

STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE DEPARTMENT

DRAFT VERMONT ENERGY PLAN

September 29, 2011
7 p.m.

Rutland High School
Rutland, Vermont

Public hearing held at the Rutland High School, 22 Stratton Road, Rutland, Vermont, on September 29, 2011, beginning at 7 p.m.

P R E S E N T

Elizabeth Miller
Commissioner, Department of Public Service

STAFF OF DPS:

Kelly Launder
Ed Delhagen

Also present: Bill Bousquet, Beaver Wood
Rep. Bill Canfield

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.
P.O. BOX 329
BURLINGTON, VERMONT 05402-0329
(802) 863-6067
(802) 879-4736 (Fax)
EMAIL: info@capitolcourtreporters.com

S P E A K E R S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page

Neil Robinson	42
Bill Stannard	46
Claire Stanley	49
Richard Dahm	54
Martine Victor	56
Ina Smith	62
Annette Smith	66
Jerry Hansen	74
Guy Page	77
Brian Keefe	78
Keith Dewey	81

1 COMM. MILLER: So I think we should get
2 started to reward everyone who came on time
3 and showed up despite the rain. Thank you
4 for doing so. What I thought we would do
5 tonight -- this is our third public hearing
6 for the energy plan draft. Hi there. Just
7 starting. Come on in.

8 So this is our third public meeting, and
9 we were down in Middlebury two nights ago
10 and in Brattleboro last night. Tonight
11 Rutland, and then next week we are going to
12 be in Colchester and Danville conducting our
13 five public hearings on the draft. And we
14 are accepting public comments through mid
15 October, trying to get it finalized for the
16 Governor to take a look at the draft later
17 in October and get the final out the door in
18 November in time for the legislature to
19 consider it next term. And thank you,
20 Representative Canfield, for coming tonight.
21 I appreciate it.

22 So what I thought I would do is start
23 first with just an overview for those of you
24 who haven't had a chance, or even if you
25 have had a chance, this gives you a little

1 summary of what we considered when we put
2 the draft together and the big themes that
3 the draft contains. It's a difficult thing
4 to summarize, so what we have tried to do in
5 the presentation is just give you a quick
6 flavor of the main recommendations in each
7 energy sector.

8 But then what I really want to do is
9 hear from the folks who have come tonight.
10 We have a reporter here, court reporter, who
11 can transcribe everything that's said, so
12 that we make sure we capture the comments.
13 We will take notes as well. And probably
14 what we will do given how few of us there
15 are, unless we get a real rush at the door,
16 is just after my presentation hear from
17 those of you who want to say something
18 briefly, and then open it up for a bigger
19 conversation so everyone has a chance to at
20 least speak first. Hey, how are you?

21 So with that, Kelly is going to be my
22 Power Point clicker. Thank you. You all
23 probably are familiar with why we engaged in
24 this process but just very briefly, the
25 legislature has a set of statutes that apply

1 to the comprehensive energy planning
2 process. And basically, the Department of
3 Public Service, and by the way I apologize,
4 I'm Liz Miller for those of you who came in
5 late and I didn't meet personally. I'm
6 Commissioner of the Department of Public
7 Service. The Department of Public Service
8 runs the process to complete the
9 Comprehensive Energy Plan but we do that
10 with other state agencies and departments.
11 And we do it in order to create
12 comprehensive analysis and projections on
13 usage, cost, supply and environmental
14 effects of all of our energy sectors, not
15 just electricity, which is the thing most
16 people associate the department with. But
17 also transportation, thermal energy, which
18 is home heating and business heating, and
19 the way that that intersects with land use
20 and efficiency.

21 We have got a dynamic presentation. And
22 we do all of this to make sure that Vermont
23 has some vision, some forward looking
24 thinking on how we can supply our energy
25 needs in a way that's adequate, reliable,

1 secure, sustainable, environmentally
2 responsible, efficient, affordable. Those
3 are all the words from the statute, and all
4 the things we think about as we are putting
5 the plan together. Okay. So I'm going to
6 give you a little set of facts that were the
7 things we thought of as we put the plan
8 together, then talk about our long-range
9 goal. Why we think the goal's important,
10 how we think the goal can be achieved, and
11 then give you, like I said, highlights by
12 each sector; efficiency, electricity,
13 heating, transportation and land use.

14 So where are we now? Again, this may be
15 familiar to some of you. So I'll try to be
16 quick, but I do want to lay the groundwork.
17 We use about a third of our total energy in
18 transportation, about a third in our homes,
19 and about a third, just a little over, in
20 our businesses. So and then within each
21 sector different types of energy sources are
22 used. Obviously transportation is nearly
23 one hundred percent, petroleum of some form
24 or another or diesel. Residential is about
25 half electric and about half going to our

1 home heating, and commercial is more like
2 2/3 electric and the rest going to
3 industrial processes and heating. Just a
4 little overview.

5 What we know is that, this is, I know,
6 hard to read from a distance, but from 1980
7 to present what we know is our energy usage
8 has increased pretty dramatically. It's a
9 pretty big steep rise in Vermont. And this
10 is by energy source. So transportation is
11 the big orange bar that's second down.
12 Electricity is the red bar below that. And
13 you can read down, natural gas and others.
14 Everything has been going up basically,
15 especially in transportation and
16 electricity.

17 So we use a lot more energy now than we
18 did a generation or two ago.

19 MR. KEEFE: Commissioner, just a
20 question.

21 COMM. MILLER: Although I'm not going to
22 take a ton of questions, or else this would
23 last for like an hour.

24 MR. KEEFE: Electricity, what does that
25 say, before conservation?

1 COMM. MILLER: Before conversion losses,
2 I think.

3 MS. LAUNDER: Yes, before conversion
4 losses.

5 MR. KEEFE: Brian Keefe.

6 COMM. MILLER: That's the other reason
7 not to ask questions during the
8 presentation. You've got to tell who you
9 are. Kidding.

10 MR. KEEFE: I'm done.

11 COMM. MILLER: I'm going to put this on
12 line by the way. Is this on line today? We
13 will upload it tomorrow.

14 Greenhouse gas emissions shows a little
15 bit different story compared to energy uses,
16 and that's good news. What it tells you is
17 we have had greenhouse gas emissions go up
18 over time. From about 2003 onward we have
19 actually seen a bit of a trend downward
20 which is great news. It means -- what it
21 means is we are being more efficient with
22 our energy use and using cleaner sources
23 overall. We think it's also related to the
24 fact that Vermont has become over time more
25 of a service industry oriented state than a

1 manufacturing industrial so the energy
2 intensity has gone down a bit. But
3 certainly the legislative policies and the
4 things we have done have helped. Because
5 you see from 2003 down and onward we have
6 had a bit of a drop.

7 What you also see though is we are not
8 going to hit certain legislative goals. The
9 first yellow line which drop off pretty
10 steeply to 2012 is what we would have to do
11 to meet the first legislative goal for
12 greenhouse gas emissions. We are not going
13 to hit it, bottom line. The other dotted
14 line, orange, going off into the distance to
15 2028 shows you the path we would have to
16 attain to hit that legislative goal. And
17 there is, if you look at the slope in recent
18 years, at least a way to see that if we
19 continue our progress, continue our
20 policies, continue clean sources, we could
21 hit that goal. But it's not going to happen
22 without some effort.

23 Okay. And generally speaking, renewable
24 energy most of the sources are far less
25 carbon intensive than other energy sources.

1 So I like to tell people where we currently
2 are on renewable energy. This first circle
3 is our total energy type, and the way I
4 broke it down is electricity is about 39
5 percent of our total energy usage,
6 everything else transportation, and heating
7 is 61 percent. Of electricity, we are
8 almost 50 percent renewable right now,
9 sources, and that includes large hydro,
10 Hydro-Quebec, it includes the facilities
11 where our utilities are presently able to
12 sell what are known as renewable energy
13 credits out of state. So this is just by
14 source.

15 We are about 48 percent renewable.
16 Transportation and heating not so much. We
17 are only five percent renewable right now.
18 And that's primarily because of the wood
19 heat that we are using, biomass heating in
20 our schools and institutions, about five
21 percent of the total. So a lot of room over
22 on that left side. In total, if you add all
23 that up and do the math, you would see that
24 Vermont's current energy usage in total is
25 nearly a quarter renewable. So actually

1 that's great. But 77 percent, mostly
2 attributable to transportation and heating,
3 not renewable.

4 Okay. Energy costs just briefly, the
5 chart on the left is the dollars that you
6 actually paid out of pocket every year from
7 1990 to 2009 for different types of energy.
8 Electricity is the top one, and so what you
9 see is electricity is the most expensive in
10 absolute terms. The ones underneath are
11 gasoline, LPG distillate oil, and then
12 biomass.

13 On the right we have done an inflation
14 adjusted chart so that what you can see is
15 if you adjust it for inflation, although
16 electricity is the most expensive in
17 absolute terms, it's actually not kept pace
18 with the rate of inflation. So in 1990
19 dollar comparison terms we are actually
20 doing a bit better than we had been. Not
21 true for the other sources of energy,
22 particularly if you look at LPG and gasoline
23 as you would expect, you know this because
24 you've lived in the last 10 years. It's
25 gone up higher than the rate of inflation.

1 Okay. Efficiency, just for a moment,
2 what we did in the plan, Vermont had not yet
3 had a chance to do this previously. We
4 asked for an economic impact study of our
5 efficiency programs. Because we hear a lot
6 from consumers, and I understand this, why
7 am I paying the efficiency charge on my
8 electric bill. What am I getting for it?
9 And so rather than just saying we are
10 getting efficiency, we are saving energy,
11 it's good, we thought we would actually do
12 the economic impact study. And what we did
13 is we took a single year, there is lots of
14 ways you could do it. We took a single year
15 of efficiency investment and asked for an
16 economic impact study of that one year. So
17 that we could say, hey, what do we get out
18 of one year of public spending? A couple of
19 facts. We found -- we have found that on
20 average we have been saving about two
21 percent of our electric load a year through
22 our efficiency measures. That's really
23 good. Vermont is one of the leaders
24 nationwide in saving energy through
25 efficiency.

1 On a cost basis, if you look at -- if
2 you look at the kilowatts saved as if you
3 were having to pay for them instead, as
4 electricity, you would find that the cost is
5 about 4 cents a kilowatthour which is less
6 expensive than most sources of electricity
7 we could buy, so right there you know that
8 it's better to have efficiency if you can
9 get it than to buy the electricity.

10 What we also found though is that there
11 is an economic benefit to the state beyond
12 just the electricity saved. Because
13 efficiency measures put contractors in your
14 home, bring materials out of the stores,
15 insulation, caulking, you know, et cetera,
16 light bulbs, we spend about one dollar of
17 public money and get nearly 5 dollars, 4
18 and-a-half dollars of net present value to
19 the state. It's big.

20 We also get jobs creation. That's
21 detailed in the report that we have included
22 in the plan. We also save a regional charge
23 on our electric bills. It's a little
24 technical, but basically we are saving about
25 two cents a kilowatthour on a regional

1 charge because we are doing well in
2 efficiency. That's a Vermont benefit. It's
3 actually detrimental to the rest of New
4 England, by the way, but it's good for
5 Vermont. In other words, when we compare
6 ourselves to the other states we are saving
7 money.

8 Okay. And on thermal efficiency we also
9 asked for the impact study to be done on our
10 thermal programs. We spend far less public
11 dollars on our heating efficiency programs
12 than we do on our electric, but it does
13 still create jobs and leverages the fiscal
14 resources. That's detailed in the plan, and
15 what it shows overall is that we should be
16 investing in efficiency. Okay. And really
17 briefly, efficiency in Vermont has a number
18 of programs. What we see is that there are
19 a mix of programs on the electric side and
20 the thermal side, but over and over again we
21 heard -- next click -- that Vermonters feel
22 that there is no easy path to access the
23 services. They get an energy audit and then
24 what. Or they wonder, wait a second,
25 windows for my thermal, you know, my heating

1 bill and light bulbs are for my electric,
2 how do I -- I don't really care. All I want
3 to do as a Vermonter is save money on my
4 energy bill in total and have my home more
5 comfortable. So we kept hearing there is no
6 easy path.

7 We also discovered, and people knew
8 this, but certainly upon investigation we
9 confirmed it, we are behind on our goals.
10 The legislature has asked that we set
11 policies to allow 80,000 homes to be
12 improved, 25 percent in their energy usage
13 by 2020. We are well behind that goal. If
14 we were to actually hit that goal, we would
15 need to pick up the pace and do about 8,200
16 homes a year between now and 2020. That
17 would be like triple the pace of what we are
18 doing now. So we are way behind on the
19 goal.

20 Transportation. Gina Campoli from
21 VTrans may come. She was hoping to, and I
22 don't know with the rain and some of the
23 issues they have been having at VTrans that
24 she is going to be able to make it. Let me
25 just say even if she doesn't come, you can

1 confirm for her later that I said it.

