

Climate science shows that to avoid catastrophic warming, we must reduce emissions and take CO<sub>2</sub> that's already in the atmosphere out – most likely by restoring and expanding forests. We need to cut our net emissions in half in the next ten years, and reach emissions neutrality – with emissions balanced by uptake – by 2050.

The Manomet Report that was commissioned by Massachusetts to inform the state's biomass energy policy, and showed that burning forest wood for energy is counterproductive. Wood is technically renewable, but wood-burning power plants emit more CO<sub>2</sub> per unit energy than fossil-fired plants, pumping greenhouse gases into the atmosphere just when we need most to reduce emissions. Forests cut for fuel may grow back eventually to offset those emissions, but this takes decades to more than a century. The result is a net increase in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to the atmosphere just when it's most important to reduce emissions.

We are asking that the rules defining what is a renewable resource that is subsidized by taxpayer dollars only includes funding for net zero emission projects. We need to put our valuable and limited tax funds to developing an infrastructure for the future. We want to have the burning of wood and garbage removed from the definition of renewable resources, and have net zero carbon sources be the types of projects that can have state subsidies.

I support the bill - H.853: An Act to Assure the Attainment of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Goals in the Alternative Portfolio Standard. And urge the DOER to adopt its definitions for renewable energy.

Jackie Rosenbloom  
Jul M  
49 Ridgcrest Rd  
Amherst, MA 01002

