete failure to address GHG emissions from the logging sector is unacceptable. 2. The concept of "net-zero" which relies on a theoretical carbon-offset of 15% to balance emissions, relies on forests and so-called "Natural and Working Lands" (NWL) as a key goal of the climate legislation and direction from the Legislature. Your CECP fails to delineate exactly how these NWL will factor into the attainment of net-zero by 2050, and instead uses a bogus concept of "carbon flux" to claim that there is a surplus of carbon removal from our forests, so that makes everything ok. This is entirely deceitful and uses fraudulent accounting to claim that logging has no GHG emissions because some tree somewhere else is compensating for the degradation of the carbon sink being caused by your actions (management). The DCR and DFW both use this fraudulent accounting practice to justify their commercial logging programs so that they will never have to attain the 80% reduction in GHG emissions required of all sectors of the economy and society. Why do our state agencies get a free pass when everyone else has to take actions to meet GHG reduction targets? Why do the very agencies that have the most potential to contribute to climate mitigation get to conduct business as usual as if what they are doing is somehow "climate-smart" or "climate-friendly", even though they can not produce a single shred of evidence to back it up? Even their own data shows that DCR Reserves store twice the carbon over 100 years than any management options, but still they disregard their own data and continue to do the opposite of what everyone knows we must do? There is no accountability. 3. The public lands logging program has steadfastly refused to disclose the GHG impact from the commercial logging of our state-owned lands, in spite of the public demanding that the agencies do so for the past 15 years. GHG emissions come directly from management activities and need to be reported at the project level. Instead DCR and DFW claim that they have a net-positive impact on emissions because the forested lands "as a whole" have a net positive "flux". By counting lands that are not actively managed as a "credit" the agencies are able to cheat and hide their actual GHG emission levels and therefore never actually reduce the emissions from their management activities (logging). In addition, the DCR and DFW intentionally target the largest and oldest trees in the forest on our public lands, because they have the most commercial value as timber, but never consider that these very trees are the most critical trees in the forest due to their age and structure, being the trees that are removing the greatest amount of CO2 for the

		<p>atmosphere, and that these mature trees increasing their removal rates and amounts every year. Instead the agencies use dishonest accounting to claim that they are doing something good for the climate. This fraud must stop. The CECP should disclose the truth, instead of relying on smoke and mirrors.</p> <p>4. The public knows what is really going on, and your EEA staff have repeatedly spouted timber industry talking points to justify your false analysis and refusal to address ecological reality. Logging results in net positive emissions of GHG, even when the small amount of carbon stored in "durable wood products" is factored in. Logging degrades the carbon sink, releases CO2 and GHG for decades after disturbance, and just because you don't cut down all the trees all at once, you don't get any credit for the trees you have left standing. This is a level of intellectual dishonesty that is appalling. Just stop doing it and tell the truth. Have some integrity. Show some ethical spine.</p> <p>5. This criticism will be disregarded, just like the public comments that were made on the NWL section of the Decarbonization Roadmap Plan and the draft CECPs that have been presented. What we have experienced is scientific fraud and administrative corruption. Luckily, this Administration is rapidly coming to an end very soon, just 77 days from today, and hopefully we will have a new leader who is not a climate poser. Luckily we have a Legislature that saw the need to more frequently update the CECPs, and that process will need to begin with a new and more honest process 78-days from now.</p> <p>6. You didn't rise to the occasion, you kicked the can down the road. Your CECP proposed the weakest and most pathetic measures imaginable for the NWL section, such as "consider policy changes" or "evaluate the possibility of X" or "promote more forest protection", as if such simpering and meaningless non-actions were somehow addressing anything of actual value. This is your legacy. When you had a chance to take bold action, you did the opposite. When the opportunity to do something real was in front of you, you closed your eyes and stuck your head in the sand. While we are not surprised, we are deeply disappointed.</p> <p>Good luck, and don't the revolving door hit you on the way out.</p> <p>Glen Ayers Greenfield, MA</p>