2 VTrans has been fantastic in this energy
3 planning process. They took the lead on the
4 energy plan section on transportation. It's
5 really something they dug into, and I think
6 it's a great thing and I really -- I really
7 recommend looking at the transportation
8 section. Transportation costs about a fifth
9 of our household expenses on a national
10 basis, but in Vermont we spend more than
11 that. In Vermont it's usually the second
12 largest expense for an average homeowner.
13 It's even more than education, food -- if
14 you keep clicking -- health care. Most
15 Vermonters spend money for housing and then
16 next for transportation.

17 We also, as you saw from the earlier
18 chart, contribute to our greenhouse gases
19 more through transportation than anything
20 else. So it's a challenge. And why is
21 that? It's because again if we look over
22 time, 1975, a couple generations ago to
23 2009, we are driving way more than we used
24 to. I mean that's the bottom line. The
25 population -- the population rate in the

1 state has not nearly gone up as much as this
2 chart shows. We are just driving more. And
3 you know, therefore, we are spending more
4 money, and we are contributing more to
5 greenhouse gases and everything else. So
6 what's the problem there? There is a land
7 use and transportation connection. And what
8 the connection, I think we all know, but the
9 data shows it, we are a more rural, less
10 densely populated state than the rest of the
11 country.

12 The red line is Vermont in terms of
13 density. The blue line's the United States.
14 We all know this. 30 percent of our
15 citizens live in our designated downtown and
16 growth center districts. So they live in
17 compact areas. However -- next click -- if
18 you look at the -- sorry about the screen by
19 the way. If you look at the 2010 census,
20 what you would find is that those 21
21 designated areas grew at a slower pace than
22 the rest of the state. So that's just a way
23 of saying we are seeing sprawl in our
24 population growth. And that's related to
25 transportation. That's one of the reasons

1 we are driving more, because -- next slide
2 -- there is -- this is probably obvious, but
3 there is data for this. People travel fewer
4 miles in their car if they have services,
5 work, home, closer together. So how we grow
6 matters.

7 The downtown picture on the top has a
8 different energy profile than the suburb
9 here or the edge community on the right. It
10 matters for our energy usage, not just our
11 quality of life and other things.

12 Okay. So that was the factual setting
13 for some of our goals. Our long-range goal,
14 if you've looked at the plan, you'll know
15 that we are recommending that by mid century
16 Vermont can be nearly free of fossil fuel
17 usage in all energy sectors. 90 percent
18 renewable by 2050 is what we are suggesting
19 the state shoot for. Again, just to remind
20 you we are at about a quarter now. So we
21 are suggesting that we go all the way to 90
22 percent by 2050. It's a big, big change.
23 Graphically it looks like if you hit the --
24 next slide -- going from what you saw before
25 all the way to the right. 90 percent

1 renewable. Why should we do this?

2 The plan outlines the benefits. There
3 are four key benefits. First, economic
4 security and independence. If we transition
5 to a more renewable future, we will be less
6 dependent on the types of fuels that are
7 volatile in cost, unreliable in source, and
8 intensive on our environment. And it will
9 bring Vermont greater economic security
10 independence. It also safeguards our
11 environment because it does help, it will
12 help our greenhouse gas profile for the
13 future generations. We expect it also will
14 drive innovation and job creation because
15 the renewable energy future that we are
16 calling for will have a large part right
17 here in the state. It's not going to be all
18 in state.

19 Right now we take some of our renewable
20 energy from out of state and we expect that
21 will continue, and we talk about that in the
22 plan. A lot of it will be here, and it's
23 going to drive innovation. And fourth, if
24 we do all of this, and we tie it, you know,
25 we move to it in our transportation sector,

1 we intentionally move towards it in land use
2 as well, we believe we will increase
3 community involvement in the investment. So
4 it will be good for our community as a
5 whole.

6 How will the goal be achieved? I get
7 this question a lot. It's a big goal. I
8 like to illustrate it this way. This is
9 just my graph. The red line is what's known
10 as an acceleration curve. It starts off
11 with little progress. And the progress
12 builds over time. It's just like rolling
13 your car down hill as it were. You get more
14 progress as you keep going. It's not a
15 linear progression. If you were to take the
16 2050 goal and divide it up yearly between
17 now and then and try to achieve that
18 progress year over year over year, starting
19 next year, that's not what the plan calls
20 for. That's not what we believe can be
21 achieved. And the reason for that is
22 because we have big, big, big changes that
23 are needed, especially in transportation and
24 to a lesser extent in home heating, but a
25 big change there too. And those changes are

1 not going to happen overnight.

2 We have made a lot of progress on the
3 electric side. We believe we can make
4 substantially more. But even with those --
5 even with that progress, we need to set
6 policies now that set us on the right path
7 to increase our progress as we go forward.

8 Okay. And if you're going to do that,
9 what sort of policy should you put in place?
10 We heard a lot of comments that it shouldn't
11 just be, hey, let's just tinker with this
12 law here or put a little outreach in
13 education over here. That instead you can
14 put up all four, that instead with any
15 program you're going to look at, you need to
16 address all four of these areas. Outreach
17 and education, making sure people know what
18 the program is, what the benefit is, and how
19 they can get it. Two, finance and funding.
20 How can people access the ability to pay for
21 it. What can the public sector do to
22 support it? Three, innovation and
23 expertise. Do we have right here in Vermont
24 the things that we need, the contractors,
25 the service companies, to address the

1 policy? And then four, regulatory policies
2 and structures. What can we do as a state,
3 what can the legislature do to make sure
4 that the policies are supportive? You can't
5 just do number four. You have to address
6 all of these or you're not going to get
7 progress.

8 Okay. So strategies by energy sector.
9 This is -- I think of this next section as
10 inherently sort of unsatisfying because it's
11 a big plan, and what I want to do is walk
12 you through all of it, but I can't possibly
13 do that and then have comments, which is
14 what I really want to get to. I'm going to
15 do a slide or two for each section. Energy
16 efficiency. We call on the plan for the
17 efficiency to be the first thing that's
18 thought of in any sector because it saves us
19 the most money in any sector, and the
20 easiest way to avoid using energy. So the
21 biggest recommendation in the efficiency
22 realm that I think we make is intentional
23 decision to look at all of the different
24 programs we have, come together around a
25 table and say how are we going to

1 rationalize these programs. Right now
2 Vermont, like I said, Vermonters don't care
3 if they are accessing a program for their
4 electricity efficiency or their thermal
5 efficiency. What they want is their home to
6 be more comfortable. And our programs right
7 now are not designed for consumer delivery.
8 Or they are not designed as well as they
9 could be for consumer delivery is the way I
10 should say that.

11 However, we don't want to just simply
12 say okay, legislature, fix it this year. We
13 want to actually get people around the table
14 from Agency of Human Services, from the
15 utilities, from Efficiency Vermont, from the
16 Department of Public Service, from our
17 energy service providers, from our fuel
18 dealers, and say what are we going to do to
19 address this? And where are the gaps?
20 Including on the funding and financing side
21 PACE is being rolled out. That's great.

22 Another thing the plan calls for with
23 efficiency is moving toward on utility bill
24 payment systems. I would be happy to talk
25 about this more. It's essentially another

1 mechanism that consumers could use if they
2 wanted to finance improvements in their
3 home, using something that they already do
4 which is paying their utility bill.

5 Electricity. We do call to continue not
6 just the two percent progress we have made
7 in the past, but to ramp that up in the
8 coming years to three percent. We have
9 already advocated for that at the Public
10 Service Board and had a budget for that
11 passed for 2012 through 2015. Why just
12 three percent when we have got these big
13 goals? There are two reasons. Number one,
14 we need programs in place to actually
15 support -- if you're going to go for more
16 you have to have bigger programs in place to
17 do it, and we can't stress the programs that
18 we have now by trying to achieve you know, 5
19 or 10 percent in one year. It's not going
20 to happen. But we do think we can get to
21 three percent. And thermal, we have some
22 specific goals. We are about 30 percent of
23 all new homes right now are Energy Star
24 rated. It's actually a good percentage. We
25 should be happy about that. We think we can

1 double that percentage by 2020. We already
2 have in place residential building energy
3 standards, commercial building energy
4 standards are coming.

5 But the only reason -- not the only
6 reason -- but a good reason to do that
7 interim step is to get us to what will
8 really be a big energy saver and that is to
9 encourage a path for new construction to be
10 what's known as net zero energy by 2030.
11 And that's where you build the building
12 tight enough, and then you put in ancillary
13 energy systems on the site so that the home
14 in total can be net zero. We have a number
15 of homes in Vermont already at net zero, but
16 we could definitely put a path in place to
17 get us there if we put our minds to it.

18 Okay. Electricity. First you've
19 already seen big renewable goal.
20 Electricity is certainly a part of that. We
21 need to set policies to not just maintain
22 the existing progress but also dramatically
23 increase the progress. As I said, renewable
24 electricity is now about 48 percent. There
25 are proceedings going on at the Public

1 Service Board right now looking at what's
2 known as a Renewable Portfolio Standard. I
3 don't want to hit you with a lot of
4 technical stuff, but the bottom line is the
5 PSB will come out with a plan probably in
6 October, I believe it's October, the draft
7 plan is for a 75 percent goal by 2032. And
8 the department modeled that as a part of
9 this Comprehensive Energy Plan. You can see
10 that in our plan. We believe that's both
11 achievable, affordable, realistic. We
12 believe that's something that can be put in
13 place. So that's the sort of progress we
14 are talking about on electricity.

15 That needs to come with some process
16 improvements. When you look at renewable
17 energy projects we have had, if you think
18 about 10 years ago versus today, we have had
19 an enormous amount of renewable energy
20 projects in that last 10 years that we
21 really didn't see in the 10 years prior to
22 that. So we have some experience now, and
23 we can look at how the siting process at the
24 Public Service Board works and look to
25 improve it. There is a couple specific

1 recommendations we make. One is the
2 department is going to bring on board a
3 renewable energy project manager, somebody
4 who can work with different state agencies
5 and departments, with developers, with
6 utilities, with stakeholders, and say this
7 is where the process is now. Here's the
8 next step. Here's, you know, they can
9 essentially be the ambassador for getting
10 the projects that come in the door out to
11 the public and the stakeholders and then in
12 the Board process. It doesn't exist right
13 now, and we hear often that one of the
14 problems both interested parties have and
15 developers have is that the process is not
16 transparent enough.

17 Second, mediation. I come from a law
18 background. The court system in Vermont has
19 had mandatory mediation in civil cases, in
20 family law cases. It really works. We
21 don't have it in renewable energy siting
22 cases. I personally believe it could be
23 very helpful if the Board put in process a
24 developer-funded mediation process.

25 And then finally review of recent siting

1 permitting. Again, I said we have some
2 experience now. Are some of the smaller
3 projects able to be simplified or not? I
4 think we can start to look at that. We have
5 had some solar projects in particular, some
6 on Route 7 you are probably familiar with.
7 What's the experience there, and can we
8 actually help those projects get through the
9 permitting process in a way that's more
10 simple and shorter in the future?

11 Okay. Finally, finance and funding.
12 There is two main things that are going on.
13 First the on-bill financing I already
14 mentioned. Again, I can talk more about
15 that if you like when we break for comments.
16 And second the CEDF, Clean Energy
17 Development Fund. The legislature changed
18 the structure of the CEDF this past term.
19 We appointed or the new Board was appointed
20 in -- I think it was in June. They are
21 engaging in a strategic planning process
22 right now after their first meeting in July.
23 It will be completed by the end of their
24 first year. It's looking at funding and
25 programs for the CEDF. So that's coming.

1 It's not solved in the plan, but it is
2 coming.

3 Okay. Thermal energy. Sustainable
4 heating. First efficiency. I already
5 talked about that. The best way to help our
6 home heating bills is to improve our
7 efficiency programs. That's first. Second,
8 natural gas. The plan does call for an
9 increased access to natural gas. I have
10 certainly been asked the question, you have
11 this big renewable goal. Why are you
12 calling for expansion of a fossil fuel? And
13 my answer is -- my answer is choice for
14 Vermonters.

15 We right now have an infrastructure in
16 natural gas that extends just through
17 Franklin and Chittenden County. If you look
18 at the cost profile of natural gas in recent
19 years and project it quite a bit into the
20 future, if you look at the type of system
21 that it is, in other words, a regulated
22 system, and you look at the way it's
23 delivered which is hard pipe transmission
24 rather than trucks on our roads, I believe
25 there is a reason to expand that choice to

1 other Vermonters, and that bringing the
2 transmission system south is a good thing
3 for Vermont's energy future.

4 We only have about five percent natural
5 gas right now, so there is some head room
6 there to allow this. I recognize there are
7 trade-offs and that we have to be very
8 vigilant on the environmental side and
9 understand those trade-offs. Increased use
10 of biomass and biofuels, though, is how you
11 actually move that five percent which is
12 currently renewable to a much bigger
13 percentage. And the plan talks about that.
14 Both for woody biomass as well as crop
15 grass, which is a developing technology.

16 And then also biofuels. Liquid
17 biofuels. There is a focus on combined heat
18 and power projects because they are the ones
19 that use the resource the most efficiently
20 for more than one purpose, both electric and
21 heat. And in addition, advocacy for low
22 sulfur and low carbon fuel standards that
23 would apply even to the portion of the
24 portfolio that's not yet fossil free. And
25 then that has to go hand in hand with

1 thinking about how our economy currently
2 works and how it might work in 2050. So we
3 need to have plans in place to let our local
4 fuel dealers, who after all come to our
5 homes, deliver the fuel, now transition to
6 the new economy whether it's delivery of the
7 biomass or delivery of the services such as
8 efficiency services to the homes.

