

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
26

STATE OF VERMONT
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE

RE: THE WINDHAM REGIONAL COMMISSION'S
REQUEST FOR A DETERMINATION OF ENERGY
COMPLIANCE PURSUANT TO 24 V.S.A. SECTION 4352

June 5, 2018
7:00 p.m.

Townshend Town Hall
Townshend, Vermont

Public hearing held before the Department of
Public Service at the Townshend Town Hall, 2006 Vermont
Route 30, Townshend, Vermont, on June 5, 2018 beginning
at 7:00 p.m.

P R E S E N T

Vermont Department of Public Service:

June Tierney, Commissioner
Dan Potter, Energy Policy and Program Analyst
Sheila Grace, Special Counsel

CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS, INC.
P.O. BOX 329
BURLINGTON, VERMONT 05402-0329
(802/800)863-6067
Email: info@capitolcourtreporters.com

	<u>PUBLIC SPEAKERS</u>	
		<u>Page</u>
1		
2		
3	Marion Major	6
4	Calvin Farwell	11
5	Chris Company	16
6	Andy Snelling	19
7	Bob Kehoe	21
8	Maureen Bell	22
9	Vance Bell	24
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Well, good evening.
2 My name is June Tierney. I am the Commissioner of the
3 Vermont Department of Public Service. Thank you for
4 being here tonight. I can be very soft-spoken. I
5 don't mean to give offense. Let me know if you can't
6 hear me, and I'll try to use the parade field voice I
7 have instead which is not --

8 MR. FARWELL: Little more volume, even at
9 this distance.

10 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Even at that level,
11 you want greater volume?

12 MR. FARWELL: That's better.

13 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: That works pretty well
14 for you? Okay. Let's give this a shot then. To me,
15 it feels like I'm shouting at you.

16 MR. FARWELL: Yeah, shout. Go ahead.

17 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Okay. So I am June
18 Tierney, and I am the Commissioner of the Vermont
19 Department of Public Service, and I thank you for being
20 here tonight. With me tonight are my colleagues, Dan
21 Potter, who is our planning wizard extraordinaire at
22 the Department, and also with me is Counsel Sheila
23 Grace who helps me understand what's in the green books
24 otherwise known as the state statutes, and they have
25 both been working on this review with me in our

1 offices.

2 I'd like to start by offering just a little
3 context for our hearing tonight. Act 174, as you no
4 doubt are aware, created an energy plan process in
5 Vermont for regional planning commissions, and, as I
6 understand it, we are reviewing a regional plan
7 tonight. Under this process, a regional planning
8 commission has the option of submitting its duly
9 adopted plan to the Commissioner of the Department of
10 Public Service -- that would be me -- for an
11 affirmative determination of compliance with the
12 statutory standards of 24 V.S.A. -- wait for it --
13 4352. There we go, yes.

14 When a regional plan has received an affirmative
15 compliance determination under Section 4352, the
16 Vermont Public Utility Commission is then obliged by
17 law to give substantial deference to that plan whenever
18 it's reviewing a Section 248 application, for instance,
19 for the siting of generation facilities in a given
20 community.

21 What else do I want to tell you about this? So
22 the purpose of tonight's hearing is to gather input
23 from the folks who are here tonight who choose to
24 speak. Whether you are supportive of the plan or not,
25 this is your opportunity to talk to me and my staff

1 face-to-face and let me understand where you're coming
2 from in your assessment of the plan.

3 If I find that the plan complies, as I said, you
4 will see that the PUC is then obliged to give it
5 substantial deference in 248 proceedings. If I find
6 that the plan does not comply, you will certainly be
7 apprised of the reasons why, and I can assure that the
8 Department will make itself available liberally to help
9 fix whatever issues there are so that the region can
10 get a plan in place as soon as practicable thereafter.

11 We have asked Ms. Major to give a brief overview
12 of the plan tonight. If you would kindly do so, I
13 understand you have been the leader in the process in
14 developing this plan. And then, after that, I'm going
15 to turn to this list I have of folks who have signed
16 up. Are you among them by chance, sir? Do you plan to
17 speak tonight?

18 MR. FARWELL: I think I'm Number 1.

19 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: You are Number 1.
20 Mr. Farwell, is that correct?

21 MR. FARWELL: Yeah, I used to be Mr. Farwell.
22 Now I'm Calvin Farwell.

23 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: So, you know, this
24 could be a much more interesting conversation than some
25 of the things we'll talk about tonight because I was

1 raised in a country where you always address people by
2 their last name. I was raised in Germany so you would
3 be Mr. Farwell to me, but I wouldn't want to give
4 offense so I should call you Calvin; is that right?

