

Comments to SMART Emergency Regulations

Edward Shyloski <05ecsjret@gmail.com>

Wed 5/27/2020 10:06 AM

To: SMART, DOER (ENE) <doer.smart@mass.gov>

Cc: eric.lesser@masenate.gov <eric.lesser@masenate.gov>; daniel.carey@mahouse.gov <daniel.carey@mahouse.gov>; Domb, Mindy - Rep. <mindy.domb@mahouse.gov>

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.

Dear Commissioner Woodcock:

The Shyloski family is a large landowner in Granby, MA and we write today to raise strenuous objection to the Land Use & Siting Criteria in your Emergency Regulations. Specifically Section 7. C., Ineligible Land Use. We own 2 parcels of land that we have under agreement with a solar developer which are now ineligible because they fall under the BioMap 2 Priority Habitat/Core Habitat designation as mapped by the State. It is our strong opinion, this type of regulation which negatively impacts thousands of private landowners across MA needs to be eliminated from the final regulations. There are already protections in place within the existing framework of environmental permitting through Mass Wildlife's Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP).

Based on my understanding of this provision, it will kill both projects on our land as well as hundred's of other projects across the State. The solar developer with whom I have an agreement has told us that when siting solar projects, a robust electrical infrastructure which does not require substantial upgrades which are expensive and cause significant delays is the most important qualification. The project on our parcels falls into that category.

By DOER including this provision within their emergency regulations, it will have in effect eliminated a lot of good properties near robust electrical infrastructure. This is short sighted and will neither achieve the State's ambitious renewable energy goals or achieve any additional environmental benefits as the existing process through NHESP ensures those protections.

We urge you to remove this provision from the final regulations.

Respectfully,

Edward C. Shyloski Jr.