9 Okay. Transportation. Making sure Gina
10 didn't come. I would otherwise let Gina do
11 this because she certainly deserves the
12 credit. It's obviously, as I said before,
13 largest cost. We spent a billion dollars on
14 transportation. 700,000 or so, I'm sorry
15 700 million or so is fuel that goes mostly
16 out of state cost. Greatest use of fossil
17 fuels, highest contributor of greenhouse
18 gases, so what are we going to do to address
19 it.

20 The plan calls for setting policies now
21 to help the state transition to renewable
22 electricity in our transportation sector.
23 This is not easy. There are things that
24 have to be addressed. Financing vehicle
25 charging infrastructure, the technology and

1 cost, this is not easy but it is possible if
2 we start now. We are not alone.

3 Massachusetts just had a big announcement
4 about what they are doing to improve their
5 transition and start their charging
6 stations. But Vermont does have to start.

7 And VTrans has set a metric -- VTrans is
8 great at planning, by the way. They have
9 set an actual metrics saying look if we are
10 really going to hit 90 percent by 2050, we
11 need to think about how we get to 25 percent
12 of our passenger vehicle fleet renewable
13 within -- by the end of 20 years. And you
14 think, is that possible? And the answer is
15 it's going to be hard, but it is possible.
16 Cars transition about every 7 to 8 years.
17 Think about our own buying patterns and
18 think about whether you're on average or
19 not, but we can by 20 years have about a
20 three times transition. Ford, Nissan,
21 Chevy, other car dealers already have
22 electric vehicles in the show room. By the
23 end of next year we are told by VTrans 14
24 different car manufacturers will have
25 passenger vehicles that are electric plug-

1 in. It's going to increase.

2 There is also a lot of technology going
3 on right now in the light-duty vehicle fleet
4 as well on electric. So it's an ambitious
5 goal, but it is possible. We can't just do
6 that though. VTrans has a number of
7 recommendations in the plan for advocating
8 for better fuel standards, greater access to
9 commuter facilities and transportation
10 options to help reduce the need to use the
11 fossil fuels in transportation by helping
12 the efficiency of our system. VTrans wants
13 to actually measure for the first time the
14 combined average fuel economy of the Vermont
15 registered fleet. And then say, okay,
16 what's that. And how does that compare to
17 the national average. Now let's set goals
18 to beat it by five percent by 2025. So they
19 are actually thinking in short-term steps
20 which is a great way of going and a way that
21 we can get to our eventual goal in the plan.

22 Another example which I think is near
23 and dear to many of us, I know it is to me
24 since I commute from Burlington to
25 Montpelier, tripling the park and ride

1 spaces. Having specific places to do that
2 within the planning period and doing those
3 things should reduce single occupant trips
4 by 20 percent in 20 years. Right there
5 you've got a lot of energy savings, but the
6 big numbers are only going to happen if we
7 get to renewable energy sources for
8 transportation.

9 I just want to plug this really quickly.
10 If VTrans were here I would give them
11 credit. Connectingcommuters.org website if
12 you haven't gone there. It's a great site.
13 It's not just about bus schedules and public
14 transportation. It's about ride share,
15 alternative transportation options, walking,
16 biking, et cetera, and it's very accessible.
17 It's a really good model and I want folks to
18 know about it.

19 Okay. Finally land use. We usually
20 think of our land use choices as ones that
21 help preserve our rural character, conserve
22 our resources, develop our downtowns, keep
23 our village centers, and therefore invest
24 efficiently in our infrastructure. That's
25 all good and it helps Vermont stay Vermont.

1 It also helps our energy usage. So Agency
2 of Commerce and Community Development worked
3 very closely with us on the planning
4 document. They want to foster better
5 coordination with the regional planning
6 commissions and the town energy committees.
7 They want to specifically review with the
8 RPC and the town energy committees the
9 recommendations in this plan and the RPCs
10 and town energy committees conform their own
11 energy policies toward the state goals.

12 They also want to improve the
13 designation program so downtown and village
14 center designations I talked about, they are
15 working on recommendations right now in
16 order to give them to the legislature this
17 coming January. And they want them
18 implemented. They are going to measure the
19 success of that effort by seeing that
20 increased density. In other words, the
21 population going up in those designated
22 downtowns by the next census. That's a good
23 way to measure it.

24 We need to also coordinate and align our
25 state incentives. We sometimes have a

1 transportation program on an intersection,
2 for example, that conflicts with our desire
3 to keep things compact. We sometimes have a
4 waste water program or goal that conflicts
5 with our desire to keep things compact. So
6 ACCD is looking at those things and making
7 recommendations of how we can align them
8 better.

9 They are also developing specific
10 training programs for the recently adopted
11 Complete Streets initiative as well as
12 transit-oriented design, and they are going
13 to hold three workshops in 2012. These are
14 pretty detailed. But if you're in these
15 areas, you would see them as pretty good,
16 concrete land use steps that would help
17 support our land use energy policy.

18 A couple other highlighted actions in
19 the plan. Again, it's a large plan. I
20 understand that, so I want to pull a couple
21 things out. One idea that is presented in
22 the plan that we are going to recommend the
23 legislature take a look at and allow us to
24 study is something known as a total energy
25 standard. We often focus, and frankly CVPS,

1 one of your representatives has brought this
2 up quite a bit at public hearings. We often
3 look at renewable electricity without really
4 thinking about how are we going to move the,
5 you know, move ahead on the other areas of
6 energy usage. One way to move ahead on
7 those other areas is to start measuring them
8 against each other. So if we change all of
9 our energy usage into a single unit such as
10 a BTU and say, okay, we have got 23 percent
11 renewable right now total. How can we move
12 that to 24, 25, 26? What incentives can we
13 put in place to do that? How can we measure
14 it? We believe that would be a way to get
15 to our eventual holistic goal without just
16 focusing on renewable electricity in a
17 little box, and then just looking at
18 transportation in a separate box. So we
19 suggest it.

20 Second, this is across different
21 sectors, so I pull it out separately. There
22 is a number of strategies in the plan having
23 to do with biomass, including crops and
24 grass and renewable energy systems on farm
25 sites and methane digesters, all having to

1 do with farm energy programs. How we have
2 our farmers produce more of their energy for
3 their own use on their working landscape, as
4 well as using that working landscape for a
5 separate income source and to help the rest
6 of us obtain energy.

7 And then finally, State of Vermont
8 energy leadership, Deb Baslow and
9 Commissioner Obuchowski have been very, very
10 helpful in this planning process. The state
11 is attempting to lead by example. Shap
12 Smith and the Governor called for a five
13 percent reduction in state energy usage.
14 The Department of Buildings and General
15 Services is leading that charge putting
16 programs in place to do it, looking at our
17 fleet, looking at our buildings. Post Irene
18 they are really looking at our buildings.
19 And last month the energy usage issues have
20 been particularly brought up.

21 I have had a lot of conversations with
22 BGS as they are entering into leases and
23 looking at new sites. So the state is
24 committed to leading by example, and we have
25 things in the plan set forth in order to do

1 that. So that's really it. We are here to
2 have public hearings, to hear your comments
3 tonight. We would love to receive any
4 written comments you would like to
5 separately submit by October 10. We are
6 going to revise the plan and present it to
7 the Governor in mid October. He wants it on
8 his desk October 15. I keep hoping that's a
9 weekend day, but I'm not sure. Look at the
10 calendar.

11 MR. CANFIELD: It is. It's a Saturday.

12 COMM. MILLER: Good. I've got a day or
13 two. We are then going to get any feedback
14 he has directly and put revisions out for
15 copy, editing so we can get it to the
16 legislature well ahead of January. Our plan
17 is to have the published version done in
18 November.

19 Okay. There is a couple other things to
20 know. One is that the Governor has asked
21 that we actually formalize this recognition
22 of all the energy sectors being intertwined
23 by having the Climate Cabinet rather than
24 just the Department of Public Service be in
25 charge of implementing the plan from the

1 executive level. Climate Cabinet involves
2 the secretaries and commissioners across
3 agencies and departments that have to do
4 with these areas, so it makes a lot of
5 sense. Again presenting it to the
6 legislature.

7 I want to have -- I think if you click
8 down one more -- you know, it's a big
9 document. I'm sure you have it. Yeah,
10 right. That's actually my copy by the way.
11 I want to take that document and make sure
12 that it has a list of possible legislative
13 actions so the folks in the State House
14 aren't flipping through it wondering what
15 they need to do. And then the RPC and town
16 energy committees are a key part of this.
17 The department will work with them to roll
18 this plan out. We are going to just have a
19 series of meetings and workshops across the
20 state with the RPCs and the town energy
21 committees once this is finalized. Then we
22 are going to review, revise, repeat.

23 The legislation currently calls for us
24 to do this every five years, although we
25 haven't had an adopted plan since 1998. I

1 think one of the barriers, one of the
2 reasons that happened is five years is kind
3 of a long time. Even since we started this
4 planning process things have changed. Every
5 week we have meetings and we think oh my
6 gosh, what are we doing to do about this new
7 program or new thing that is happening. We
8 suggest having annual reviews headed by the
9 Climate Cabinet and revising the actual
10 document every three years. We think that
11 would align better with the state energy
12 plan which is on a six-year cycle. Five
13 years doesn't make a lot of sense with that
14 right now. We think it would be helpful.

15 Thank you for coming. I'm sorry for the
16 length but I hope you found that helpful and
17 informative. We will put it on line.
18 Nobody else -- VTrans didn't come -- I was
19 going to let them say something. Let's
20 just, if you wouldn't mind, do we have the
21 list there?

22 MS. LAUNDER: Yeah.

23 COMM. MILLER: Okay great. So what we
24 will do is Kelly will let us know who is
25 signed up actually to speak. We will call

1 those folks first. And I would love it if
2 you could give us, I don't know, three to
3 five minutes, something short, on what
4 you're here to talk about. And then we will
5 see if others want to talk. And then after
6 we are done let's have a conversation,
7 because there is not too many of us to do
8 that. So who is first?

9 MS. LAUNDER: Neil Robinson.

10 MR. ROBINSON: Me. I took the time to
11 at least look at your document that I just
12 put on there. I've got to tell you it's
13 terribly frustrating from someone who lives
14 in an area that really is looking at
15 biomass. I feel that biomass has been
16 shortchanged all along. I feel very
17 strongly that no where in that document do
18 you talk about the creation of employment.
19 Jobs is a big thing. I don't know whether
20 the legislature is in a cave or what, but
21 jobs are very important.

22 This is not to say that biomass is not
23 important, but it also has the added
24 benefit. You've already got the pellet
25 aspect of it going in. Now you've got a

1 hydroponic nursery that's being looked at
2 going in. Who else in your energy profile
3 that you're looking at can give you job
4 creation and hence forth a tax base? And
5 while we are at it, who else in your profile
6 -- you keep reading toward everything -- I
7 see you keep talking about solar. Who is
8 sitting in the city that's supposedly going
9 to be solar city?

10 Well I'm sorry folks. I was born in
11 this area. And the sun doesn't shine that
12 much in Rutland, Vermont. If you go to the
13 national weather service, you'll find out.
14 I'm not knocking anybody that wants that.
15 You're talking about a system that will be
16 24/7 except for shutdown. Neither solar nor
17 wind can claim that.

18 So that's where I'm coming from. I
19 don't have any problem with the other two.
20 But I just cannot understand, and by the
21 way, one of the things that's never talked
22 about is just think about what utilizing the
23 tree tops, et cetera, literally waste in the
24 forest to create electricity. Think about
25 what it will do for the habitat of the deer

1 and turkeys. They are literally talking
2 about a great program for the hunter. So
3 there is a side effect on this whole thing.

4 And they are talking about private
5 funding. These people wouldn't step forward
6 and say, hey, we have got the financing and
7 siting. That was another thing that came
8 up. There is no problem. People in Fair
9 Haven and surrounding areas want this. So
10 I can't think of any reason why you really
11 aren't looking at biomass for electricity.
12 Because we have got the product, we have got
13 the investor, we have got the site, we have
14 got the financing, we have got everything in
15 place. And frankly the bottleneck, we are
16 looking at it.

17 I'm sorry, but I don't have good
18 feelings about what I'm hearing. The other
19 thing I will say, I understand -- in reading
20 about the series of meetings that we had,
21 apparently the comments that came out from
22 most folks was they didn't like the idea of
23 using wood for electricity.

24 COMM. MILLER: Electricity only.

25 MR. ROBINSON: Only. Well they aren't

1 using it for electricity only.

2 COMM. MILLER: Right, I understand.

3 MR. ROBINSON: And this never was
4 responded to. Number two, the emissions.
5 You said in your own report it's carbon
6 neutral. Yes, you did. I read the report.
7 So again, I'm not here to be abrasive, but
8 you know, we have been working on this thing
9 and God love, these people have been working
10 a lot longer than us, and we are just
11 terribly frustrated.