5 MR. FARWELL: Sure, yes.

6 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: You prefer that?

7 MR. FARWELL: Yeah. I used to teach over
8 there at that next building, and I was Mr. Farwell
9 there.

10 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: You were Mr. Farwell
11 over there? Kind of makes you feel older, doesn't it?
12 Yeah. That's, when they started calling me ma'am,
13 that's how I felt too. So okay. We will turn now back
14 to our regularly scheduled program, and I will ask Ms.
15 Major to give that overview if you wouldn't mind,
16 please.

17 MS. MAJOR: Thank you. Thank you for that
18 context. That was very helpful. So I'm just going to
19 talk briefly about the process that we went through in
20 developing this plan and then really, really briefly do
21 some kind of highlights of the plan findings and just
22 go over how it, how it is integrated into our larger
23 regional plan and our plans moving forward.

24 So, over the past almost two years, we've been
25 developing this regional energy plan. That process of

1 development included data and GIS analyses that studied
2 the current use of energy consumption and resource
3 availability. We also included modeling and adapting
4 all the figures and the models for this region in
5 specific.

6 It also included several outreach events to
7 develop our policies and our goals. So we had two
8 public workshops, stakeholder events, to identify
9 policies and pathways in reaching our goals, and we
10 also had a workshop, public workshop on the maps to
11 understand our resource availability and how the maps
12 work themselves.

13 We had four public meetings after we did several
14 iterations of the draft plan itself to gather public
15 input throughout the region, and then we had the plan
16 itself on almost every agenda at our monthly energy
17 committee meetings within the, the Windham Regional
18 Commission and the Energy Natural Resources project
19 review committees met jointly three times to assess the
20 plan, the drafts, and work on the policies themselves.

21 The plan itself was presented in full and in part
22 to the full commission at three times during the
23 development and drafting process, and the WRC, we
24 hosted two public hearings to gather testimony from the
25 public on our, on our final draft before it was adopted

1 and a full commission meeting on April 24th. So that
2 was our process for the last two years, give or take,
3 take a little bit.

4 And so the, the highlights of the plan itself are
5 our current consumption in the three sectors that we
6 were kind of charged with analyzing were heat,
7 transportation, and electricity. \$194 million are
8 spent within this region on that energy, and in the
9 future to meet the 90 percent renewable by 2050 goal of
10 the state, we'll have to -- we look to reduce our
11 energy consumption overall by 40 trillion BTUs. That's
12 a huge amount of conservation and efficiency that we'll
13 be pursuing pretty aggressively.

14 MR. FARWELL: That's annual?

15 MS. MAJOR: This is in total from our current
16 consumption to our consumption in 2050.

17 MR. FARWELL: The annual consumption, that
18 large number of BTUs was for --

19 MS. MAJOR: Yeah, that will be annually.
20 Sorry. Yes, thank you. In that model there's an
21 assumed huge kind of transition in electrification and
22 in the transportation sector. Also, in the heating
23 sector there's also an assumed expansion of biomass
24 heating.

25 We also had generation targets of renewable energy

1 in order to become 90 percent renewable by 2050.
2 Overall, we have 362,943 megawatt hours is our overall
3 generation target. We've already, given what we
4 already are producing, are generating within the
5 region, we'll have to generate 58,493 megawatt hours to
6 reach that target in addition to what we're already
7 generating. So we're doing well, but we have a lot of
8 work.

9 So the policies in the plan are really adapted
10 from our original regional plan. We worked pretty
11 directly off of the energy policies, land use policies,
12 and transportation policies. Any constraints that we
13 applied to development, which was only on the utility
14 scale, was, is a constraint that's applied to all types
15 of development. So, essentially, our plan really
16 supports all types of renewable energy generation
17 across the region.

18 Currently, and, and with this plan, our region,
19 the Windham region, is already pursuing implementing a
20 comprehensive energy planning and implementation. We
21 have several programs that we're working with now. A
22 few are Windham Wood Heat, which works to convert
23 public buildings and nonprofit buildings to biomass
24 heating. We have the Windham County Energy Program,
25 which is a grant program that assists in the

1 development of renewable energy installations, and in
2 the past we had the Energy Efficiency and Conservation
3 Block Grant. So this plan really looks to expand on
4 programs like that and to continue our implementation
5 of conservation and renewable energy development within
6 the region, and that's all.

