

Maddalena, Lesley (ENE)

From: Keith Hastie <kehastie@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2024 4:55 PM
To: DOER SMART (ENE)
Cc: CBrown@SEAdvantage.com; tmichelman@seadvantage.com
Subject: SMART Review Comments

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 DOER staff;

Please consider my comment below in response to questions 1 and 8:

Achieving the Commonwealth's very ambitious goal of reaching carbon net zero by 2050 will require the rapid installation of tens-of-gigawatts of new solar generation capacity; SMART incentives should prioritize those categories of systems that most effectively contribute to our achieving that goal. Currently, the fastest and most efficient means of deploying massive amounts new solar capacity is large-scale ground-mount projects. Conversely, the most inefficient means of adding solar capacity is canopy-mount systems. Compared to ground-mount and rooftop systems, canopy-mount systems are significantly more expensive on a \$/W basis and, because of the necessary concrete, steel, and aluminum support structures, more costly on an "energy return on energy invested" (or CO2 abated on CO2 invested) basis. Therefore, canopy-mount systems should not be prioritized over more efficient and effective categories of solar energy projects.

Sincerely,

Keith Hastie
Shutesbury, MA