12 We need the jobs. We need actually to
13 utilize our assets we happen to have,
14 tremendous forest down here, that aren't
15 being used.

16 COMM. MILLER: So I would be very happy
17 to respond to some of that, but I really
18 want to make sure other people --

19 MR. ROBINSON: That's fine.

20 COMM. MILLER: -- have a chance. So I'm
21 going to let people speak and then talk.

22 MR. ROBINSON: Thank you for the time.

23 MS. LAUNDER: Okay. Bill, and I'm not
24 sure how to say the last name.

25 MR. STANNARD: Stannard,

1 S-T-A-N-N-A-R-D. Sorry to continue on
2 biomass, but that's my main focus. And I'm
3 from Fair Haven, so obviously I'm interested
4 in the Beaver Wood project specifically, but
5 overall I'm interested in the efficient use
6 of biomass statewide. Professionally I'm a
7 forester which makes me even more interested
8 in the outcome of your study regarding
9 recommendations on biomass.

10 And I would say one of my interests
11 would be in working towards a goal of making
12 existing biomass electrical producers more
13 efficient. And in a leadership role Beaver
14 Wood energy can do that by setting an
15 example, which is what we like to do, set an
16 example for improvement in any sector. And
17 they are proposing to build the most
18 efficient, perhaps biomass electrical
19 production plant in the United States, one
20 that can be assumed to be a model for the
21 rest of the country and certainly for the
22 State of Vermont. And something we can be
23 proud of as it produces jobs and other
24 benefits to the economy.

25 It also strengthens the argument towards

1 efficient use of our forest. When we
2 utilize biomass in more ways and more
3 efficient ways, it gives us in the forestry
4 community a better way to prescribe better
5 forestry methods that improve the forest
6 overall which is a benefit to all of us, as
7 Neil mentioned, for wildlife, recreation or
8 otherwise, they use -- the smart use of
9 biomass is, I believe, under considered in
10 this study for whatever reason. I don't
11 know. But I think it should be focused on
12 much more so and specifically in the
13 recommendations towards working with an
14 outfit like Beaver Wood that is proposing to
15 set an example.

16 I think it's a good thing for the State
17 of Vermont, and I don't think it's mentioned
18 in any particular way good or bad in your
19 report as I understand it. And I don't know
20 why. I think it's the only base load energy
21 that's being proposed in renewables that I'm
22 aware of, solar and wind are not, either
23 one.

24 COMM. MILLER: Hydro.

25 MR. STANNARD: And we need to explore

1 some base load, whether it's natural gas,
2 biomass, and combinations of those types of
3 things, considered renewables or efficient
4 sources. And I don't think we are focusing
5 on that. It just doesn't seem that we are.
6 It seems like it's being left out for some
7 reason that I don't understand.

8 COMM. MILLER: Just since two folks have
9 brought up Beaver Wood, I just want to say
10 one thing, that is the plan is specifically
11 and frankly by requirement forward looking.
12 It does not take a position on any pending
13 project.

14 MR. STANNARD: I understand that.

15 COMM. MILLER: So that part is
16 purposeful, and I think, important frankly.
17 So I just wanted to make sure that you knew
18 that the specific lack of treatment of
19 Beaver Wood is purposeful.

20 MR. STANNARD: Specifically my concern
21 is to the lack of mention of biomass.

22 COMM. MILLER: The policy --

23 MR. STANNARD: For base load power
24 generation. It's not specific to Beaver
25 Wood.

1 COMM. MILLER: Fair enough.

2 MR. STANNARD: Beaver Wood just happens
3 to be the benefit we can achieve by
4 considering this in a way that I'm
5 suggesting.

6 COMM. MILLER: Yeah. The other -- are
7 there other folks here who have similar
8 comments? Should I address it now? Okay.
9 Well then --

10 MS. STANLEY: Just ditto. I'm Claire
11 Stanley. C-L-A-I-R-E. I'm selectman, Fair
12 Haven. They said it much better than I
13 could, but -- and I keep thinking if we are
14 planning, and I guess it's going to happen,
15 we are going to close Vermont Yankee. All
16 our energy after that is coming from away,
17 out of state, out of the country. Wood
18 fired biomass can be in Vermont, by
19 Vermonters employing Vermonters, paying
20 taxes to Vermont and so on and so and so on.

21 COMM. MILLER: No. I understand. So
22 let me just say a couple of things. I
23 should have mentioned this already. So I'm
24 sorry. There is appendices, you know, parts
25 of the report at the back. One of them ANR

1 drafted for us on forest management
2 practices. It is their vision of how the
3 biomass resource should be thought of from a
4 forest management point of view. So if you
5 haven't seen that, it's stuck -- I think
6 it's appendix 5. I just want you to know
7 it's there.

8 Unfortunately ANR --

9 MR. STANNARD: Can I ask you a question
10 in that regard?

11 COMM. MILLER: Let me finish one other
12 thing. And biomass is treated in two
13 different places in the report itself
14 through collaboration. You know, the
15 department worked together with Ag and ANR.
16 It's treated in both the electric section,
17 and it does say that biomass can be used for
18 multiple purposes including electric so long
19 as the resource is managed properly. So it
20 sounds a lot frankly like what you just
21 said.

22 It also in the renewable section says
23 that one of the metrics that should be used
24 when looking at the benefits of renewable
25 energy is total economic impact. Jobs

1 creation is a part of that. So I do think
2 there are parts of this plan. You said that
3 it was absent altogether, and I do feel I
4 have to defend the plan a little bit and say
5 it is in there.

6 It's also in the thermal section which
7 is heating. And it does there talk about
8 combined heat and power, and heat, but it is
9 in the electric section, and I do want -- if
10 you haven't had a chance to read that
11 specifically -- ask you to do so because it
12 is in there.

13 Then finally there is the -- one of the
14 reasons that the report, the draft plan,
15 does not have an even fuller discussion on
16 the topic is because there is a legislative
17 process, and that might be the report you
18 were talking about before, it might not have
19 been the department's report. I'm not sure.
20 It's called the Bioenergy Working Group. I
21 think if I remember correctly.

22 MR. CANFIELD: Biomass Working Group.

23 COMM. MILLER: We call it Bio E for
24 short. It's coming out with a report later
25 this fall, and they are working right now on

1 some of their recommendations. So it didn't
2 seem to us productive to work at cross
3 purposes with the process the legislature
4 had already put in place to address these
5 very issues. So it is in there. It's not
6 in there as much as you would probably like
7 to see.

8 MR. STANNARD: Are you talking about the
9 rework of the BERC study? Is that what
10 you're referring to?

11 COMM. MILLER: This is a cross
12 legislative, I think Senator Ginny Lyons is
13 in charge of it. Deputy secretary of ANR
14 Chris Recchia is the Co-chair. There is a
15 number of other stakeholders who have
16 participated.

17 STANNARD: Can I ask my question?

18 COMM. MILLER: Sure.

19 MR. STANNARD: I have been confused
20 right along by the fact that ANR is taking
21 the lead in testimony regarding forestry
22 practices when we have a forestry
23 department.

24 COMM. MILLER: I think it's under ANR.

25 MS. LAUNDER: Yeah.

1 MR. STANNARD: But it hasn't been the
2 Forest Service, as I understand it, I could
3 be corrected there.

4 COMM. MILLER: I can't answer that
5 question.

6 MR. STANNARD: That's taking the lead
7 and giving testimony to groups like the
8 House Energy Committee and so forth. That's
9 been other representatives of ANR, and that
10 confuses me, because I think it is strictly
11 a forestry issue, that that should strictly
12 be the source of information that feeds your
13 study.

14 COMM. MILLER: Yeah. I can't speak to
15 that specifically other than to say that
16 Department of Forests and Parks --

17 MS. LAUNDER: Parks and Rec.

18 COMM. MILLER: Parks and Rec is part of
19 ANR umbrella. We are an independent
20 department. You know, we are just the
21 Department of Public Service, but ANR has
22 many departments under it.

23 MR. STANNARD: It's my understanding
24 last legislative session that ANR gave
25 testimony to the energy committee. And it

1 was a deputy secretary or somebody from ANR
2 that gave that testimony.

3 COMM. MILLER: That's quite likely.

4 MR. STANNARD: Not a person with
5 forestry background. And that concerned me.
6 I think the forestry background is important
7 to this study.

8 COMM. MILLER: We will pass it on.
9 Okay. I am going to move on because I want
10 others to have a chance to comment. Who is
11 next?

12 MS. LAUNDER: Richard Dahm; is that
13 right?

14 MR. DAHM: Yeah, I'm Rick Dahm. D-A-H
15 -M, from Sandgate. It wasn't brought up in
16 the presentation, but it was in the book
17 there, electric efficiency. And it
18 mentioned access to the smart grid, the
19 smart meters, and the 68 million that came
20 from the Department of Energy possibly half
21 of the cost of the meter.

22 COMM. MILLER: Right.

23 MR. DAHM: And my concern specifically
24 about that was options to have a smart
25 meter, as I understand it, and not have a

1 smart meter. And as I understand it today
2 it's in the process according to the Board
3 of Civil Authority if I don't want a smart
4 meter I would pay a surcharge of 10 dollars
5 a month not to have my smart meter send my
6 results to the state or to the --

7 COMM. MILLER: Or actually just not to
8 have a smart meter.

9 MR. DAHM: Right. An opt-out decision.

10 COMM. MILLER: Yeah.

11 MR. DAHM: And that particularly offends
12 me. I don't think I should have to pay for
13 something that I don't want since my meter,
14 I assume, is working well. My bill comes
15 monthly. So I thought that was offensive
16 that I should have to pay for it.

17 And then there are other concerns,
18 health issues with the transmission of the
19 radio waves or however they play on the
20 wires, technology used to transmit that
21 data. And I spoke at the Service Board as
22 well mentioning that.

23 COMM. MILLER: At the hearing recently?

24 MR. DAHM: Yeah. In Bennington about
25 two weeks ago.

1 COMM. MILLER: Good. I was there. I
2 was on the other end of the camera. Okay.
3 Thank you.

4 MR. DAHM: That's mainly what my
5 comments are.

6 COMM. MILLER: Okay. I'm going to let
7 others respond, and then we can talk. Okay.

8 MS. VICTOR: Martine Victor. I too feel
9 like the health issues connected with smart
10 meters and the kind of wifi, you know,
11 wireless radiation, electromagnetic
12 radiation is the elephant in the living room
13 of this whole topic that no one has
14 addressed; the health implications of this
15 huge, you know, extension and plan and
16 expansion of this kind of technology
17 throughout the state. You know, which I
18 guess will depend on a new infrastructure
19 that I understand is now being implemented,
20 you know, these cell towers.

21 All of this is going to be transmitting
22 the information in a wireless fashion. And
23 scientists have known for decades, and more
24 and more research is coming out, that there
25 is no free ride with wifi. There are health

1 implications from it. And approximately
2 three percent of the population has overt
3 symptoms, you know, physically or
4 neurologically. They actually -- they
5 suffer and feel unwell around that kind of
6 technology. And then everyone else actually
7 is impacted on a cellular level.

8 You may not know it, but it actually
9 erodes and breaks DNA strands. It sets the
10 stage for disease for cancer, for many other
11 things are linked to this technology, but
12 it's so new, you know, really in the scope
13 of, you know, the development of technology,
14 that people, you know, are gung ho and
15 jumping into something without, you know,
16 fully knowing. Although more information
17 comes out about it, you know, the potential
18 health consequences.

19 So to roll out this technology and sort
20 of force it on everyone, because it's a form
21 of arm twisting to make people pay 10
22 dollars, you know, for something that they
23 don't want. And I think it should be
24 actually an opt-in measure. People should
25 be -- no one is addressing the health

1 issues, and that's what I'm concerned about.
2 That it just seems like, okay, if we don't
3 acknowledge it, no one will know about it,
4 therefore.

5 And also I guess you're presenting this
6 as environmentally friendly. But it's not.
7 Because it's a form of pollution. When
8 you're polluting the air waves, you know,
9 with this kind of radiation, microwave
10 radiation, it's affecting everyone. I mean
11 people, animals, you know, presumably plant
12 life as well. It's a harmful forum of
13 transmission. And it's one thing to choose
14 it yourself. If you want to have wifi in
15 your house, okay. Use your cell phones,
16 fine. I have a cell phone. I tend to text
17 with it. I don't have wifi. I have my
18 computer hard wired, and apparently I heard
19 at that meeting that was two weeks ago, that
20 you could install these meters in a hard
21 wired fashion, so that they would not
22 transmit wirelessly, but you're not choosing
23 to do that. Maybe -- I don't know if it's
24 an expense issue. But I just -- I'm really
25 concerned that it's -- like this technology

1 is being implemented with no regards to
2 safety and also the impact on, you know,
3 studies have come out connecting this with
4 Autism, with Alzheimers, with many, many
5 conditions. Because especially, you know,
6 pregnant women and developing, you know,
7 children, are a lot more susceptible to this
8 kind of radiation.

9 And that's why in many countries in
10 Europe, for example, I think in France, they
11 had wifi in their national library. They
12 removed it. It was making people ill. More
13 information comes out and people are
14 stepping back and trying to apply caution.
15 You know, to this, what it seems like a run
16 away train.

