

**Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs  
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RESOURCES**

**SMALL CLEAN ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITY SITING &  
PERMITTING (225 CMR 29.00)**

**DRAFT GUIDELINE**

**Guideline on Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures**

**Effective Date: March xx, 2026**

**Background and Purpose**

This document provides guidance regarding qualifying Minimization and Mitigation measures for impacts identified in Criteria-specific Suitability Scores under 225 CMR 29.00 and the application of *Site Suitability Assessments for Clean Energy Infrastructure* (“Site Suitability Guidance”).

A Small Clean Energy Infrastructure Facility (“SCEIF”) should be sited and designed to avoid, minimize or, if impacts cannot be avoided or minimized, mitigate impacts and environmental and land use concerns to the greatest extent possible. The Local Government should use an SCEIF’s Criteria-specific Suitability Scores to determine what, if any, Minimization or Mitigation measures should be required for an Applicant to receive a Consolidated Local Permit.

**1. Exemptions**

Refer to 225 CMR 29.07 (1) for the types of Small Clean Energy Infrastructure Facilities that are exempt from Site Suitability and associated Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation requirements.

**2. Criteria-specific Suitability Scores**

Criteria-specific Suitability scores are calculated using the methodology described in the Site Suitability Guidance. Criteria-specific Suitability Scores will be assessed for each of the following criteria:

- Climate change resilience;
- Carbon storage and sequestration;
- Biodiversity;
- Social and environmental burdens; and
- Agricultural resources.

Assessments of an SCEIF’s climate change resilience, carbon storage and sequestration, biodiversity, agricultural resources, and social and environmental burdens will result in

numerical scores for each criterion. Certain Criteria-specific Suitability Scores can be modified by two specific assessments: an assessment of an SCEIF's development potential, and its social and environmental benefits.

The following table should be used to interpret Criteria-specific Suitability Scores and determine the scope of Minimization and Mitigation required for approval of a Consolidated Local Permit Application:<sup>1</sup>

<b>Table 1: Criteria-specific Suitability Scores</b>		
<b>Criteria Score Range</b>	<b>Suitability (for specific criteria)</b>	<b>Interpretation (for specific criteria)</b>
Less than or equal to 1.0	Highly suitable, minimal impact	No Minimization or Mitigation measures required
Greater than 1.0 and less than or equal to 2.5	Suitable, low impact	Limited Minimization and/or Mitigation measures may be required. Mitigation measures at this level should correspond to a 2:1 ratio of mitigation benefits to project impacts.
Greater than 2.5 and less than or equal to 4.0	Moderately suitable, moderate impacts	Moderate Minimization and/or Mitigation measures may be required. Mitigation measures at this level should correspond to a 3:1 ratio of Mitigation benefits to project impacts.
Greater than 4.0	Unsuitable, high impact	Significant Minimization and/or Mitigation measures may be required. Mitigation measures at this level should correspond to a 4:1 ratio of Mitigation benefits to project impacts.

The ratios of Mitigation benefits to project impacts in the table above may be based on any quantified measure with a rational nexus to the criterion, such as land areas, fluxes of carbon, storm water retention, heat island effects, or other defined costs.

## **2.1 Application of the Mitigation Hierarchy**

The mitigation hierarchy prioritizes Avoidance, then Minimization, and, where necessary, Mitigation of the impacts of SCEIFs on agricultural resources, biodiversity, carbon storage and sequestration, climate resilience, and social and environmental burdens. The mitigation hierarchy

---

<sup>1</sup> *Site Suitability Assessments for Clean Energy Infrastructure* § V(C)(ii)

supports the appropriate siting of SCEIFs, reduces project impacts on people and the environment, and aligns with the goals of nature-positive development and no net-loss of nature.

Applicants should apply the mitigation hierarchy when developing proposed Mitigation and Minimization measures to be included in their Consolidated Local Permit Application.

### **2.1.1 The Mitigation Hierarchy**

The mitigation hierarchy is applied through the following steps.

