

## Ferguson, Thomas (ENE)

---

**From:** Annie Reed <[anniehollyreed@gmail.com](mailto:anniehollyreed@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 30, 2024 9:19 AM  
**To:** Ferguson, Thomas (ENE)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Charging Forward: Energy Storage in Net Zero Commonwealth

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.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Annie Reed** <[anniehollyreed@gmail.com](mailto:anniehollyreed@gmail.com)>  
Date: Tue, Jan 30, 2024 at 9:16 AM  
Subject: Charging Forward: Energy Storage in Net Zero Commonwealth  
To: <[Grid@masscec.com](mailto:Grid@masscec.com)>

This report fails to address several realities, all of which make it totally unrealistic, if not completely impossible to continue 'Charging Forward with Energy Storage in Net Zero Commonwealth'.

1. Adequate grid scale storage capacity: The capacity to back-up intermittent renewables (Wind & solar) will need to be provided in weeks, not hours, or days of storage. There was a period last summer when the wind didn't blow for about 2 weeks, and the sun only shines in New England on average about 30% of the time. In addition, capacity must be allotted for the aftermath of periods where intermittent renewables are not generating electricity, so that depleted storage systems can recharge. An appropriate period of excess capacity above demand, needs to be accounted for, and built into calculations. And since severe weather is somewhat unpredictable, it may not be possible to design a system with robust capacity to recharge before the next weather event necessitates depleting the storage systems again. In the winter of 2014-15, back-to-back snow storms dumped more than 100" of snow on Boston in less than a month. Without this capacity, MA citizens will be subject to blackouts, which are catastrophic & can result in death (elderly & the poor are more at risk) when people have no access to heat or cooling in extreme weather conditions.
2. MDES and LDES technologies with grid scale capacity do not currently exist. They may be 'under development or emerging', but there is no mention in the report or accomodation for the time it will take to develop these technologies to make them viable for gridscale deployment. Technological advances may never achieve financial or practical viability. And there is no consideration of the enormous quantity of critical minerals required and the intensive mining required (most of which will come from other continents & may impact our energy security). Nor is there any mention of the enormous negative impact on the ecology of the Earth that these enormous storage systems will require.
3. Cost: The report notes that ' Financial, siting, permitting, interconnection, operational, technological, and supply chain barriers must be overcome to allow for the deployment and use of energy storage systems'. Who is going to shoulder the cost of 'de-risking and procuring' these MDES and LDES technologies? The report implies that it is going to be

the ratepayers & tax payers in MA. The citizens of MA already pay the third highest electricity rates in the nation, almost double the national average. My electricity rate has doubled in the last decade. I, like other average citizens, cannot afford to see my electricity rates double again in the next decade. I am also a citizen who can't afford to pay more in taxes. And I don't want to see my Commonwealth tax dollars shifted away from our robust social service programs or our first in the nation public education programs, so we can continue 'Charging Forward' with an energy transition that appears to be based on good intentions and wishful thinking. We can't afford to keep providing endless financial incentives for an energy policy & decarbonization solution that is not viable, and doesn't appear to be based in economic, engineering or scientific reality.

Where is the equity & social justice in making electricity unaffordable and unreliable, and pushing our already fragile grid infrastructure to its limits, and the brink of the economic & social disaster that will eventually result from rolling blackouts? Lets allocate our available financial resources (both tax dollars & rate payer dollars) to upgrading our grid so that it will be robust & reliable as we double the power load to meet the increasing electricity demands in the next couple of decades.

I urge Massachusetts leaders & decision makers to focus on a pragmatic electricity generation solution for all of us 'stakeholders' that is going to truly allow us to decarbonize, while protecting nature and the earth's atmosphere.

Please reconsider Nuclear Power as the most viable clean energy alternative. Nuclear power is strong, reliable, dispatchable energy that requires no backup. And the technology & infrastructure to support it exists TODAY. It currently provides close to 20% of our electricity here in MA from Seabrook in NH & Millstone in CT. We could triple that amount by 2050, as John Kerry has committed to doing at COP 28, along with 24 other countries. Nuclear power produces no CO2 and is readily available now to continue addressing climate change. If we are truly sincere in "Charging Forward", we must add Nuclear Power to our energy mix.

--

Annie Reed - 108 Columbia St Brookline MA

Nuclear is zero carbon - Split atoms and save the environment

[Nuclear energy explained in 2 minutes](#)

--

Annie