17 And the thing that really concerns me is
18 that meeting was so poorly attended, the one
19 that I had gone to in Bennington. I'm from
20 Manchester. He's from Sandgate. We are the
21 only two people in Bennington. Nobody knew
22 about it. When I talk to the people on a
23 day-to-day basis, I don't know, do you know
24 anything about smart meters, they are like
25 what? No one has even heard of it. They

1 can't make an informed decision about
2 whether they would choose to have this
3 technology or not.

4 Let's see. And then also, you know, you
5 talk about making jobs, creating jobs, but
6 you're putting all the meter readers out of
7 work. So that's a little counter
8 productive. And I just feel too that all
9 that money, the millions and millions of
10 dollars going into this could have gone into
11 developing, you know, solar power or, you
12 know, other alternatives or other, you know,
13 hydro. I mean I'm not well versed in that.
14 But it just seems like a ton of money that's
15 going into something that's just, you know,
16 tweaking consumption a little bit.

17 It's only behavior modification by
18 individuals that would actually reduce
19 consumption. Not the meters themselves
20 aren't going to save anything, and my
21 understanding too is if there is a power
22 outage, the meter is out as well. The meter
23 is connected to the power grid so everything
24 goes black and you have to report an outage,
25 you know, the old fashioned way by telephone

1 unless you're saying there is maybe some
2 central office that is aware of when things,
3 you know, when people lose power.

4 But I believe you said at the last
5 meeting that it runs almost a hundred
6 percent efficient as it currently is. So
7 what big difference can the meters make as
8 far as reporting outages? Let see. That's
9 really my concern, is that nobody has said,
10 you know, a word about the health
11 implications, and I know that in, for
12 example, Bath, Maine, they have just
13 declared a moratorium, you know, on this
14 smart meter project there because they feel
15 it should be a matter of individual choice.
16 People should opt in. There is no fee to
17 not have the meter. And I think that's what
18 we want in this state.

19 You know, I mean the irony is here we
20 are in the green State of Vermont, you know,
21 where people come to really have a rural
22 life. And you're introducing a really toxic
23 high-tech kind of technology, you know, that
24 affects human health and the environment.
25 And I just feel like I want to hear more

1 about it because if you guys don't know
2 about it, then you shouldn't be doing this,
3 if you're not informed about the health
4 consequences. Then you shouldn't be
5 blindly, you know, introducing this
6 technology.

7 COMM. MILLER: Thank you. Can I ask
8 whether we can move on to others? Just
9 because I am now actually concerned that we
10 everybody has a chance to speak.

11 MS. VICTOR: Sure.

12 COMM. MILLER: I appreciate the point,
13 and if we have time at the end, I'll be
14 happy to talk a little bit about it.

15 MS. LAUNDER: So the next person is Ina
16 Smith.

17 MS. SMITH: I'm from East Poultney. And
18 it's interesting that you talk about smart
19 meters, as you know, and with health
20 implications, and kind of a run away train.
21 I feel the same way about utility-scale
22 wind. And I don't see that the public has
23 had much involvement in decision making
24 process that the Public Service Board has
25 been undertaking; that there hasn't been a

1 single wind project denied a permit.

2 There are people now in Lowell camping
3 out on the border of blasting that's about
4 to take place on the Lowell ridgelines.
5 This is an incredibly divisive technology.
6 There are health implications that are
7 fairly well documented that I can't speak to
8 as an expert, but I have read, and about low
9 frequency vibrations. I think we are
10 pursuing a tragic, tragic development of --
11 in terms of utility-scale wind along our
12 ridgelines.

13 I don't approach this as simply from a
14 visual perspective. I think that because it
15 is so divisive to communities and watersheds
16 that especially since Irene, what we ought
17 to be looking at is the preservation of our
18 high ridgelines and the source of our water,
19 not the destruction of it, not blasting
20 ridgelines like mountain top removal. I
21 mean it's crazy what we are doing. And it
22 seems like Montpelier is just kind of
23 blindly going ahead and doing this, you
24 know. And I include Public Service, the PSB
25 in that as well, without really -- without

1 much regard for the thousands of people in
2 the state who are very determined not to see
3 what makes Vermont Vermont. What makes it
4 -- what makes people spend billions of
5 dollars here every year in tourism to
6 destroy that, for a 30 percent capacity
7 return is appalling.

8 You say in here "Vermont should continue
9 to facilitate development of in-state wind
10 projects in order to achieve renewable
11 energy goals with particular focus on
12 community and small-scale projects," which
13 there are relatively none. "For utility
14 scale projects development should be
15 permitted if there are significant economic
16 and social benefits to Vermonters and all
17 other CPG criteria are fulfilled."

18 So the significant economic benefit has
19 not been shown except for some jobs during
20 construction. After construction point 6
21 jobs per turbine. Societal benefits, except
22 for the destruction of community
23 cohesiveness, and there is very little
24 benefit from utility-scale wind. That's all
25 I'm talking about is utility-scale wind. If

1 somebody wants to put up a hundred-foot
2 turbine at a school, which some communities
3 have done, great. But you start blasting
4 ridgelines and destroying the watershed, I
5 think -- I was just going to read the last
6 paragraph that was in today's New York Times
7 or yesterday's New York Times.

8 COMM. MILLER: Today's I think.

9 MS. SMITH: "Pursuit of large scale
10 ridgeline wind power in Vermont represents a
11 terrible error of vision and planning, and a
12 misunderstanding of what a responsible
13 society must do to slow the warming of our
14 planet. It also represents a profound
15 failure to understand the value of our
16 landscape to our souls and our economic
17 future in Vermont."

18 And if this is not already in the public
19 record, I would like to enter this New York
20 Times Op Ed piece.

21 COMM. MILLER: Absolutely. Sure.

22 MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: Who is the author?

23 COMM. MILLER: Steven Wright.

24 MS. SMITH: The author is Steve Wright.
25 He is a former Commissioner of the Vermont

1 Fish & Wildlife Department.

2 MR. PAGE: So is the climate change
3 person -- Guy Page.

4 COMM. MILLER: The answer was?

5 MS. SMITH: Steve Wright. Former
6 Director of Vermont Fish & Wildlife and also
7 Climate Change Advocate National Wildlife.

8 COMM. MILLER: So that's it for the
9 folks who actually had a chance to sign up
10 when they came in, but I'm sure others of
11 you would like to speak.

12 Who else is here would like to speak?
13 Annette?

14 MS. A. SMITH: Thank you, Commissioner.
15 Appreciated the presentation with all
16 updated information.

17 COMM. MILLER: Thanks, you saw the early
18 version.

19 MS. A. SMITH: It's really -- Annette
20 Smith, Vermonters for a Clean Environment.
21 And I live in Danby. And I'm going to make
22 comments first as Vermonters for a Clean
23 Environment and then some personal comments.
24 We will be submitting further comments.

25 I have not had a chance to really digest

1 the plan and offer you substantive comments
2 tonight. I want to speak to a specific
3 issue, and that is the public process. And
4 while I appreciate the addition of
5 mediation, I am gravely concerned about our
6 public process and frankly what a joke it
7 has become. And the comments I'm going to
8 offer I do not say lightly.

9 COMM. MILLER: Just to clarify for
10 others, you're talking about renewable
11 energy siting projects at the PSB? I mean
12 --

13 MS. A. SMITH: It actually goes beyond
14 that. I think that it's the Public Service
15 Board process in general. I have been
16 watching the Public Service Board process
17 deal with specifically utility-scale wind
18 projects for the last two and-a-half years,
19 and have studied the process in that prior
20 to that. It's since about 2005.

21 I'm also concerned about the tower
22 siting and how that is being done. And with
23 the potential merger of CVPS and Green
24 Mountain Power and the majority ownership of
25 VELCO, it really feels like a steam roller

1 coming through our communities. And
2 Vermonters for a Clean Environment works
3 with communities to assist people to
4 participate effectively in the regulatory
5 process. I often find myself in the
6 position of advising individual groups of
7 people and towns about how to participate
8 effectively.

9 At this time, I cannot in good
10 conscience advocate or advise anyone to
11 participate in the Public Service Board
12 process on any issue that I have been
13 watching to hire lawyers, to hire experts
14 and to raise money. It is extremely
15 expensive and a complete waste of money.
16 People would be better off buying cardboard
17 and signs and staples and ink guns and
18 picketing in front of the Public Service
19 Board or just opening up their checkbooks
20 and writing checks and getting a lot of cash
21 and pouring it down the drain. Because as I
22 have observed, I have not seen a single
23 expert's opinions by any other -- any other
24 than developers put into action through
25 Public Service Board Certificates of Public

1 Good. It's astonishing.

2 We have set some of the lowest setbacks
3 from property lines in the country, the
4 Public Service Board has, for large-scale
5 utility projects. Every single project
6 that's been approved have setbacks less than
7 200 feet from neighboring property lines for
8 machines that are more than 400 feet tall.
9 The average throughout the country is 1.1 to
10 1.5 times the total height. We have seen
11 the Public Service Board in every case set a
12 standard noise at 45 decibels which is the
13 well documented level at which harm is known
14 to happen to people, case after case after
15 case.

16 And in particular in this most recent
17 Lowell Green Mountain Power case, where
18 credible experts came in, two noise experts,
19 a doctor -- even the applicant's expert who
20 said that he would want 35 near his house.
21 The Public Service Board was told you are
22 setting the standard at the level at which
23 it will cause harm. And it is extremely
24 well documented, and more and more studies
25 are coming out even since March. And we are

1 not protecting the public.

2 So while that is specific to wind, I
3 have the same concerns for biomass. I have
4 the same concerns for any large-scale
5 project, and I certainly see it in the
6 towers where there is very little public
7 input and it is rushed, a lot of it fueled
8 by federal stimulus money coming into our
9 communities, giving our communities no tools
10 to deal with the process that does not
11 listen, absolutely does not listen.

12 If you were an attorney, Commissioner
13 Miller, practicing before the Public Service
14 Board, representing citizens or towns in any
15 recent wind cases, you would be saying I
16 can't do this any more. Many lawyers have
17 told me they do not want to do it. They
18 will not do it, and they will never do it
19 again. This is something that you must take
20 seriously because our process is broken.
21 And having mediation before the Public
22 Service Board process, that won't help. And
23 we recommend community-based stakeholder
24 process where the community works with the
25 developer to agree on the expert to hire,

1 and then you don't have the dueling experts,
2 you don't have the community bankrupted
3 putting money into testimony that is going
4 to be ignored.

5 It is -- if you want evidence, I would
6 provide you with the evidence that it is a
7 complete joke now. And I'm very sorry to
8 have to make these comments. But if you
9 wanted to deploy renewable energy, this is
10 new energy, we must do it in a new way. We
11 cannot continue this path where community
12 after community is divided, and we should
13 stop right now, and Sheffield Wind Farm come
14 on line. They will be on line in the next
15 month or two. We will find out. We have
16 already had an oil leak. Everything the
17 opponents are saying, it's coming true, and
18 it's time for us to pay attention.

19 On a personal note, I live off solar and
20 I have for 23 years in Vermont. I currently
21 get about 95 percent of my electricity from
22 solar. Solar does work in Vermont. I also
23 have solar thermals for hot water, not only
24 for my hot water, but for heating my office.
25 It works. And I'm probably closer to

1 getting off fossil fuels than just about
2 anybody I know. I drive a hybrid. I was
3 just told by the garage that my battery is
4 about to go at 120,000 miles, and I need to
5 spend 6 thousand dollars on a battery, which
6 actually is what my car is worth. I could
7 get a Chevy Volt for 42 thousand dollars.

8 So while this dream of electric vehicles
9 is something I want to believe in, I'm not a
10 rich person. I've managed to make the
11 choices in my life to get to this point.
12 But I think that we have to be realistic
13 about what's happening. And until the cost
14 of batteries come down and until the cost of
15 electric vehicles come down, I don't see
16 this transition happening.

17 It's great that you say there are going
18 to be all these electric vehicles, but we
19 have options now to make smart choices. One
20 of the deficiencies that I see in this plan
21 around solar is that I think that we must
22 prepare for the massive deployment of solar
23 in Vermont once the price comes down, which
24 it's projected to do, to be at grid parity
25 in 2015, and we needing siting standards.

1 Because if we just continue with this helter
2 skelter build out of the solar without any
3 standards, I think that we are going to see
4 a landscape in Vermont that Vermonters don't
5 want.

6 I'm already hearing complaints about it,
7 and it's absolutely not necessary to do
8 solar in a way that is objectionable in
9 terms of aesthetics. But if you follow
10 what's happened in the Shelburne planning
11 commission, they have said Public Service
12 Board is not listening to us. And that if
13 -- what's going to happen to our town if
14 things keep going this way? The town of
15 Waitsfield is revising their town plan, and
16 their town plan has language in it that
17 discourages large solar installations in
18 visible areas especially along scenic
19 highways. That encourages it in areas where
20 it's not visible, for instance, at Shelburne
21 Farms is a great model for how to do it
22 right.

23 But we really need to take a look at
24 siting standards both for wind and solar and
25 get ahead of this rather than this

1 continuing helter skelter without any plan.