1. Avoidance:
  - a. An applicant demonstrates Avoidance through measures taken to prevent negative impacts on values such as climate change resiliency, carbon sequestration and storage, biodiversity, agricultural resources, social and environmental burdens, and recreation.
  - b. Small Clean Energy Infrastructure Facilities with Site Footprints that receive highly suitable Criteria-specific Scores (less than or equal to 1.0) pursuant to the Site Suitability Guidance are presumed to have demonstrated Avoidance.
  - c. Applicants whose projects do not achieve highly suitable scores may demonstrate Avoidance by describing in the Site Suitability Report how the configuration, design, construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of the project will avoid impacts that are otherwise anticipated for the project site.
2. Minimization:
  - a. An applicant demonstrates Minimization through measures taken to reduce the duration, intensity, and extent of impacts, including direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts, that cannot be completely avoided, to the extent practicable.
3. Mitigation:
  - a. An applicant demonstrates Mitigation through measures taken which include, but are not limited to, the repair, rehabilitation, or restoration of an area affected by an adverse impact of siting.
  - b. Mitigation measures may also be implemented in areas outside of the Site Footprint, with the permission of the municipality, or when it is not possible to implement Mitigation measures on-site.

### **2.2 Score Modifiers**

Site Suitability Score Modifiers may be applied to adjust Criteria-specific Suitability Scores. Procedurally, Score Modifiers are applied before qualified minimization or mitigation measures are assigned. Site Suitability Score Modifiers are based on an assessment of an SCEIF's development potential, or any social and environmental benefits the Applicant agrees to provide.

### **2.2.1 Development Potential**

Development potential is scored based on whether the site meets the requirements of certain types of highly suitable or highly unsuitable categories of land. In general, Brownfields, Eligible Landfills, and Previously Developed Lands are considered highly suitable sites, whereas Protected Open Space is considered highly unsuitable. SCEIFs sited on a Brownfield, Eligible Landfill, or Previously Developed Lands shall receive a Criteria-specific Suitability Score of zero for the following criterion:

- Carbon storage and sequestration;
- Biodiversity;
- Social and environmental burdens; and
- Agriculture resources

Conversely, SCEIFs with a Site Footprint that overlaps with Protected Open Space shall automatically receive a five (5) for each Criteria-specific Suitability Score.

### **2.2.2 Social and Environmental Benefits**

Social and environmental benefits Site Suitability Score Modifiers are calculated to reflect any benefits to human health and wellbeing, livelihoods, and/or environmental quality provided by the proposed SCEIF. An Applicant who wishes to apply this Site Suitability Score Modifier may do so only after entering into a written agreement with the Local Government that binds the Applicant to delivering agreed-upon benefits.

Proposed SCEIFs can have one-half (0.5) of a point subtracted from their Social and Environmental Burdens Criteria-specific Suitability Score, up to a total of five (5) points, for demonstrating each of the following benefits:

1. **Environmental Justice and Equity:** Addressing historical harms, reducing environmental burdens, and ensuring that the most burdened communities receive priority access to energy and environmental benefits, clean energy, and public health protections.
1. **Economic Development and Workforce Creation:** Creating good-paying, accessible jobs for local residents, supporting small and minority-owned businesses, and building long-term economic opportunities.
2. **Infrastructure and Community Support:** Investing in the physical and social infrastructure that communities need to thrive - such as affordable housing, transportation access, broadband, or childcare facilities.
3. **Implementation of Environmental and Public Health Protections:** Protecting people's health and the natural environment through preservation efforts, pollution prevention and controls, land and habitat restoration, and climate resilience measures.

The following list includes additional examples of the types of agreements or documentation that could satisfy the different categories of social and environmental benefits listed above:

<b>Table 2: Example Social and Environmental Benefits</b>	
<b>Example Benefit</b>	<b>Example Documentation or Agreement</b>
Improvement to Local Habitat	Signed agreement, confirmed by municipal conservation or planning commission or equivalent body
Improvement to Outdoor Air Quality	Documentation of displaced emitting source provided by relevant utility or site owner
Creation of Expanded Recreational Opportunities	Signed agreement with municipal city council, selectboard, economic development board, or planning commission, such as a trail easement
Deployment of Public Electric Vehicle Charging	Signed contract for construction of site or provision of funds
Application of Community Solar Bill Credits to Reduce Electric Bills	Signed bill credit allocation commitment and/or credit allocation forms
Establishment of Cultural Easements	Deed of easement or relevant restrictive covenant
Creation or Maintenance of Local Jobs	Signed Collective Bargaining Agreement or guaranteed employment contracts for specific term
Utilizes Pollinator-Friendly Habitat	Securing a silver certification or higher from the University of Massachusetts Clean Energy Extension Pollinator Friendly Certification Program and a signed agreement with municipal conservation commission or equivalent body

### **3. Qualifying Minimization and Mitigation Measures for Criteria-Specific Suitability Scores**

Mitigation must have a rational nexus to the specific criterion on which the score was assessed. Qualifying Mitigation measures involving replacement of impacted resources (e.g., tree replacement, or habitat replacement) should adhere to a “no net loss” goal and at least a two-to-one replacement ratio of impacted land area. Local Governments and Applicants should refer to the recommended mitigation ratios in the table on Page 2 of this guideline to determine the scope of qualifying Mitigation.