Jack Lochhead	Electric transport issues	<p>I am encouraged by your plans to encourage electric transport but I find one aspect highly misguided. Anyone who has spent time at UMass knows that while government can build things it is terrible at maintenance.</p> <p>I am therefore concerned that there are plans to build out a network of electric car high speed chargers. These are not needed.</p> <p>The problem today is not that there are too few chargers rather it is that many of them do not work. Other than Tesla, the charging networks are not well maintained. Government chargers are likely to be even worse.</p> <p>I would rather see the money spent on government enforcement of laws requiring chargers to be maintained.</p> <p>I do think that all government buildings should have adequate slow speed chargers for all staff commuting to the building. But high speed chargers should be left to the private sector and the government roll should be restricted to enforcing maintenance just as government now makes sure that gas stations accurately measure the gasoline as it is pumped into the car.</p> <p>Thank you for all you are doing to speed up the transition.</p> <p>Jack Lochhead</p>
Jodi Rodar	The Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2050	<p>The Clean Energy And Climate Plan For 2050 Should Include The Following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delineate how much of the 88.6% in expected greenhouse gas emissions reductions by 2050 each suggested strategy or policy is responsible for, to allow for better tracking and course adjustment as needed;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require emissions reductions from large buildings (instead of just energy reporting); • Increase the Clean Energy Standard (renewable energy requirement) to 100% by no later than 2035; • Track pollution levels in addition to clean energy investments in environmental justice communities; • Maintain the focus on expanding workforce development; • Aim to <i>reduce</i> vehicle miles traveled instead of just “stabilizing” them; • Reconsider the impact of federal developments resulting from the Inflation Reduction Act. <p>Thank you</p>
<p>Judith Black</p>	<p>Comment on 20/50 Clean Energy and Climate Plan</p>	<p>Thank-you for the public hearing I attended on 10/11/22. There was an invitation to submit comments:</p> <p>There are many laudable innovations that the state is pursuing, but many that have been minimized or ignored.</p> <p>TRANSIT</p> <p>-Why isn't expansion, improvement, and electrification of mass transit a major part of the transportation plan? The plan, as it stands will only nurture our crowded highways, our 'car culture,' and the endless need for more highways. Highly improved mass transit, as one sees in London and many other cities in Europe, nurtures walking (a big plus for human health), more open cities, and a huge cut in related pollutants. Unfortunately much of these pollutants, including 2.5 particulate matter, originates from tires and break pads, so simply transforming the system to EVs will not solve the issue with pollutants.</p> <p>-The transportation plan must include the expansion of safe bicycle paths, making biking a reasonable alternative for commuters, students, and shoppers. Here is an option for transportation that produces no emissions, takes up no precious urban space with parking, is imminently affordable, and has positive impact on human health.</p> <p>BUILDINGS</p> <p>Geo-thermal heating and cooling should be in the forefront of heating options, especially in new structures.</p> <p>Electric Power</p> <p>-No biofuels should be included in our standards. Much of what is used are from things like old train tracks, which have been doused with preservatives/creosote and are not safe to burn. Also any fuel that might encourage denuding the land of trees is completely counter intuitive. Trees drink in CO2 and exhale oxygen.</p> <p>-Claiming that wind and solar are unstable is balanced by the brilliant innovation in battery storage.</p> <p>-We could also, living on the coast, be researching and using tide power.</p> <p>-'Renewable natural gas' unless it is used on the site where it is created, experiences all same problems. It LEAKS.</p> <p>-The suggested hydrogen/methane mix that energy companies, now installing pipes to support it, is an utterly terrible idea. It is an expensive future technology that will simply increase the life of methane use for many more decades. We do not have the time for such a snails pace transition.