2 Those are my comments.

3 COMM. MILLER: Thank you. Others?

4 Yeah.

5 MR. HANSEN: Thanks for coming. My name
6 is Jerry Hansen. I live here in Rutland.
7 And I'm just going to speak in general terms
8 right now. There is something that is
9 missing, and I'm working currently with the
10 power companies, both power companies. We
11 have a committee, and we are looking into
12 other alternative energy besides the solar
13 biomass, wind, and so forth.

14 The one that I think has not come up on
15 radar recently is geothermal. And if you
16 look at national studies and so forth, most
17 everybody will tell you that geothermal is
18 very doable, especially in the northeast
19 where you have the unpredictable winds and
20 sun and so forth, and the infrastructure
21 with the geological structures to support
22 that.

23 We are also working with a state agency
24 on that aspect of it. I don't want to
25 divulge too much because we have been

1 working on this for two years now. We keep
2 moving ahead. We have found no obstacles to
3 our investigation. And so we are being very
4 methodical about it. We have talked to the
5 congressional side of things, both federal
6 and local. And we have got a number of
7 people very interested in learning more as
8 we go forward. We are also talking to some
9 of the major labs that are being wooed to
10 come to Vermont.

11 And I would ask you to take another look
12 at geothermal applications. We have done
13 cost analysis, so we know it can be
14 competitive. We are encouraging people all
15 over the place to do home geothermal systems
16 on a small scale. A lot of these programs
17 as far as what she was saying and the other
18 fellow, is there is a lot of supplemental
19 energy that could be provided on a home
20 level to reduce cost. But you have to get
21 the cost to the systems down so people can
22 afford it.

23 It's like the electric cars. People
24 would buy a 20 thousand dollar car, but not
25 a \$40,000 car if they thought it would be

1 beneficial. So I would just say that I
2 would ask you to look at some of these other
3 vehicles for alternative energy. We also
4 have a very large river to our east that
5 could be utilized for more hydro.

6 I go to Europe quite a bit and I see
7 this happening in the Scandinavian countries
8 where they are using the currents and tidal
9 basins and flows, so forth, from the oceans
10 to generate electricity on an ongoing basis.
11 These things are very predictable, very
12 reliable. Okay. Non invasive, the least
13 invasive on the environment. So those are
14 things that might accommodate a lot of
15 people here to know that there are other
16 alternatives out there to the obvious which
17 is the wind turbines. And there is actually
18 vertical turbines, not just horizontal
19 turbines, that are far less invasive that
20 will give you almost equal output. And they
21 are being utilized in a lot of other
22 locations, some in the United States, but
23 predominantly in Europe.

24 So we take that application and
25 engineering and bring it over here. I think

1 it would be more conducive to meeting the
2 environmental issues of Vermont. As she
3 said, we are the Green Mountain state. We
4 can lead by example, being green for the
5 lack of a better word.

6 But I think we need to look at all
7 aspects and all vehicles to get us to where
8 we want to go. You had made a comment that
9 we are falling a little behind in some of
10 the progression of getting from point A to
11 point B. I guess in my mind I would like to
12 know what are the obstacles that are keeping
13 us from getting there. So those are some
14 questions, I guess, I would ask you at some
15 later date.

16 So that's in summary, Commissioner. I
17 appreciate your time being here and thank
18 you for the opportunity to talk.

19 COMM. MILLER: Thanks. Guy had his hand
20 up first. Can you just for the court
21 reporter say --

22 MR. PAGE: Guy Page. Vermont Energy
23 Partnership. I hadn't planned to say
24 anything because I know I had my say last
25 night in Brattleboro, but I'm just

1 wondering, I'm hearing concerns that more
2 research is needed on the frequency stuff.
3 And let's wait and see what happens with
4 Sheffield once its built as far as the noise
5 impact.

6 From my own perspective there is this
7 big uncertainty of Vermont Yankee, what's
8 going to happen with that. No one really
9 knows. And so the theme I'm sort of seeing
10 here is I'm wondering if the state has any
11 sort of contingency plan to gather this
12 information, even if it means waiting, so
13 that the final product will have important
14 questions answered.

15 COMM. MILLER: If others have comments,
16 I'll do those first, and then I'm writing
17 down questions as I go.

18 MR. PAGE: Okay.

19 COMM. MILLER: Thank you. Brian, did
20 you have something?

21 MR. KEEFE: Yes, thank you Commissioner.
22 Brian Keefe. And I wanted partly to
23 identify myself -- I work for Central
24 Vermont Public Service, but also a comment
25 to commend you, Commissioner, and your

1 department for looking broadly at all fuels.
2 I think that is the most refreshing part of
3 this energy plan relative to past efforts.

4 As two of your slides point out, one
5 points out that electricity as a -- is
6 almost 50 percent renewable depending on
7 different measurements and such. There is a
8 large renewable component in electricity.
9 There is no reason to think we can't at
10 least hold that going forward in the future
11 and do better.

12 COMM. MILLER: We can do better.

13 MR. KEEFE: We can do better. Assuming
14 we even hold that at 50 percent, and another
15 slide pointed to the cost and how
16 electricity is cost competitive today with
17 fossil fuels and home heating oils and such.
18 So technology such as heat pumps,
19 geothermal, heat pump technology and as
20 Annette says, electric vehicles. I realize
21 those technologies are not quite there yet,
22 but they are closing fast. And going back
23 to another one of your slides, they are
24 going to close in on that. And I just --

25 COMM. MILLER: Pause for one second.

1 I'm sorry that I didn't have a chance to
2 address what you said before. You're
3 leaving. I know you know how to get in
4 touch with me, Annette.

5 MS. A. SMITH: I want dinner. Thank you
6 very much. It's been a long day.

7 COMM. MILLER: Thank you for coming.
8 Sorry about that.

9 MR. KEEFE: Just to sum up, looking at
10 all fuels the way you have in this plan I
11 think is very constructive. If we can
12 maintain that cost competitiveness of
13 electricity that's very important to moving
14 electricity into these other sectors. So
15 that we can, I think, in a nearer term get a
16 better penetration of renewable energy and
17 other low carbon fuels into those other
18 sectors and really start to displace some of
19 the fuel oil, gasoline, and other things
20 that you've pointed out. There is many
21 reasons why we want to displace those.

22 COMM. MILLER: Right.

23 MR. KEEFE: So using more electricity
24 rather than less. But I'll just repeat, it
25 relies on maintaining a cost competitive

1 electricity supply. And that's the
2 challenge we all face.

3 COMM. MILLER: Right.

4 MR. KEEFE: Thank you.

5 COMM. MILLER: Can you for the court
6 reporter --

7 MR. DEWEY: Keith Dewey from Weston. D-
8 E-W-E-Y. I submitted some earlier comments,
9 they are in the preliminary stage of energy
10 plan look. And one of my suggestions was to
11 actually change the name of the plan from
12 the Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan to the
13 Vermont Comprehensive Energy and
14 Environmental Plan.

15 COMM. MILLER: Right.

16 MR. DEWEY: Purpose for that comment is
17 that so that it becomes clear throughout the
18 state and beyond, that the issues of energy
19 and environmental quality are now for the
20 first time recognized, although they have
21 always been the case, but they are now
22 joined at the hip, and the problem has to be
23 solved simultaneously.

24 Just to cite one quick study, the
25 University of Leeds probably a decade ago

1 now cited that if we stay on our present
2 path of CO2 levels in the atmosphere, that
3 the year 2050, 37 percent of all species on
4 earth will be extinct because of ecosystem
5 changes and so forth. At that point the
6 biodiversity of our planet threatens all of
7 us and all of the other species, and it
8 becomes the potential tipping point of
9 downward spiral of life on the planet as we
10 know it.

11 I ask myself in relation to this
12 preliminary plan, given the fact that we are
13 setting a gallant goal of 90 percent
14 renewables by 2050, which incidentally is
15 the same year as the species extinction
16 number, what grade would mother nature give
17 this plan. And although I think there is
18 lots of wonderful things, I'm supportive of
19 you and Governor Shumlin and all the efforts
20 to even start thinking about renewables for
21 the first time, I'm afraid mother nature
22 would give this plan an F. And sadly, it's
23 not that there is not effort. It's that the
24 efforts we are making do not address the
25 real problem with the real solution. Tough

1 as it is, we got, you know, we are at 396
2 parts per million of CO2 in the atmosphere
3 right now growing at 2.2 parts per million
4 per year. A lot of you probably heard of
5 the 350.org organization who advocates we
6 need to get back to 350 to balance our
7 ecosystems. Many people think we need to
8 get back to 300, including myself. So we
9 are near 400 parts per million. We do not
10 -- what I'm saying is, if we follow this
11 plan, we do not have time to save the
12 ecosystems of the earth that we need to by
13 setting a course for 90 percent renewables
14 by 2050. It's too little too late.

15 And I understand how daunting a comment
16 that is, and it's ridiculous, we could never
17 meet that, but I'm saying we have to. And
18 we have to stop kidding ourselves that we
19 are setting these plans and goals that don't
20 get us 60, 70 percent to the goal. We have
21 got to get all the way there. That's my
22 concern.

23 And I think we are not being aggressive
24 enough. There is comments about biomass.
25 Absolutely we have got to go into biomass.

1 Emissions is a concern. You know, biomass
2 in my mind is stored solar energy. It all
3 comes down to, you know, using CHP systems,
4 district heating strategies for our
5 community so we can share these heat systems
6 with, you know, town halls and schools and
7 churches and libraries that are all
8 centristic to the towns we live in and start
9 thinking about mass transit. I didn't hear
10 anything about that. It sounds like a crazy
11 idea for nice, sleepy, rural Vermont to have
12 maglift monorail train from one end of the
13 state to the other. But if you think about
14 the fact we travel 91.7 percent of all our
15 trips in automobiles in this country, with
16 one person, with no cargo, you know, those
17 kinds of things are -- we could start to
18 strategize, to consolidate our energies for
19 this needy transportation sector by thinking
20 more about mass transit systems and moving
21 in that direction much more boldly and much
22 more quickly.

23 You know, I guess my basic comment is
24 let's be careful not to set a plan that
25 doesn't get us to the finish line. And we

1 have to have the courage to define what the
2 problem really is. Do the math. You know,
3 there is lots of comments about sound
4 decibel levels with turbines and setbacks
5 and all those kinds of things. I think we
6 need to do the homework of all those things
7 and do them well too. But if you look at
8 the reality of how much clean green
9 electricity, which would be the common
10 denominator of our energy in the 21st
11 century, we need a massively greater amount
12 of clean electricity, and it all has to be
13 green. Because we can't break apart the
14 environmental solution from the energy
15 solution, part of the same.

16 And so that tells me that my concern
17 should not be gee, I don't want to look at
18 the wind turbines on the hillside or, you
19 know, whatever, you know, solar panels that
20 are in my view and all that kind of stuff.
21 That changes my priority thinking to oh my
22 God, we have got to get going. We have got
23 to do all of this and then some. And there
24 is very, very few people that have done the
25 math of how much clean, green electricity we

1 are going to need to solve mother nature's
2 demands. We have got to start with that.

3 COMM. MILLER: Thank you. Others? It's
4 about 8:35, 8:40, and I do want some time to
5 address some of the questions, if possible.
6 But anything you would like to add? Others?

7 Okay. Well let me just open it up for
8 some conversation then to address some of
9 the questions. Keith, I appreciate the
10 comments. I remember the comment that you
11 made before, we have gotten at every public
12 meeting, I think, and this is good, it means
13 Vermonters have the same, you know, across
14 the state we are hearing similar comments.

15 On the one hand, how could you set goals
16 so far out. It's not quick enough. And
17 frankly, on the other hand, we are hearing
18 what I think some others here lean more
19 toward which is how are you going to ever
20 achieve this in an affordable manner given
21 all of the other challenges, particularly
22 that transportation is not something we
23 directly affect given its interstate nature,
24 et cetera. So we are hearing those
25 comments.

1 And what I can tell you is the Governor
2 understands the environmental choices and
3 the connectivity between the energy and the
4 environment. That's one of the reasons why
5 he's asked for a Climate Cabinet oversight
6 of this plan as opposed to simply a
7 department that's in charge of electricity
8 for the most part. We do call on the plan
9 for things that aren't going to satisfy
10 ultimately your comment, but they do get us
11 toward that.

12 We call for the legislature to look at
13 the structure of how energy issues are
14 addressed in our state government. Some
15 states have specifically combined
16 environment and energy departments, for
17 example, just in recent years. One thing
18 this planning process has allowed us is a
19 much closer connection to some of our
20 agencies and departments that touch on these
21 issues.

22 This has been a collaborative process.
23 We expect it to be a collaborative process
24 going forward. That answers at least the
25 connection issue. We do understand the

1 connection.

2 Some of the other comments that were
3 made, Guy, you asked about contingency
4 planning and waiting. I view this entire
5 process as dynamic. You can't have a plan
6 and then put it on a shelf, nor can you have
7 a plan and then execute it like this without
8 looking at what's happening in the world
9 around you. So the plan attempts to
10 recognize that by asking for a dynamic
11 process of annual review, more frequent
12 updates of the formal plan itself,
13 specifically because things change. That
14 does not mean in my view and the plan does
15 not call for specifically waiting. Because
16 there is a need both because there is a
17 current process in place for projects that
18 are pending, and because there is a need to
19 move forward now.