Proposed SCEIFs that are considered highly suitable and have minimal impact according to the Criteria-specific Suitability Score may still be required to fulfill mitigation requirements to comply with local, state, and federal laws and regulations (e.g., wetlands replacement, stormwater and erosion control measures).

The following subsections provide technical guidance to assist municipalities and Applicants with identifying and developing appropriate Minimization and Mitigation measures based on each Criteria-specific Suitability Score. This guidance does not prescribe specific practices but

defines the outcomes for Minimization and Mitigation that selected measures should achieve. Qualifying measures should be applied in alignment with the mitigation hierarchy process and designed and constructed by technical experts in the domain of the relevant criterion.

While developing and assessing Minimization and Mitigation proposals, Local Governments, Applicants, and technical experts should also consider whether the measures may have positive and/or negative cross-cutting effects on other criteria. For example, measures to restore habitat can also enhance climate resilience through improved stormwater infiltration and can alleviate social and environmental burdens by providing low-impact recreational access. Conversely, measures to mitigate impacts on carbon storage and sequestration may reduce available habitat for certain species by altering the structure and composition of a site's vegetation. Parties using this Guideline should make a holistic assessment of the positive and negative cross-cutting effects of Mitigation measures to achieve desired management outcomes and to avoid unintended consequences.

### **3.1 Climate Change Resilience**

Qualifying measures for climate change resilience will be selected based on the Site Footprint's exposure to: (1) riverine flooding and (2) coastal flooding from sea level rise and storm surge.

- Qualifying Minimization measures for climate change resilience are practices that reduce a project's vulnerability and exposure to damage from riverine or coastal flooding, under present and future conditions of sea-level rise, storm surge, and extreme precipitation. These measures include, but are not limited to, nature-based flood and stormwater control systems, project design enhancements, practices to support soil infiltration and porosity, and physical structures to manage floodwater. Local Governments may request that Applicants consult with technical experts in flood resilience, engineering, and climate adaptation to identify and implement qualifying Minimization measures that reduce vulnerability and exposure to flooding.
- Qualifying Mitigation measures for climate change resilience are practices that conserve, restore, or improve the adaptive capacity and resilience of coastal and riverine ecosystems, under present and future conditions of stormwater runoff pollution, sea-level rise, storm surge, and extreme precipitation. These measures include, but are not limited to dam removal, saltmarsh restoration, tidal flow restoration, nature-based stormwater control systems, and conservation of natural areas that support coastal and riverine ecosystem processes. Local Governments may request that Applicants consult with technical experts in coastal and riverine ecosystem restoration and resilience to identify and implement qualifying Mitigation measures.

### 3.1.1 Examples of Minimization and Mitigation Measures for Climate Change Resilience

The following table provides a non-exhaustive selection of Minimization and Mitigation measures for climate change resilience. The suitability and effectiveness of any practice is dependent on project- and site-specific conditions. Not all practices will be suitable to address the impacts of a given project.

<b>Table 3: Example Qualifying Minimization and Mitigation Measures for Climate Change Resilience</b>	
<b>Impacts to:</b>	<b>Qualifying Minimization Measures</b>
<b>Either Coastal or Riverine Flooding</b>	Incorporate stormwater management techniques and best management practices, such as retention areas, swales, and dry wells to reduce soil erosion
	Implement green infrastructure practices such as utilizing rain gardens/bioretention, permeable pavements, bioswales, tree plantings
	Establish buffer strips (planted or naturally occurring vegetation, such as trees, shrubs, legumes, or grasses) to stabilize streambanks and shorelines, and prevent bank erosion and slumping
	Establish filter strips (vegetated areas along water bodies, designed to slow the movement of overland flow of water so that sediment will be left behind, provide an opportunity for vegetation to remove nutrients from subsurface flow, provide shade to the adjacent water body to maintain cool water temperature, and protect bank stability and prevent erosion) as defined in <i>Massachusetts Forestry Best Management Practices Manual</i>
	Implement erosion and sedimentation controls
	Preservation of on-site wetlands
	Install, establish, and maintain appropriate deep-rooting native vegetated ground cover between and under the SCEIF to facilitate infiltration
	Utilize Low-Impact Development <sup>2</sup> construction and maintenance techniques such as minimal grading, maintaining existing vegetative cover, no removal of topsoil, and post-construction decompaction to avoid and minimize soil compaction to achieve low bulk density and adequate soil depth for infiltration
	Incorporate soil/rooting depth into stormwater and water quality monitoring
	Raise SCEIF equipment height above the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood levels
<b>Qualifying Mitigation Measures</b>	