7 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Excellent. Thank you
8 for that very helpful and clear overview. It sounds
9 like your region has a lot to be proud of, and it's
10 clear to me from the procedural history that you gave
11 at the outset that a good deal of work has gone into
12 the plan, and I, I salute the communities in the region
13 for that. This is a big task that has come your way,
14 and I know that communities often have some anxiety
15 about whether they're doing it well, and if it's any
16 comfort to you, I'm not grading anybody. So and I, I
17 just am deeply appreciative of the, the
18 civic-mindedness that is evidenced by the composition
19 of a plan of this nature, especially this one.

20 I have in front of me a list of seven folks. Two
21 have indicated that maybe they will speak. One has
22 definitely indicated no intention to speak. One has
23 strayed into this column with the symbols .net, which
24 I'm going to take as a blank, and the other two are
25 blank as well. So I have no yeses for people who want

1 to speak tonight, and I'm going to look at you with
2 that practiced eye I have from the hearing room, and
3 I'm going to say, Really? Come on, folks. You came
4 out tonight, and you've got nothing to say to me? Come
5 on. Now, Mr. -- let's compromise. Mr. Farwell,
6 Calvin, have you anything to say, sir?

7 MR. FARWELL: Um, not yet, no. I, I expected
8 there would be more give and take here, but,
9 particularly, I feel hamstrung without the document in
10 front of me.

11 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: I see. Well, there's
12 a document here that I am happy to surrender to you.
13 It is not my intention to conduct a back-and-forth
14 because, truly, the nature of the hearing tonight is to
15 hear from you folks views that I would expect have been
16 informed by what you've been doing, and I am not in a
17 position to foreshadow the outcome because that would
18 not serve the integrity of the process, which is to
19 review this, get your comments, take them home, think
20 hard about what I've heard, look at the proposed
21 outcome that my staff gives me, reject it because I
22 never accept anything on a first round. Would you
23 accept a first draft?

24 MR. FARWELL: Okay. Well, I will make a
25 comment then.

1 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: So please do, yes.

2 MR. FARWELL: I want to make sure that the
3 final document, the final document that you're
4 presenting -- isn't that right, you're presenting,
5 you're evaluating --

6 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: As Ms. Major has
7 described for the benefit of the gathering?

8 MR. FARWELL: -- yeah, that a fairly late
9 contribution from the Dummerston Energy Committee
10 concerned wind energy.

11 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Okay.

12 MR. FARWELL: And I think the, as the
13 document stood at that time, there was a pretty blanket
14 statement that there was, there were no appropriate
15 sites for industrial-scale wind energy in Windham
16 County, something like that, and we felt that --
17 actually, it was before I got onto the energy
18 committee, but our committee felt that that was a
19 little bit too strong and that it should be flexible
20 enough so that, if future changes in wind energy
21 technology were taken into consideration, there might
22 be some sites that were appropriate for
23 industrial-scale wind energy.

24 For example, noise reduction, it could be that ten
25 years from now the turbines will be much quieter, in

1 which case some of the objections might go away. Or is
2 that, is that sentence still in there?

3 MS. MAJOR: Can I answer that?

4 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Please, do, yes.

5 MS. MAJOR: No, that has, that was within the
6 first draft. After our public comment, we changed it
7 to open it up more than that. So, so it's only
8 restricting utility-scale wind within resource areas,
9 which is defined within the regional plan itself. So
10 hope that helps. It does not?

11 MR. FARWELL: I didn't understand whether
12 you're saying yes or no.

13 MS. MAJOR: No, that sentence is not in
14 there.

15 MR. FARWELL: Okay. Well, it should be.

16 MS. MAJOR: Sorry. I guess --

17 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Perhaps let me clarify
18 just a little bit. So your first comment I understood
19 to be there was a sentence in the plan that you found
20 objectionable, and your committee met and thought
21 perhaps more tempered language should be in the plan
22 because technology could change and could cure the
23 objection?

24 MR. FARWELL: Yeah.

25 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: And what I understand

1 from Ms. Major is that the sentence you found
2 objectionable is no longer in the plan. Now, I imagine
3 Mr. Calvin Farwell's question is, Okay, the
4 objectionable sentence is out. Is a more suitable
5 sentence now in? And could you answer that question?

6 MS. MAJOR: Yeah. So, rather than having a
7 blanket policy statement, as you said, the, the policy
8 is that utility-scale wind is only restricted within
9 one certain type of land use, which is the resource
10 lands which is reserved for agriculture and forestry.
11 So it's a developmental constraint that would be
12 applied to any sort of development in those lands. So
13 on page -- if, if you want to take a look, I think it's
14 Page 37. We've talked about this before. 37-ish.