20 The world always changes, and Vermont
21 needs to react to the situation on the
22 ground now. Right now, and then also be
23 prepared to change and modify as we go
24 forward. I just believe that's how we have
25 to proceed, and I think if we were to -- on

1 any issue -- put a hold, we would risk
2 losing ground in a way that I don't believe
3 is productive for the state as a whole. So
4 that's the purpose of the planning document,
5 not calling for a halt in any particular
6 area.

7 By the way, if folks want to break in
8 feel free, but I'm just going to click
9 through some of the questions otherwise.
10 Brian, you addressed the issue of
11 electricity affordability. I very much hope
12 we have addressed that in the plan. I just
13 want to point out to folks that one of the
14 pieces of the plan that I didn't mention
15 earlier, I did mention the economic impact
16 study for efficiency. But I didn't mention
17 that as a part of our electricity modeling,
18 granted it's always just a model. We don't
19 know exactly what's going to happen in 2020.
20 But in the modeling we did do we took into
21 account the cost profile, and we set forth
22 three different models with three different
23 cost profiles.

24 We also looked at the carbon impact of
25 each of those profiles. The recommendations

1 that we are making are based upon an
2 understanding that you have to look at the
3 cost. Electricity -- renewable electricity
4 has an advantage now if you were to compare
5 it to the cost of gasoline. And we very
6 much believe that when you look at
7 transportation as something that you
8 mentioned looking forward, electricity will
9 be cost competitive in the future.

10 Transportation Research Center just came
11 out with a study that -- if you want to find
12 it online you could Google Transportation
13 Research Center, and I'm sure you would find
14 it. It compared the cost of fueling your
15 car with gasoline versus fueling your car
16 with electricity right now. And if we were
17 to all magically change to electric vehicles
18 we'd be saving a lot of money is the bottom
19 line. And if we can keep our electric
20 profile renewable, move it to more
21 renewable, then we are going to start
22 addressing the issue of getting to the goal.

23 And I understand some feel the goal is
24 not fast enough. But one of the things we
25 really struggled with is how can we move

1 transportation, and what is realistic with
2 transportation given the challenges that we
3 have in the state. So we understand the
4 affordability issue.

5 Yeah, Keith.

6 MR. DEWEY: I was just going to add one
7 thing that may help become a vehicle to move
8 more quickly, is that as a society up to
9 this point our bottom lines of financial
10 analysis are all these trade-offs, is all
11 based on, you know, the cost per gallon at
12 the pump, for example. Well I read
13 something recently the true societal cost of
14 a gallon of gasoline is actually about 17
15 dollars and 50 cents. And we all saw
16 firsthand recently, although you cannot
17 attribute the single severe storm to climate
18 change, the general trend of frequency and
19 severity of severe storms on the planet and
20 shifting of the earth's crust causing
21 tsunamis and earthquakes, et cetera, is all
22 definitely accelerating as a consequence of
23 our climate change. Those costs need to
24 actually be added at a governmental level to
25 the bottom line of the true societal cost of

1 doing business as usual.

2 COMM. MILLER: So we received that
3 comment. And there is a couple of places in
4 the plan that address that issue, life-cycle
5 cost, essentially is one quick way people
6 say it. Governor Shumlin at the cabinet
7 level is having us investigate what are
8 known as alternative progress indicators
9 kind of generally speaking. It's another
10 way of looking at economic progress. And it
11 wouldn't be as if you would just change the
12 current metric or throw the current metric
13 out. Instead you would measure alongside to
14 say, okay, here's the traditional way of
15 measuring progress. If you take life-cycle
16 cost, here's what it looks like. Some
17 states have done that. More states are
18 looking to adopt it. Vermont is
19 investigating it right now. We recommend
20 it. So that helps that issue.

21 Also if we were to get authority to
22 start looking at a total energy standard,
23 it's not an easy thing to do. No state in
24 the country has done that. But if we did
25 look at that, it would help address what

1 you're talking about. You would say, okay,
2 what's really the comparative costs. So
3 that's one benefit of moving to that system.

4 MR. DEWEY: And Vermont being the type
5 of people we are, the size we are, we could
6 set the standard for not only the nation but
7 the world. We should do that.

8 MR. STANNARD: Can I ask a question?

9 COMM. MILLER: Yeah, of course.

10 MR. STANNARD: In our quest to move more
11 towards electric vehicles, I guess
12 particularly with personal vehicles, don't
13 -- do we take into account the increased
14 demand for electricity to power them?

15 COMM. MILLER: Absolutely. That's one
16 of the big --

17 MR. STANNARD: Is that considered in the
18 plan?

19 COMM. MILLER: Yeah. The answer is it
20 is considered. One problem we have is that
21 we are at this moment in time as electric
22 vehicles are really becoming possible, this
23 is going to get you in the weeds, the
24 dispatch modeling -- the type of modeling
25 that we do in the electric world to forecast

1 well into the future, doesn't have a model
2 right now. At least we couldn't find one.
3 It doesn't exist, that can account for all
4 of the societal changes, all of the
5 infrastructure changes, all of the
6 transmission changes, all of the distributed
7 energy changes including, for example, the
8 fact your batteries may become a power
9 source, you know, two-way street.

10 So we can't exactly model, you know,
11 it's not like you can have a crystal ball
12 and exactly model it into the future. But
13 what we do call for in the plan is a
14 recognition that's exactly the sort of thing
15 that we need to start accounting for. And
16 if you had everything change to an electric
17 vehicle in Vermont, poof, this is how much
18 the load would be, this is how much we would
19 need to account for it. So we are aware of
20 the issue. It's not specifically modeled in
21 the plan because frankly, that type of
22 dispatch modeling doesn't exist.

23 MR. STANNARD: And then with the
24 increased efficiency or the savings and the
25 dollars would have to account for the

1 increased use of the electrical vehicles.

2 COMM. MILLER: Yeah.

3 MR. STANNARD: So forth, so on.

4 COMM. MILLER: It's really complicated.

5 MR. STANNARD: It's a never-ending,
6 complicated equation, and that's why you
7 have to deal basically with what you're
8 dealing with today and separately with the
9 future. Which goes back to his point which
10 was a very good one. You're not going to
11 cure the problem without mass transit.

12 COMM. MILLER: Yeah. And thank you for
13 saying that. Again, it's hard to capture
14 everything in the slides. And the VTrans'
15 strategies in the plan do include public
16 transportation strategies. Obviously there
17 are issues in a rural state, as you
18 mentioned, but we can do better. And there
19 are calls specifically for how to reduce
20 individual single occupancy vehicle commute
21 trips. Ride sharing, you know, strategies
22 that can work in a more rural setting.

23 So, and I think, you know, you probably
24 saw in my spring presentation, I like to
25 tell Vermonters all you've got to do to save

1 a bunch of energy is put one other person in
2 your passenger car. You don't necessarily
3 have to take a bus anywhere. It's obvious
4 once you start thinking about it. It saves
5 half the energy.

6 We did a good job tonight, those of you
7 who put someone in your vehicle tonight.
8 You did a good thing.

9 Okay. So we don't have a lot of time,
10 but I want to address some of the other
11 issues that came up. On the smart grid
12 issues let me just say very broadly without
13 getting first to the meter and the RF issue,
14 the smart grid system is a multi-faceted
15 program that's being rolled out. It's not
16 only the meters. So thinking just more
17 broadly for a second, what the smart grid
18 system as a whole is going to allow us to do
19 is have a more responsive, more adaptable
20 transmission system which will help with
21 things like getting electric vehicles
22 managed on load in our state.

23 It will help with things like outage.
24 There is data on outages and how the smart
25 meters that communicate with the whole

1 distribution system can help with outages.
2 That is, it's hard data. It exists, that
3 will be a good thing. So it's not just the
4 meters. That's the first thing I want to
5 say. The smart grid will help us do some of
6 the things folks have talked about here
7 tonight, have more distributed generation,
8 more diffuse areas throughout the state
9 rather than the old model which was a really
10 big power plant in one state with big
11 transmission lines going out from it. So
12 there are benefits to improving our
13 transmission system by using that
14 technology.

15 When it comes to the meter systems, as
16 you mentioned, there is a process going on
17 at the Public Service Board. I hope you
18 heard -- I hope you were there for my
19 comment that despite the fact that we sent
20 the -- department sent out a press release,
21 we tried to publicize it. I was sorry to
22 see that there wasn't more public
23 participation. That process is, however,
24 ongoing. We are addressing at the
25 department customer choice, giving people

1 the choice to opt out.

2 We heard the comments on cost. The
3 Hearing Officer heard the comments on cost.
4 There are -- and again this isn't so much
5 the energy plan. But I'm addressing the
6 comments that were made. There are costs to
7 all of the other ratepayers when some folks
8 choose not to have the new infrastructure.
9 There are costs to that. And the question
10 is whether the individual who chooses not to
11 take the meter bears the cost or everybody
12 else bears the cost. Those are the two
13 choices. Traditionally, and I'm just
14 telling you what the law has been,
15 traditionally the Public Service Board here,
16 and frankly in other states, has had a rule
17 that's called cost causer pays, that's just
18 shorthand. In other words, the person who
19 is causing the cost bears the cost rather
20 than the rest of us. So that's the model
21 that was in mind when the opt-out program
22 was put in place.

23 I don't know if you're CVPS customers,
24 that's probably the tariff you were
25 referring to. But I do want to let folks

1 here who might not be aware of this know,
2 Vermont is in the forefront of offering that
3 choice in the first place. And someone said
4 that the Maine system was cost free. I
5 don't actually believe that's correct. I
6 believe the charge is higher in Maine. We
7 don't have all the answers right now. But I
8 am very aware that consumers in Vermont do
9 want a choice. I understand that. My
10 belief is that the opt out rather than opt
11 in, as someone had mentioned, is appropriate
12 because we are talking about new
13 infrastructure and the infrastructure will
14 work. And I'm not just talking about the
15 meters here. I'm talking about the whole
16 system, if we roll out the whole system to
17 as many Vermonters as possible.

18 In terms of the RF issues, I'm sure
19 you're aware of FCC guidelines and the FCC
20 overlay on this, and I don't want to get
21 into a discussion on issues that I'm not
22 personally expert on. But the federal
23 government has guidelines. In fact, the
24 federal government --

25 MS. VICTOR: Just to jump in I think

1 most scientists that really, really are
2 experts that really know this believe those
3 guidelines are completely, you know, foey.

4 COMM. MILLER: I'm not an expert. I'm
5 just telling you that from a state law point
6 of view there are federal laws we have to
7 look at too.

8 MS. VICTOR: That's the run around,
9 that's not the moral answer to this.
10 Because if you really honestly were
11 concerned about health, you would really
12 find out about the truth.

13 COMM. MILLER: My approach to this has
14 been one of giving customers choice.
15 Because we get comments on all sides of this
16 issue.

17 MS. VICTOR: I'm sure you do.

18 COMM. MILLER: Similar to other issues,
19 I feel that there ought to be customer
20 choice. And I've pushed hard, and Brian
21 will nod his head, I've pushed the utilities
22 hard to offer opt out to customers. Because
23 I understand folks have that concern. Many
24 folks have a privacy concern, separate and
25 apart, or even without regard to any health

1 concern. They might be someone with a
2 wireless network in their house and they
3 still don't want the meter because of
4 privacy issues.

5 So I guess that there are concerns, and
6 the department is pursuing a policy of
7 allowing customer choice. Again it's not
8 particularly -- that's a current proceeding,
9 so it's not specifically addressed in the
10 energy plan. But that's what we are doing
11 there.

12 MS. VICTOR: Which is great. I'm glad
13 that you're doing that, but I just feel it's
14 still maybe not enough.

15 COMM. MILLER: I understand the concern.
16 We will have it in the other proceeding. I
17 just wanted to address it at least briefly
18 again tonight.

19 Addressed biomass a little bit earlier
20 letting you know where else to look in the
21 plan. I'm certainly in contact with Beaver
22 Wood on the project itself. And I know -- I
23 think I know at least, I think I know the
24 most recent update on where you are with the
25 project.

1 MR. BOISQUET: Yes.

2 COMM. MILLER: And you certainly know
3 how to get in touch with me to discuss it.
4 What else have I missed?

5 MR. STANNARD: Can you give us a quick
6 opinion on the correlation between the in-
7 state base load power generation example by
8 things like Beaver Wood in comparison to
9 sending our money out of the country to
10 Canada on both a short-term and a long-term
11 basis? For which I would assume there is a
12 different prediction.

13 COMM. MILLER: Short term and long term
14 you mean?

15 MR. STANNARD: A-hum.

16 COMM. MILLER: Your base load comment
17 earlier, one thing that came to my mind is I
18 didn't -- and Guy and others who have been
19 to other presentations, I tried to shorten
20 it tonight frankly. But I did have a slide
21 earlier in presentations that kind of laid
22 out where electricity comes from. We are
23 about 11 or 12 percent in-state hydro right
24 now, for example. That's a base load --
25 considered a base load resource. About 30

1 percent out-of-state hydro, primarily
2 Hydro-Quebec, although we also get some
3 power from New York, so in terms of other
4 base load resources besides Yankee which is
5 about a third of our power right now, taken
6 by four of the utilities in the state, we do
7 have other base load including in-state base
8 load.