<sup>2</sup> See. Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, Water Resources Commission [Low Impact Development](#)

	Execute land conservation agreements, such as easements or land purchases, for coastal and riverine ecosystems and floodplain areas
	Implement a coastal or riverine habitat restoration project
<b>Coastal Flooding</b>	<b><i>Qualifying Mitigation Measures</i></b>
	Conduct a Tidal Restoration Project, which is a project that will restore tidal flow and that does not meet all the eligibility criteria set forth in 310 CMR 10.13, and may be permitted as an Ecological Restoration Limited Project

### 3.2 Carbon Storage and Sequestration

Qualifying measures for carbon storage and sequestration will be selected based on the anticipated carbon emissions and loss of future carbon sequestration associated with the clearing and disturbance of the Site Footprint.

- Qualifying Minimization measures for carbon sequestration and storage are practices that reduce carbon emissions and foregone future carbon sequestration from the Site Footprint's above ground biomass and soil carbon stocks. These measures include but are not limited to on-site tree replacement, revegetation of disturbed soil with native species, buffer zones to limit disturbance from construction equipment, and timing site clearing activities for frozen ground conditions.
- Qualifying Mitigation measures for carbon sequestration and storage are practices that offset carbon emissions and foregone future carbon sequestration from the Site Footprint's above ground biomass and soil carbon stocks. These measures include but are not limited to conservation of habitats threatened by conversion, habitat restoration to improve carbon cycling processes, and purchase of carbon offsets or implementation of carbon offset projects that are eligible under independent standards for high-integrity carbon offsets, such as the *Core Carbon Principles Assessment Framework of the Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market*.

Local Governments may request that Applicants consult with or contract with a certified forester or carbon project technician to identify and implement qualifying Minimization and Mitigation measures for carbon storage and sequestration.

### 3.2.1 Examples of Minimization and Mitigation Measures for Carbon Storage and Sequestration

The following table provides a non-exhaustive selection of Minimization and Mitigation measures for carbon storage and sequestration. The suitability and effectiveness of any practice is dependent on project and site-specific conditions. Not all practices will be suitable to address the impacts of a given project.

<b>Table 4: Example Qualifying Minimization and Mitigation Measures for Carbon Storage and Sequestration</b>	
<b>Impacts to:</b>	<b><i>Qualifying Minimization Measures</i></b>
<b>Natural Carbon Cycle</b>	Implement reforestation or afforestation practices with native tree species within the site footprint
	If applicable, incorporate system-based conservation agriculture or agroforestry practices within the site footprint
	Create and implement a long-term management plan to ensure the continued growth and health of wooded areas within the site footprint, or, with permission from the owner, on adjacent parcels of land
	Convert forest slash to biochar
	Revegetate disturbed soils with deep-rooting native species
	Reduce damage or compaction to soil by putting slash on skid trails, not harvesting trees in the rain, clearing trees while ground is frozen, and using forwarders instead of whole-tree skidding
	Control invasive species through a variety of methods including manual removal and mulching, and establishing native species
<b><i>Qualifying Mitigation Measures</i></b>	
	Execute land conservation agreements for ecologically important natural areas
	Implement a habitat restoration project that enhances carbon storage and sequestration and the resilience of carbon pools to disturbance events
	Purchase credits from or implement a carbon offset project that complies with the technical requirements of high-integrity carbon offset standards, such as the Core Carbon Principles of the Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market

### 3.3 Biodiversity

Qualifying measures minimize or mitigate negative impacts on land and waters with high habitat and biodiversity conservation value.

- Qualifying Minimization measures for biodiversity avoid or reduce project impacts affecting the function, resilience, and connectivity of on-site and surrounding ecosystems and their species. Qualifying measures should also address impacts to landscape scale

ecological processes and habitat availability and integrity for species of conservation concern. These measures include but are not limited to seasonal timing of construction and clearing activities to protect migratory or nesting species, establishment of buffer zones around sensitive habitats, creation of wildlife corridors to support connectivity, and implementation of an invasive species control plan, and use of pollinator-friendly native seed mixes to revegetate disturbed soils.

