

6 June 2019

John Wassam, DOER.RPS@mass.gov Boston, Mass

I went to your hearing tonight, Wed June 5, to talk about the notice that National Grid sent to central Massachusetts towns. I had no idea that bio-mass was such an issue. I felt sorry that the 4 (or maybe 5) of you had to endure so much testimony. But I did notice that a common thread was the benefit to the environment that trees provide. I agree with the protesters on this point only. My issue is the size of the landmass required to support commercial solar. I have done rough calculations (back of the napkin style). If Massachusetts has 31,000 MW of installed electrical generating capacity and your goal is to replace 35% of that with "renewables", namely solar (at 7.5 acres per MW) then you need to cover 127 square miles of Massachusetts with solar panels.

That is a lot of trees to kill to save the environment!

Now consider that solar has a capacity factor of less than 19%. Your 127 square miles is not 35%, but 6 1/2% of the total generation capacity.

Even worse, "renewables" are not dispatchable. They are erratic, variable and non-flexible. Some estimates to remedy these shortcomings exceed a hundred BILLION \$\$.

Renewables should not be forced onto the grid until they are combined with storage. The RPS needs to be amended to require that every generating unit must be dispatchable.

You are proposing raising the 14.07: Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard - Class I annual increase from 1% to 2%. In light of the National Grid action, there should be no increase in this mandate until after the "Cluster Study" is complete.

The "Cluster Study" will undoubtedly reveal a need to standardize inverters and certify metering. If you continue installing solar, knowing that it currently behaves badly on the grid, without addressing these issues the DOER should be held accountable for the damages. The solar installers and their customers need to have equipment that is compatible with the grid.

Maybe your intention is to destroy the current centralized grid and replace it with your distributed grid. Think back to the horse & automobile. The horse was not taxed to death for polluting the streets with manure, but rather the automobile was improved to the point that it out performed the horse. If your "renewables" require the governmental force of incentives then they are not ready for deployment.

More research and development is needed before clearing square miles of central Massachusetts. The RPS should include prohibitions. No farm lands, no forest, no preserved land, no chapter 61 conversions. Why not run the entire UMass Amherst campus without fossil fuel, entirely on "renewables" before sending your gas powered chain saws and diesel bulldozers to central Massachusetts. I understand you just gave them a million dollars and that they have 31 million of other money. Use your money wisely. Prove that renewables can actually power facilities independent of the grid before sacrificing the environment.

Thank you for your time

Steve Grady

Hello, Mr. Wassam:

I wish to sign this letter as well. I am very concerned about the growth of solar plants, made of Chinese cheap panels, that use materials, and chemicals, that we can neither ascertain or check.... Our forests are cleared for ugly solar farms... and at the end it will be a very expensive source of energy. Why is not there research into affordable systems that each household could build in its yard and power our homes. IT is unreasonable to force us into solar commercial...in 20 years there will come the decommissioning time and we will have on our hands a huge problem. What to do with the toxic panels?

I protest this mechanism forcing each citizen of Massachusetts into an unwieldy scheme.

Sincerely,

T. McAuley
June6, 2019