9 We also have the McNeil generator, the
10 Ryegate generator, both biomass electric;
11 probably missing some others.

12 MR. KEEFE: Farm methane. Cow Power.

13 COMM. MILLER: Cow Power. Thank you.

14 Of course.

15 MR. STANNARD: I'm aware of that, but I
16 think I'm a little concerned about our
17 projection to rely --

18 COMM. MILLER: Landfill.

19 MR. STANNARD: -- to rely more and more
20 on Hydro-Quebec. Because at the moment it
21 seems to be for less money at a lower rate.
22 Whereas I don't know that anybody can
23 predict that to be true in the long-range
24 future.

25 COMM. MILLER: No. It's a concern we

1 have heard. You know, how much we keep in
2 state versus allowing to be more regional.
3 The Hydro-Quebec contracts, the new ones,
4 are long-term contracts with known kind of
5 bands of pricing, so they are not flat. But
6 they are more stable than I think your
7 bigger concern which is, you know, what
8 could happen in any given year. We actually
9 do have some protection from that with the
10 long-term contracts we have, which is good.
11 The plan is about a 20-year plan.

12 MR. STANNARD: My bigger concern is also
13 to consider all of the effects of the in-
14 state base load as opposed to the out of
15 country --

16 COMM. MILLER: Right.

17 MR. STANNARD: -- base load, which sends
18 jobs out of the country as opposed to
19 creating and keeping jobs in state, which I
20 think is a very important factor, and we
21 don't hear much about it.

22 COMM. MILLER: Right. And we do, again
23 I think I said this earlier, but I'll say it
24 again. We do suggest that for renewable
25 energy projects the total economic impact be

1 considered so that if there is --

2 MR. STANNARD: Okay.

3 COMM. MILLER: If there is a benefit, we
4 also suggest that other benefits be
5 considered. Locational benefits is one we
6 often talk about. If you put a resource in
7 a particular location, sometimes it has a
8 better benefit to the grid and a better
9 cost. So those are things we suggest get
10 looked at.

11 There was one other point though that
12 you had made earlier that I wanted to make
13 sure I mentioned. Can't remember what it is
14 now, of course, so I apologize.

15 MR. STANNARD: It's all right.

16 COMM. MILLER: No, that's okay. I'm
17 sorry I can't remember it.

18 MR. STANNARD: Done a good job.

19 MR. HANSEN: Talking about job creation
20 and so forth, the reason we are looking at
21 geothermal is it's all internal, it's in
22 state.

23 COMM. MILLER: Yeah, geothermal. That's
24 what I forgot. Thank you for saying that.

25 MR. HANSEN: It's very important. As I

1 said, it's the least invasive of all the
2 alternative energies on the environment.
3 Okay. It's also the most predictable, most
4 reliable, and the most resourceful.

5 COMM. MILLER: Right. Mr. Hansen,
6 right?

7 MR. HANSEN: Correct. H-A-N-S-E-N.

8 COMM. MILLER: I actually wrote it down.
9 Thank you. Sorry. Thank you for reminding
10 me. If you have information on geothermal
11 becoming more cost competitive, if you could
12 share it, that would be great. We do talk
13 about geothermal in the plan. And we would
14 be very supportive of that expanding. The
15 problem, you know, the challenge I guess,
16 with geothermal has been similar to what the
17 problem mentioned with transportation, and
18 you know, the reason why we see the progress
19 going like this with transportation
20 (indicating), the costs have to come down
21 first. Same with geothermal.

22 MR. HANSEN: Absolutely.

23 COMM. MILLER: If you have information,
24 that would be something to share with us.
25 It would be great to have.

1 MR. HANSEN: We have got some financial
2 analysis and so forth. We have involved
3 just the right amount of people to this
4 point. That's why I didn't want to discuss
5 too much in an open forum. Okay. And glad
6 to share that with you.

7 COMM. MILLER: Great.

8 MR. HANSEN: We are being very
9 methodical about how we do this. Gary may
10 know a little bit more about it. His
11 company is involved. Green Mountain Power.
12 We are trying to be very methodical about
13 this. Right now we are kind of letting the
14 dust settle because of the M&A. The
15 acquisition between the parties. We are
16 trying to be careful how to move ahead, keep
17 the ball rolling. As you said, this is
18 dynamic. So we had need to look at all the
19 vehicles.

20 COMM. MILLER: That's one of the great
21 things about the planning process is it's
22 been very collaborative. Personally I feel
23 it's been collaborative, and we try to hit
24 kind of all sources. But the frustrating
25 thing is just that things change. So we do

1 talk about geothermal, but we recognize in
2 the plan that it would be fantastic to
3 expand that resource, but that scale and
4 cost competitiveness have been the issue.

5 And then the other thing we talk about
6 that's a little bit related, and some others
7 have mentioned, is storage. We didn't talk
8 about it tonight. But energy storage. The
9 most kind of known one to folks is the idea
10 that with the two-way grid communication we
11 can actually use our vehicles in the future
12 as a potential balancing source of power.
13 But energy storage generally there is work
14 in hydro, and there is work in solar.

15 MR. HANSEN: As I said earlier, we are
16 also looking at some other hydro aspects,
17 but we have already sited five sites,
18 geologically formations, that would support
19 that, and four of them are in proximity to
20 the existing grid to keep costs down.

21 COMM. MILLER: Interesting. What else
22 did I forget? I don't want people to feel I
23 hadn't given them a little address.

24 MR. DEWEY: I was just going to suggest
25 that Honda is banking on hydrogen and fuel

1 cells that their strategies --

2 COMM. MILLER: Fuel cells, right.

3 MR. DEWEY: Hydrogen creation through
4 electrolysis, which is all electric based,
5 but that will be a real part of our future
6 as well.

7 What I wanted to say was in terms of
8 incentives you mentioned that the Efficiency
9 Vermont success story, one dollar invested
10 versus \$4.6 --

11 COMM. MILLER: Of net present value.

12 MR. DEWEY: -- to the state. We should
13 use that as a model. I'm a firm believer in
14 carrots, not sticks. Especially when it
15 comes to the green building movement and
16 energy efficiency and all the renewable
17 industries, that we can create and sustain a
18 positive attitude toward that movement, by
19 creating large state-sponsored carrots which
20 we see from an Efficiency Vermont model as
21 big dividends. That we should not be afraid
22 to offer healthy incentives to jump start
23 this entire movement and get this moving so
24 we can get there faster than we thought.

25 MR. HANSEN: We would bring the

1 technology to Vermont. That's what we are
2 working on. That creates jobs too.

3 COMM. MILLER: Right. I didn't have a
4 chance when Annette and the other individual
5 was here who talked about siting and the PSB
6 process to respond, and for those of you who
7 heard that and want to know what the plan
8 suggests with regard to the PSB, I
9 highlighted the mediation process. I do
10 feel that that would be helpful, but we have
11 gotten a number of comments similar to what
12 was raised here tonight. So I do understand
13 the concern.

14 And from the PSB, you know, from my seat
15 at the department, working with the PSB,
16 it's always difficult in a contested case to
17 let everybody feel that they have been
18 heard. And I think the public hearing you
19 mentioned from a couple weeks ago is an
20 example of that. And the Hearing Officer
21 that night, I don't know if you heard, asked
22 me, I don't know if it was while the cameras
23 were rolling or not, but he asked me how can
24 we get the word out better.

25 So I do think there is an awareness that

1 there needs to be better outreach. So again
2 it's not directly related to the plan. But
3 I just wanted to let you know that we are
4 aware of the issue. I believe the Board is
5 as well. There is no immediate silver
6 bullet, but we are aware of the issue.

7 Any other comments? It's about 9
8 o'clock.

9 MS. STANLEY: Very quickly. It's a
10 digression. Something that leads to
11 efficiency is a matter of education. And
12 I'm just looking at us here, there is four
13 of us from Fair Haven. We all know each
14 other very well, and I believe we probably
15 came here in four different cars.

16 COMM. MILLER: Well --

17 MS. STANLEY: And so we don't think
18 first of, gee, we are all going to the same
19 place, let's see if we can take one car.

20 COMM. MILLER: Right.

21 MS. STANLEY: Never occurred to me to
22 ask these three gentlemen to get in my Jeep
23 and come with me, and I apologize.

24 COMM. MILLER: Well next time.

25 MR. KEEFE: You were thinking these

1 gentlemen would think of you.

2 COMM. MILLER: No. That is -- it's
3 interesting. I now work in Montpelier and
4 live in Burlington. I have become much more
5 aware of my travel habits since having that
6 commute. It's really --

7 MR. STANNARD: It's almost ludicrous if
8 you sit and watch traffic and count what
9 you're talking about. The gentleman was
10 absolutely right on his count.

11 COMM. MILLER: Right. Well thank you.
12 Yeah. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

13 MR. ROBINSON: I just want to say at a
14 couple of your meetings I have been struck
15 with the different people coming from
16 different areas that have expertise on
17 different topics. And yet we don't have a
18 clue as an audience who they are. I think
19 it would be beneficial if you could do it
20 without invading privacy and perhaps
21 somewhere you could post such and such --

22 COMM. MILLER: Comments.

23 MR. ROBINSON: -- came, you know, and
24 this is their particular level. I know at
25 the last one I went to we had a couple of

1 gentlemen from down in Bennington, and we
2 were just biomass. And they were -- I
3 didn't have a clue who they are, yet they
4 wanted to be involved in conversations,
5 could be a conduit for that. Because you're
6 the only one that has that information --

7 COMM. MILLER: Right.

8 MR. ROBINSON: -- as far as
9 participants.

10 COMM. MILLER: You know, last night in
11 Brattleboro we received a comment about,
12 again it wasn't directly plan-related, but
13 it was a good idea about setting up some
14 sort of clearinghouse, information
15 clearinghouse, similar -- that's an
16 interesting idea. Because we have a lot of
17 information, you're right. And we have
18 posted summaries of comments, but we haven't
19 done what you're suggesting.

20 MR. ROBINSON: Yeah.

21 COMM. MILLER: Okay. Thank you. Yeah.

22 MR. DEWEY: I was just going to say
23 probably the most important thing you can do
24 to make your plan successful is education.
25 This lady here made mention that she talks

1 to people about smart grid, and some people
2 don't even know what that term means. Well
3 that's true across the state, and people get
4 busy with their day-to-day lives. They
5 don't understand the issues that -- the big
6 picture what they are facing, so they get
7 easily swayed by politicians, and they twist
8 their priorities around and decide one thing
9 is more important than another.

10 The way to cut through all that is for
11 your department, and I congratulate you,
12 you've made better outreach effort as a
13 Commissioner than anyone I've ever seen.

14 COMM. MILLER: Thank you.

15 MR. DEWEY: But that is the key to
16 having success is to educate the general
17 public in the state, whatever vehicle or
18 effort that takes on your office to do that.

19 COMM. MILLER: Right.

20 MR. STANNARD: You can't educate them
21 through the media.

22 COMM. MILLER: No.

23 MR. STANNARD: The media doesn't get it
24 right for whatever reason.

25 COMM. MILLER: I appreciate the comment.

1 And we have talked a lot about that
2 internally. I didn't mention it tonight,
3 and it's a minor thing comparatively, but I
4 do want to mention it in closing.

5 Vermont Renewable Energy Atlas is a
6 great resource for folks who are here and
7 just wondering about what Vermont has in
8 terms of renewable resources currently
9 deployed and potential for solar and other
10 things. If you put in Vermont Renewable
11 Energy Atlas it will come up. It's a minor
12 piece. But that's the sort of thing that I
13 wish more people knew about.

14 And so thank you.

15 MS. STANLEY: What did you say it was?
16 Vermont Energy?

17 COMM. MILLER: If you type in Vermont
18 Renewable Energy Atlas.

19 MS. STANLEY: Atlas?

20 COMM. MILLER: Yeah. It will come up.
21 Do you know the URL?

22 MS. LAUNDER: I don't know the direct
23 URL, but it's on the Vermont sustainable
24 jobs funds Web site which is www.vsjf.org.

25 COMM. MILLER: Well thank you for coming

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

out on a rainy night. I really appreciate
it.

(Whereupon, the proceeding was
adjourned at 9:05 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2
3 I, Kim U. Sears, do hereby certify that I
4 recorded by stenographic means the public hearing re:
5 Vermont Energy Plan, at the Rutland High School, 22
6 Stratton Road, Rutland, Vermont, on September 29, 2011,
7 beginning at 7 p.m.

8 I further certify that the foregoing
9 testimony was taken by me stenographically and thereafter
10 reduced to typewriting and the foregoing 116 pages are a
11 transcript of the stenograph notes taken by me of the
12 evidence and the proceedings to the best of my ability.

13 I further certify that I am not related to
14 any of the parties thereto or their counsel, and I am in
15 no way interested in the outcome of said cause.

16 Dated at Williston, Vermont, this 3d day of
17 October, 2011.

18 _____
19 Kim U. Sears, RPR
20
21
22
23
24
25