- Qualifying Mitigation measures for biodiversity are practices that conserve or restore the functions, resilience, and connectivity of on-site, surrounding, or off-site ecosystems. Qualifying measures should protect, replace, and enhance, in a like-for-like manner, the ecosystem functions and habitats impacted by project development. These measures include but are not limited to creation of a conservation easement, habitat restoration, and support for on-going habitat restoration projects or conservation research.

Local Governments may request that Applicants consult or contract with conservation professionals or organizations to identify and implement qualifying Minimization and Mitigation measures for biodiversity.

### **3.3.1 Examples of Qualifying Minimization and Mitigation Measures for Biodiversity**

The following table provides a non-exhaustive selection of Minimization and Mitigation measures for biodiversity. The suitability and effectiveness of any practice is dependent on project- and site-specific conditions. Not all practices will be suitable to address the impacts of a given project.

<b>Table 5: Example Qualifying Minimization and Mitigation Measures for Biodiversity</b>	
<b>Impacts to:</b>	<b><i>Qualifying Minimization Measures</i></b>
<b>Habitat</b>	Design projects to minimize impacts to natural vegetation and habitats
	Preserve wildlife corridors throughout the project site to support connectivity with surrounding landscape
	On-site preservation of existing habitat
	Incorporate pollinator-friendly design and enrichment planting as defined by securing a silver certification or higher from the University of Massachusetts Clean Energy Extension Pollinator Friendly Certification Program
	Design fences to reduce impacts to habitat connectivity and access for animals and to reduce the risk for vehicle collisions with large animals and reduce traffic mortality for small animals
	Implement stormwater management best practices and erosion and sedimentation controls efforts to reduce runoff into aquatic habitats
	Use construction practices, permanent native ground cover, and operation practices that enhance soil health and create habitat and water quality co-benefits

	<b><i>Qualifying Mitigation Measures</i></b>
	Execute land conservation agreements, such as easements or land purchases on site or on other undeveloped land purchased by the Applicant
	On-site or off-site habitat restoration to protect and replace ecosystem processes and functions impaired by project impacts
	Support for on-going habitat restoration projects
<b>Native and Invasive Species</b>	<b><i>Qualifying Minimization Measures</i></b>
	Seeding disturbed areas with native grasses and straw bales
	Use invasive-free sand, gravel, mulch and silt barriers
	Dispose of invasive debris in a manner that avoids further spread, such as burning.
	Monitor the Site Footprint for invasive plants for three to five years after the construction. Concentrate monitoring on high traffic areas such as trails, roads, and landings. If invasive plants are discovered, begin control efforts immediately.
	<b><i>Qualifying Mitigation Measures</i></b>
	Implement preventative measures to control the growth of invasive vegetative species. Conduct regular follow-up checks on sites even if populations are no longer visible, to ensure eradication. Often invasive vegetative species can re-occur from seeds left behind or from undetected rhizomes and roots even years after the above ground biomass has disappeared.

### 3.4 Agricultural Resources

Qualifying measures to protect farmland soil can apply when the Site Footprint overlaps with: (i) Prime Farmland; (ii) Farmland of Statewide Importance; and (iii) Farmland of Unique Importance.

- Qualifying Minimization measures for agricultural resources are practices that preserve or enhance soil health and agricultural production, particularly when those areas are active farmland. These measures include but are not limited to incorporating agrivoltatics into the site design, planting native vegetation groundcover, implementing stormwater, sedimentation and erosion control measures, establishing buffers, and reducing soil damage and compaction through appropriate methods during construction and operations and maintenance phases.
- Qualifying Mitigation measures for agricultural resources are practices that preserve and enhance agricultural resources or workforce for an agricultural economy. These measures include but are not limited to restoring and monitoring degraded lands, supporting research into new practices, sponsoring training programs, and establishing agricultural conservation easements.

Local Governments may request that Applicants consult or contract with a soil health expert or extension service provider to ensure the qualifying Minimization and Mitigation measures are implemented properly and in accordance with scientific standards.

### **3.4.1 Examples of Qualifying Minimization and Mitigation Measures for Agricultural Resources**

The following table provides a non-exhaustive selection of Minimization and Mitigation measures for agricultural resource impacts. The suitability and effectiveness of any practice is dependent on project- and site-specific conditions. Not all practices will be suitable to address the impacts of a given project.