</p> <p>NON-INDUSTRY</p> <p>-We need passive building stretch codes. Continuing to use fossil fuels for heat and electricity is not a sustainable option if we want a livable climate.</p> <p>-The poor and vulnerable will be the ones paying exorbitant heating prices as those who are financially able turn towards electrification from renewable sources do so. The state needs to control this process by setting clear deadlines and subsidizing low income home owners and landlords in the transition.</p> <p>When we hear people screaming: “We are in an emergency. We must expand oil and gas pipelines and access.” I want to scream back “We are in an emergency. Our CO2 levels are now at 420PPM, far, far</p>

		<p>above the 350PPM that is desirable to maintain our climate systems. We must look beyond a single winter if we want a future.”</p> <p>Submitted by Judith Black Marblehead, MA *****</p> <p>Visit my storytelling web site: www.storiesalive.com</p> <p>- Ted Talk: An Antidote to Despair-Storytelling and the Climate Crisis https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4nMAV8xFUMg</p> <p>-3 Terse and funny minutes to understand corporate GREENWASHING https://youtu.be/B2cqQsYPpm0</p>
Laurie Boosahda	Industrial Solar must go on rooftops and brownfields, NOT on mature forests or productive farm land	<p>It is exciting that the federal government will have more money to support large scale solar however, we cannot destroy all the benefits of mature forests (carbon sequestration, wildlife habitat, water storage/erosion control) OR the value of farmland - simply because such locations are easy. MA incentives and regulations must put solar on industrial rooftops, roadsides, parking lots and brownfields. When all of those options have been exhausted, then the state should invest in agricultural solar, which space is the panel so that enough light reaches the ground allowing grazing and crop production to coexist. When all of those options have been exhausted, then the state should invest in agricultural solar, which space is the panel so that enough light reaches the ground allowing grazing and crop production to coexist. Solar siting policy does not lend itself to a popular survey. Policy must be based on long range scientific understanding are all the factors involved.</p>
Louise Amyot	Siting solar panels on forested land	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>The question before us seems to be whether or not the solar panels we (may) need to slow climate change should be sited on presently forested or farmed land.</p> <p>Given the amount of land that is presently covered by landfills, parking lots, warehouses, corporate offices, hospital, school and government buildings, the starting premise of this investigation seems to be devoid of any logic. All of the aforementioned properties could be potential sites for solar arrays located already in areas of heavy need, thus making power transmission easier and less expensive than rural sites. And none would involve destroying any of our critical forests or farms.</p> <p>Farmland which we need to feed people is needed for just that: to feed people. Careful farming techniques also provide for some of the most effective carbon sequestration known to civilization. Covering farmers' fields with solar panels might still allow certain forms of farming to be done but the very act of putting those panels in place would inevitably degrade the soil in the process.</p> <p>Forests, for their part, are needed for the carbon sequestration that they do as well as for the clean oxygen that we so desperately need from them. What's more, a forest requires very little effort on our part, lasts for decades, sometimes centuries, provides us all with cooling shade, recreation, habitat for our fellow creatures, mushrooms and more. If it were possible to quantify these benefits, the benefits of solar would pale by comparison.</p> <p>For the logical thinker, the concept of siting solar panels on forested or active farming lands is entirely without merit. It is the kind of thinking that is forwarded and supported by businesses interested only in the bottom line, where clean-cutting a forest is easier (and remunerative in the selling of the timber) than preparing many roofs or leasing parking lots for those same solar arrays. For the lover of this planet and its inhabitants, the concept of replacing forests with solar panels is unthinkable, unreasonable, unacceptable.</p> <p>Louise Amyot Greenfield, MA 01301</p>
Lucia Dolan	Comments on the CECP 2050	<p>The Transportation Working Group of 350 Mass is encouraged to see the extension of current policy in the proposed CECP 2050, such as the expansion of housing production near public transportation, prioritization of multimodal infrastructure, electrification of rail, and the implementation of the Advanced Clean Cars</p>