15 MR. FARWELL: 37-ish?

16 MS. MAJOR: Yeah, something like. That looks
17 about right.

18 MR. FARWELL: Utility-scale wind?

19 MS. MAJOR: So it's not deemed incompatible
20 with the region in general.

21 MR. SNELLING: Andrew Snelling. I was asking
22 Marion Major that the resource land would cover all the
23 higher elevations, does it not?

24 MS. MAJOR: There's a definition within
25 there. It's not all the higher --

1 MR. CAMPANY: No, it's not all of it. I'm
2 Chris Company, Executive Director, Windham Regional
3 Commission. Some of the higher elevation lands are
4 also considered productive rural, and utility-scale
5 wind would be allowed in productive rural.

6 MR. FARWELL: I could read to everybody the,
7 the sentence here. It's okay. It says blah, blah,
8 blah --

9 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Wait. Is that B-L-A
10 or B-L-A-H? I just want to know.

11 MR. FARWELL: Okay. I'll read it all: "Most
12 areas within the region are identified as being a prime
13 or secondary wind resource fall within resource lines
14 identified on the proposed land use map of the Windham
15 Regional Plan. Given the nature of utility-scale wind
16 development which involves considerable blasting, road
17 building, and other permanent alterations of the
18 landscape and surface hydrology, it is deemed to be
19 incompatible within resource lands".

20 That sounds like slamming the door completely, but
21 the next paragraph then says, "The WRC will revisit its
22 policy position on utility-scale wind when the regional
23 plan is next revised after this revision to determine
24 if new wind technologies could mitigate problems that
25 currently make it incompatible with land use

1 properties".

2 So that's, that, that second paragraph is the
3 flexibility that we were looking for.

4 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Excellent, excellent.

5 MR. CAMPANY: Can I explain?

6 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Just a second. Could
7 I get the plan back, Calvin? Thank you. Just a
8 second, Mr. Company.

9 MR. CAMPANY: Yes, ma'am. Yes, June.

10 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: That's Commissioner
11 June. Please note laughter in the room. Um-hum.
12 Well, I have to say that was a very productive exchange
13 I just witnessed, considering that there's a sentence
14 in here that says, "The question of the appropriateness
15 of utility-scale wind has been particularly contentious
16 within and among some towns in the region". So,
17 really, I wish there were many others in Vermont who
18 could witness this tonight and be encouraged by the
19 civility with which this tension is being addressed.

20 Now, Mr. Company?

21 MR. CAMPANY: So just so folks know, the
22 resource land question, that's been -- for us to have
23 permitted -- what the, what the primary policy for
24 resource land says is to be -- I'm trying to remember
25 the exact language, but basically is to be used for

1 agriculture and forestry purposes, and so, for us to
2 have then turned around and said, Okay, utility-scale
3 wind is okay, we would have actually had to amend the
4 regional plan too. We were adopting an amendment to
5 the plan, and so that's hence the language we'll
6 revisit what the appropriate use, if that's an
7 appropriate use, in resource lands when we next revise
8 the plan.

9 We are now in the process of actually beginning a
10 regional plan revision where we'll continue to have
11 that conversation, but, right now, there was concern
12 about what else, If you allow utility-scale wind, what
13 else are you opening up those lands to development for?
14 Such as, we have certain ski resorts here that are
15 actually expanding, and that, that's actually a primary
16 concern is how much of those resource lands, and also
17 for residential development or other things because the
18 district -- because beyond a lot of, of the focus, a
19 lot of the focus in the conversation has been around
20 Section 248 proceedings, but we also have to take into
21 account Act 250 proceedings, and the District
22 Environmental Commission is also looking for
23 consistency among policies.

24 But also, more to the point, Act 174 requires that
25 we meet certain standards, and one of those standards

1 are that we have consistency with the regional energy
2 plan and with the policies of the regional plan as a
3 whole, and it wasn't felt that that would be a, that,
4 if we had allowed utility-scale wind in resource lands,
5 that would actually be consistent with the resource
6 lands policy. So that would be a topic of continued
7 discussion within the commission that's already
8 underway now, much to the -- I know that Dan was not
9 thrilled to hear that we were beginning a regional plan
10 review.

11 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: I'm sure that Dan gave
12 no indication whatsoever of his feelings, and I, I have
13 listened carefully to what you said, Mr. Company, and I
14 don't believe anything you just said disturbed the
15 resolution that Calvin Farwell reached, and the
16 flexibility that he was looking for is intact as far as
17 I could tell. So you should be okay, you should be
18 okay.