<b>Table 6: Example Qualifying Minimization and Mitigation Measures for Agricultural Resources</b>	
<b>Impacts to:</b>	<b><i>Qualifying Minimization Measures</i></b>
<b>Soil Health</b>	Plant cover crops or native vegetative groundcover after construction activities to stabilize soil, prevent erosion, and increase water retention.
	Reduce soil damage and soil compaction through mulching, retention of organic matter, designating equipment pathways and buffer zones, operating equipment when soil is frozen or otherwise less susceptible to rutting, and using less impactful equipment during construction and maintenance
	Implement stormwater, erosion, and sedimentation control efforts, such as vegetated buffers and filter strips
	Integrate trees into agricultural systems to enhance soil health.
	<b><i>Qualifying Mitigation Measures</i></b>
	Restore and monitor degraded lands
	Implement an integrated soil health management plan to support recovery of soil ecosystem processes during the life of the project and after decommissioning
<b>Agricultural Production</b>	Support research, demonstrations, and diffusion of new field-level soil health and conservation practices
	Establish an on-site or off-site agricultural conservation easement or other conservation easement
	<b><i>Qualifying Minimization Measures</i></b>
	Incorporate agrivoltaics into the Site Footprint design
	Enter into agreement to maintain agricultural uses for a minimum of 10 years
	Incorporate pollinator-friendly design as defined by securing a silver certification or higher from the University of Massachusetts Clean Energy Extension Pollinator Friendly Certification Program
	<b><i>Qualifying Mitigation Measures</i></b>
	Sponsor a training program at a local college or provide apprenticeship programs for photovoltaic technicians.

	Establish an on-site or off-site agricultural conservation easement or other conservation easement
--	--

### 3.5 Social and Environmental Burdens

Qualifying measures avoid, minimize, or mitigate negative impacts based on exposure to pollution, and additional public health and income criteria as measured by the [MassEnviroScreen](#) for the most environmentally vulnerable or burdened communities in Massachusetts.

- Qualifying Minimization measures for social and environmental burdens are practices that reduce the harms to people and the environment resulting from project development. Minimization measures should address the variety of channels by which SCEIF siting can impair social wellbeing and environmental quality. These measures include but are not limited to reducing noise levels during project operations, creation of on-site or adjoining greenspace and shade zones to reduce heat island effects, and timing construction and maintenance activities to limit impacts to traffic and neighbors.
- Qualifying Mitigation measures for social and environmental burdens are practices and initiatives that address historical harms, reduce environmental burdens, and ensure that the most burdened communities receive priority access to energy and environmental benefits, clean energy, economic development, and public health protections. These measures include but are not limited to protecting human health and the natural environment through preservation efforts, pollution prevention and controls, land and habitat restoration, and climate resilience measures. They may also include creating good-paying, accessible jobs for local residents, supporting small and minority-owned businesses, and building long-term economic opportunities.

#### 3.5.1 Examples of Qualifying Minimization and Mitigation Measures for Social and Environmental Burdens

The following table provides a non-exhaustive selection of Minimization and Mitigation measures for social and environmental burden impacts. The suitability and effectiveness of any practice is dependent on project- and site-specific conditions. Not all practices will be suitable to address the impacts of a given project.

<b>Table 7: Example Qualifying Minimization and Mitigation Measures for Social and Environmental Burdens</b>	
<b>Impacts to:</b>	<b><i>Qualifying Minimization Measures</i></b>
<b>Environmentally vulnerable or burdened communities</b>	On-site preservation and enhancement of existing habitat
	Implement reforestation or afforestation practices with native tree and plant species on the Site Footprint
	On-site habitat restoration through enrichment planting of native species

<p>Incorporate pollinator-friendly design as defined by securing a silver certification or higher from the University of Massachusetts Clean Energy Extension Pollinator Friendly Certification Program</p>	
<p>Schedule construction and maintenance activities to minimize disruptions to traffic and neighbors</p>	
<p>Reduce heat island effects, including by creating natural spaces with shade trees and native vegetated ground cover, installing shade canopies, and reducing exposed paved area</p>	
<p><b><i>Qualifying Mitigation Measures</i></b></p>	
<p>Implement measures that qualify as Score Modifiers for social and environmental benefits</p>	
<p>Create expanded recreational opportunities</p>	
<p>Establish publicly available EV charging stations</p>	
<p>Apply community solar bill credits to electric utility customer accounts or otherwise lowers energy costs in the host Local Government</p>	
<p>Establish cultural easements, in partnership with tribal and indigenous communities</p>	
<p>Create and maintain local jobs, apprenticeship programs, and educational initiatives</p>	