		<p>and Truck Standards. We urge you to further support the reduction of GHG emissions by improving the frequency, reliability, and range of public mass transit in Massachusetts.</p> <p>Improved mass transit, even without electrification, has the ability to quickly lower GHG (see graphic below). It is a necessary component to support reduced vehicle miles traveled through housing production near public transportation. Converting our commuter rail system into a regional rail system, with frequent, seven day service, multiplies the GHG reduction benefits of housing near public transportation.</p> <p>Improved mass transit supports the EJ workforce participation goals of the CECP. Access to reliable transit correlates to higher employment and income. Individual car ownership is lowest among low income residents. While recently enacted legislation will give low income residents a larger, immediate rebate on the purchase of an EV, the cost of purchasing, housing, and maintaining an EV will remain prohibitive for many. According to MassBudget 'In Massachusetts the costs of insurance, financing, taxes, repairs, parking, and fuel add up to \$12,000 or more each year.'</p> <p>Improved mass transit supports the CECP's land protection goals by moving more people in fewer vehicles, reducing the pressure to increase impervious surfaces, roads and parking, for vehicles. Additionally, it reduces the need to use open land for solar farms to increase electrical production. According to the Governor's Commission on the Future of Transportation 'adding an EV to a neighborhood is equivalent to adding an extra home.'</p> <p>Increasing green energy production and building out the EV charging network will take time. As will turning over the fleet with the purchase of new electric vehicles. Improved public mass transit is a readily available tool the State can use to immediately begin reducing GHG emissions and advance environmental justice. We urge the EEA Climate Team to add improving the frequency, reliability, and range of public mass transit to the 2050 CECP proposal.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Lucia Dolan, Co-Chair Transportation Working Group, 350 Mass</p>
<p>Marcia Young</p>	<p>Response to 2050 Energy Plan</p>	<p>I attended your Zoom presentation this week and have the following comments:</p> <p>If we are truly serious about reducing CO2, we can not rely on solar and wind power. They will not meet the need. They are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● impractical ● expensive ● land intensive ● generate huge toxic and other waste issues for the future <p>We need to take another look at nuclear power. It is the only currently available CO2-free energy source that is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● strong and reliable for base load ● requires no backup ● has minimal land and material requirements ● has a superior safety record ● has low volume waste that can be safely handled ● can utilize existing Grid system and fit into retired fossil fuel plants ● can provide abundant electricity for all countries <p>I urge the committee to take another look at nuclear power. Modern nuclear power has addressed the safety concerns of the past and has demonstrated its reliability and safety under real world conditions (see France and Sweden for examples). It is the way to reduce CO2 without sacrificing our forests and wildlife habitats to the massive land requirements of wind and solar.</p>

		Respectfully, Marcia Young Westford MA
Paul Shorb	2050 CECPO	<p>I am writing today to offer comments on the draft Clean Energy and Climate Plan (CECP) for 2050. I attended one of the EEA webinars and have reviewed draft comments prepared by the Green Energy Consumers Alliance and am persuaded by those comments, so I am endorsing them here. Specifically, for the final draft of the 2050 CECP, I encourage the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delineate how much of the 88.6% in expected greenhouse gas emissions reductions by 2050 each suggested strategy or policy is responsible for, to allow for better tracking and course adjustment as needed; 2. Require emissions reductions from large buildings (instead of just energy reporting); 3. Increase the Clean Energy Standard to 100% by no later than 2035; 4. Track pollution levels in addition to clean energy investments in environmental justice communities; 5. Maintain the focus on expanding workforce development; 6. Aim to reduce vehicle miles traveled instead of just “stabilizing” total driving; and, 7. Reconsider the impact of federal developments resulting from the Inflation Reduction Act. <p>These changes would produce a stronger, more transparent final CECP for 2050. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Paul Shorb Lincoln, MA</p>
