

Dear VT Public Utility Commission,

As a person who thinks that the most incentive should be given to solar energy plants/arrays that are located within/on the limits of already-disturbed and already-developed sites, but has seen Preferred Site status be given to many PV developments that intended to clear forest or prevent its regrowth and/or diminish the use of prime ag land, I am happy to see your proposed changes to the definition of Preferred Site.

Particularly, I applaud your addition of the overarching provision "...provided that the site does not require significant forest clearing:" that will apply to all 9 types of Preferred Sites. I would suggest, however, that you go a step further. To more clearly indicate the intent to steer solar development away from greenfields, please consider adding all of the natural types of sites listed in (3)'s third sentence to the Preferred Site definition's first line, though reworded and individually defined as would be appropriate.

Also, I applaud your addition to (7) that will require a determination that the plant is consistent with the applicable town or regional plan. I have been involved with several Preferred Site determinations in which the

determining bodies approved the requests, though it was apparent to me that their Town and Regional Plans took the position that compact development and preserving greenfields is preferred.

I have not looked at the rest of your proposed changes to Rule 5.100, but will end simply with a general comment in advocacy of this Rule evolving to be as feasibly supportive as possible of developing more non-climate-warming energy generators while rigorously protecting natural/working/green lands.

Thank you for your work and in advance for your consideration of my comments.

Tom Mosakowski

Brattleboro, VT resident