

From: tommosakowski@gmail.com
To: [PUC - Clerk](#)
Subject: Regarding "preferred sites" in forest blocks, etc
Date: Sunday, December 20, 2020 9:48:25 AM

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Hello PUC

As a member of the Brattleboro Planning Commission, we just approved (4-1) a request for a proposed net-metering 500kw solar system to be designated a preferred site. About 7 acres of forest block will be cleared. This site is currently zoned industrial and adjacent to exit 1 on I-91.

Does the PUC have a monitoring mechanism to keep track of how many times / how often (7) of Rule 5.100 is utilized?, and also, details of the sites?-(e.g., details that indicate whether or not the site is a disturbed/marginal/non-natural site like all the other categories of preferred sites).

I do appreciate that Rule 5.100 grants an allowance to a municipality to have a level of autonomy in this regard, but, considering that the developer argued that building solar in open-space/greenfield is the only cost-effective way for them at present, I propose that the PUC add another layer of incentives that, while still allowing the municipality to choose the site, gives more incentive specifically to rooftop, parking lot, etc -solar.

As can be seen by scanning a satellite view of our town between I-91 and the CT River, there is a plethora of rooftops and parking lots, and they are nearly all devoid of solar panels. I hope we, as a state, are not going to increasingly invoke 5.100(7) in forested (and other natural) parcels in order to meet our renewable energy goals.

Looking forward to reading your response on this topic,
Tom Mosakowski