Rachael Stark	Massachusetts' 2050 climate plan – must include protection for all mature	<p>Any climate protection must include strong legal protection for all mature trees. Trees are the best way of removing carbon from the atmosphere and sequestering carbon already released that is available to the average person. Keep all the trees we have and plant and care for many more new trees.</p> <p>Of course, we must wean off fossil fuels and nuclear power, subsidize compact walkable places to live and work rather than sprawl, repair existing sprawl, subsidize safe renewable energy rather than dangerous energy, and dramatically reduce what is considered “normal” use of energy.</p> <p>But we must also remove carbon. For most people, the safest, easiest, fastest, more accessible way to do that is to protect all mature trees and plant and care for many new trees.</p> <p>Include tree protection and tree planting in any climate plan. Thank you.</p> <p>Rachael Stark</p>
Sara Ross	Comment on 2050 CECP	<p>My name is Sara Ross and I am a resident of Amherst, MA. I am writing today to offer comments on the draft Clean Energy and Climate Plan (CECP) for 2050. For the final draft of the 2050 CECP, I encourage the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delineate how much of the 88.6% in expected greenhouse gas emissions reductions by 2050 each suggested strategy or policy is responsible for, to allow for better tracking and course adjustment as needed; 2. Require emissions reductions from large buildings (instead of just energy reporting); 3. Increase the Clean Energy Standard to 100% by no later than 2035; 4. Track pollution levels in addition to clean energy investments in environmental justice communities; 5. Maintain the focus on expanding workforce development; 6. Aim to reduce vehicle miles traveled instead of just “stabilizing” total driving; and, 7. Reconsider the impact of federal developments resulting from the Inflation Reduction Act. <p>These changes will result in a stronger, more transparent final CECP for 2050. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sara Ross Amherst, MA</p>

<p>Susan Starkey</p>	<p>CECP Comment</p>	<p>Dear Gwsa, I submitted comments on your Portal earlier today and would like to add this:</p> <p>Re Renewable Energy and Solar: the state’s SMART solar subsidy program is incentivizing solar energy in all the wrong places – forested lands, residential neighborhoods, and on prime farmland, often threatening groundwater and wetlands. We need state policies and town bylaws that promote solar in the right places - rooftops on every home, business, covered parking lot and/or already destroyed land (like landfills).</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Susan Starkey, Co-Chair https://capecodclimate.org/faith/</p>
<p>Susan Tordella</p>	<p>Comments on Net Zero 2050</p>	<p>Public Hearing on the Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2050 October 11, 2022</p> <p>Thank you for your work on attacking this complex problem of Net Zero by 2050. I wanted to add that I would like to see the plan on how to change people’s behavior to break the addiction to personal transportation by auto, electric or not. I ran a Transportation Management Association in MetroWest Boston for three years, with the goal to encourage people to give up driving alone to work, at least one or two days a week. The alternatives were to carpool – using a ride-matching database, public transit, bike or walk. It was like asking people to go on a very strict diet to give up the convenience, privacy, status, comfort and expense of a solo commute on the very congested Route 9 from 495 and 95 to Framingham and Natick.</p> <p>Your group has taken to heart the resistance to use land for solar, which leaves wind as the holy grail of the impossible task to get to Net Zero in 2050. Below is a summary of what I said during the forum, and additional questions to consider about the many drawbacks AND COSTS of wind (and solar), which are usually ignored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Please provide an analysis of the estimated cost of building infrastructure to support off-shore wind, including construction of a deep port, transmission lines, the wind turbines, and every 30 years – the disposal and replacement of the equipment at sea. Legislators and the GWSA must recognize the REAL costs that are typically overlooked. · How will such turbines stand up to heavy weather like nor’easters and hurricanes? · What about the wildlife in the area of the turbines? · How much electricity will be lost in transmission from the turbines to the grid? · How much battery storage