

January 27, 2018

Re: H. 2932 - "An Act Establishing the Mohawk Trail Woodlands Partnership."

To: Joint Committee on Environment, Natural Resources and Agriculture

Public subsidies are meant to encourage activities that benefit the public.

Public subsidies through H. 2932 - "An Act Establishing the Mohawk Trail Woodlands Partnership" would result in more forest damage, increased air pollution and higher carbon emissions in order to provide a financial benefit for an extremely narrow group of private interests. Such private gain at great public expense (financial and otherwise) is the exact opposite of what public subsidies are meant to do, and for this reason among many others, **H. 2932 should be rejected.**

Much of the public agrees that we need increased protection of forests, and that genuinely cleaner and "greener" energy options such as solar and geothermal provide a public benefit and thus deserve public subsidies, however, increased logging, and "browner" tree-fueled biomass energy provides no real public benefit while greatly increasing the costs carried by the public.

Tree-fueled biomass energy (including CHP and thermal) encouraged through H. 2932 has both a higher carbon footprint (even when accounting for forest growth) and higher emission rates of many dangerous conventional pollutants (even with the best available pollution controls) than the dirtiest fossil fuels. Additionally, the increased logging required to fuel this caveman energy source would increase the ecological damage and landscape impacts to our critically important forests. (See: www.maforests.org)

In summary, public subsidies to encourage increased logging and for wood biomass energy would only provide benefits to private bank accounts while dumping all the costs, financial, health and environmental, onto an already burdened public. This is the exact opposite type of public policy we need today. Public policy should benefit the public by encouraging as much forest protection as possible, and genuinely clean energy choices such as solar, geothermal, efficiency instead of taking us backwards to this polluting, caveman technology.

These new logging and wood biomass energy subsidies masquerading as concern for the environment are a bad idea and should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Chris Matera, P.E.
Massachusetts Forest Watch
Northampton, MA
www.maforests.org
413-341-3878

**Notes: For reports in support of the above mentioned statements, please see the following links.
This letter and links listed below can also be found at: www.maforests.org/MTWP.pdf**

“Timberspeak”, Logging Propaganda:

http://www.maforests.org/Timberspeak-Timber_Industry_Propaganda.pdf

American Lung Association, MA, Opposed to Biomass

www.maforests.org/ALA%20Support%20of%20Greenfield%20Biomass%20Moratorium%20Bylaw.pdf

Schulze Et Al: “Biomass not carbon neutral”

www.maforests.org/Biomass%20energy%20-%20not%20sustainable%20or%20carbon%20neutral.pdf

90 Scientists Letter to Congress “Count Biomass Carbon”:

www.maforests.org/90scientistsletter.pdf

Reasons NOT to install woodchip boilers:

<http://burningissues.org/car-www/science/Climate/woodchip-merkel06.htm>

78 Scientists to EPA, Biomass Bad for Forests & Carbon:

www.maforests.org/76%20Scientist%20-%20Biomass%202015.pdf

American Lung Association, Vermont, Opposed to Biomass

www.maforests.org/ALA%20Vermont%20Biomass%20Testimony.pdf

Dr Schlesinger, EPA should follow the science:

<http://thehill.com/opinion/op-ed/209863-on-biomass-epa-should-follow-the-science>

European Union, Scientists Against

www.maforests.org/EU_NO_BIOMASS.pdf

Biomass Carbon Realities, Dr Harmon, Dr Searchinger, Dr Moomaw:

www.maforests.org/CarbHMS.pdf

Logging, Bio-energy and Carbon Emissions:

www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/06/130611122103.htm

Biomass Never Carbon Neutral From Trees:

www.maforests.org/Biomass%20Assumptions.pdf

Biogenic Carbon, Same impacts:

www.maforests.org/BiogenicGeologic%20August%202011.pdf

Science Journal “Biomass Accounting Error”

www.maforests.org/SCIENCE.pdf

European Environment Agency, Biomass Accounting Error:

www.eea.europa.eu/about-us/governance/scientific-committee/sc-opinions/opinions-on-scientific-issues/sc-opinion-on-greenhouse-gas

Dr Eric Johnson, “Biomass Carbon Neutrality” Mythbuster:

www.maforests.org/Carbon.pdf

Doctors Against Biomass:

www.lung.org/assets/documents/advocacy-archive/health-organizations-letter-biomass.pdf

NRDC: Don’t use Forests for Fuel:

http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/slyutse/new_nrdc_video_shows_risks_of.html

Greenpeace, Fueling a Biomass:

www.greenpeace.org/canada/en/recent/Burning-trees-for-energy-puts-Canadian-forests-and-climate-at-risk-Greenpeace/

Environmental Lunacy:

www.economist.com/news/business/21575771-environmental-lunacy-europe-fuel-future

Incineration and the Climate, Energy Justice:

<http://www.energyjustice.net/files/biomass/climate.pdf>

Biomass Health Impacts, Hampshire District Medical Society:

www.maforests.org/HDMS.pdf

Biomass Health Impacts, Physicians For Social Responsibility:

www.maforests.org/PSR.pdf

Biomass Health Impacts, Dr. William Sammons:

www.maforests.org/Sammons.pdf

Biomass Health Impacts, Grave Concerns:

www.maforests.org/GrRec420.pdf

Biomass Health Impacts, Asthma NE:

www.boston.com/news/health/articles/2010/04/26/scourge_of_asthma_is_acute_in_ne/

Fighting For Wood:

www.biomassmagazine.com/articles/5021/nh-plants-petition-for-intervention-in-laidlaw-ppa

Fighting For Wood II:

<http://www.risiinfo.com/press-release/risis-wood-biomass-market-report-dispels-overabundant-waste-wood-myth/>