will be required? Is it available now? At what cost? How much electricity will be shed by transmission from the turbines, storing it and sending it to end users? Would that be practical and cost efficient? · How will wind power provide grid-stable energy? What will be the backup? Most likely gas. What is the safety record of gas – both in loss of human life and environmental leaks and accidents? · Has the GWSA investigated the experience of Germany use of wind power – that only provided electricity 30 percent of the time? The impressive experience of Sweden to use nuclear energy for 40 years? I recommend the book, “A Bright Future” by Goldstein and Qvist. · Why is nuclear power not considered in your work? I propose that the GWSA investigate the possibility of converting shuttered coal and nuclear generating plants with nuclear power. This would require a massive social marketing effort to educate Massachusetts residents on the benefits of clean, modern, safe, efficient nuclear energy. · Please encourage our state universities and community colleges to promote nuclear engineering as a career to stop the climate crisis. <p>Thank you for looking forward to the next three decades. It is easy to criticize a plan and much harder to devise one, as you have done, under legislative restrictions and the public eye. Keep up the hard work and listening to constituents.</p> <p>Susan Tordella Ayer, Massachusetts</p>

		<p>Going vegan saves ONE ton of CO2 per year</p> <p>Biking instead of driving saves FOUR tons of CO2 per year</p> <p>Saving ONE nuclear power plant saves 10,000,000 tons of CO2 per year</p>
Tom Dorney		<p>My name is Tom Dorney and I live in Sandwich on the cape.. I have some thoughts to share about the draft Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2050. For the final version I urge the Exec. Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs to give a little more emphasis in the Transportation section on electric school buses. In the current draft I found only the following reference:</p> <p><i>Electrify markets with critical health and equity implications, including vehicles for hire, school buses, and delivery trucks.</i></p> <p>Approximately 400,000 students are transported to school in Massachusetts (https://www.mass.gov/service-details/school-bus-safety-fact-sheet) each day of the school year. The overwhelming majority of these school buses burn diesel. Each gallon of diesel when combusted with oxygen produces 22.3 pounds of CO2. In my town alone during school year 2021-2022 transporting students to and from school produced 1,225,244 pounds of CO2. I calculated this number myself from the amount of gasoline and diesel that the town and the bus company provided to me.</p> <p>Maybe you can underscore the importance of electrifying school buses by giving school buses their own sentence rather lumping them in with cars for hire and delivery trucks.</p> <p>Tom Dorney</p>
Wendy Brown	CECP hearing feedback	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I'm an architect in Western MA, focused on sustainability. I attended the third public hearing presented by Judy Chang.</p> <p>Following is my feedback on the CECP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggestion for targeting high EUI buildings first, in energy retrofit plans. - Suggestion for siting solar in Brownfields. We have many in Pittsfield. - Slide 8 doesn't mention retrofit of existing buildings, and I think the targets on Slide 10 for deep weatherization are too low. - Battery storage is going to be key to transitioning off of fossil fuels and I didn't see or hear a word about it in the presentation. (Maybe I missed it.) - Suggestion for education about, and monetary assistance of, proper disposal of refrigerants. - Suggestion to promote local beef and other meat consumption vs. CAFO meat. - Suggestion to promote "Shave the Peak" more. People are going to have to pay attention to this sooner or later, anyway. - Workforce development is critical and needs to ramp up ASAP. - I don't understand why the Climate Service Corps would take so long to implement, and it shouldn't wait that long. - Other state agencies should be more aware of the state climate policies and make adjustments to their building practices. I'm thinking of MSBA as an example. LEED is not all it's cracked up to be---a LEED certified building can still use a lot of energy! - I don't know if this is in the realm of this Plan, but there are products used in high-performance buildings that are now being purchased from Europe. Vermont now has a recycled glass gravel plant, and Maine will have a wood fiber insulation plant next year. Let's support Massachusetts in this industry, too. <p>Thank you, Wendy Wendy E. Brown, AIA NCARB certificate Dalton, MA 01226</p>