19 And I think, for what it's worth, what you have
20 secured by going through this process now on the terms
21 that you've outlined is the opportunity to get a plan
22 approved that will enjoy substantial deference from the
23 PUC in 248 proceedings, and that is, I think, a good
24 thing for you. Had you not proceeded, you, you would
25 be in the position that you've been in today that, for

1 many communities, gave rise to the impetus for Act 174,
2 but having proceeded in that manner doesn't close the
3 door on the flexibility that you were speaking about as
4 far as I could tell, Mr. Farwell. I will give this
5 point very close attention when I'm reviewing the plan.
6 Now, I've got another maybe on here from Mr. Snelling.
7 Can I push you over the edge?

8 MR. SNELLING: You can push me to a yes.

9 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: What's it going to
10 take for me to push you to a yes?

11 MR. SNELLING: Would you like me to say it
12 now, or would you like me to just give you a summary?

13 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: I've got to check to
14 see how much money I've got first. Go ahead.

15 MR. SNELLING: Well, in the plan there is
16 talk and, in general, with regards to the entire Act
17 174 planning process, of being energy self-sufficient
18 and the economic benefit of having generation within
19 the region or community. For the most part, there's a
20 big emphasis on added electrical and a shifting energy
21 consumption to electrical, and then and primarily with
22 wind on the side and not a lot of hydro sites possible,
23 we have a lot of photovoltaic generation being the
24 means of new generation.

25 There is no discussion of the fact that the

1 photovoltaic generation is going to be intermittent,
2 and there's no plan in there for adding storage
3 capacity for time shift or demand shift. So my look at
4 it is that, if we wanted to be self-sufficient and
5 retain the economic benefit of energy generation within
6 our region, we need to have a way to be able to
7 generate base load power 24/7 because, if we're
8 depending totally on photovoltaics, what we are going
9 to have happen is that, yes, we may generate adequate
10 BTUs on an annual basis to meet our annual BTU
11 consumption, but evening, nighttime, we're going to be
12 importing Hydro-Quebec as base load.

13 So that's not really self-sufficient. It's not
14 keeping the economic benefit within the region or
15 within the state, and I didn't see anything where there
16 was a discussion as to whether there were suitable
17 energy storage facilities or terrain that would be
18 suitable for energy storage development within the
19 county.

20 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: All right. That's a
21 very thoughtful comment, and I have an opening right
22 now in my planning division if you'd be interested. So
23 I appreciate that. Thank you. Do I have another
24 comment from anybody? Yes, you would be?

25 MR. KEHOE: Bobkehoe.net.

1 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Oh, Mr. Kehoe. I was
2 trying to guess. You are .net then? Okay, why don't
3 you go ahead?

4 MR. KEHOE: I'm from Windham, Vermont, and I
5 think, you know, I'd like to go on record that, you
6 know, we're mostly concerned because we have a viable
7 wind site. We've been through two wind farm projects.
8 We have a fractured town right now with a divided
9 people. I'm on the select board now, not on the
10 planning commission. I was on the planning commission
11 for 23 years, and my goal is to try to solve this, and
12 I'm just very much interested how this plan's going to
13 impact Windham with the resource areas opening up and
14 we have a viable site. That's what I got.

15 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: All right. Thank you,
16 Mr. Kehoe. Um, I'm not going to pick on the no. You
17 know, I follow baseball and the idea of batting a
18 thousand, wow, you know, it sounds great. Never
19 happens. But I've been pretty good at these meetings
20 getting people to talk even when they say they won't.

21 MS. BELL: Pick on me.

22 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: So the thing to do is
23 to leave the no all by themselves and then lean on them
24 with peer pressure at the end.

25 MR. BELL: I am the no.

1 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: You've outed yourself
2 now, Vance. Thank you. But I think that means Maureen
3 can probably be pushed, right?

4 MS. BELL: Absolutely, yes.

5 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Excellent. Let's get
6 you started, Maureen.

7 MS. BELL: All right. So I'm Maureen Bell.
8 I'm on the select board in Windham. I'm the chair of
9 the select board, and I'm not prepared to speak to the
10 specifics of the plan, but I am here to tell you that
11 the majority of our energy commission as well as our
12 planning commission support the plan, um, very much so,
13 in fact. And I think Marion has a statement to read
14 from Bill?

15 MS. MAJOR: I have a statement from Bill.

16 MS. BELL: Would you like me to read it?

17 MS. MAJOR: I think it might be appropriate
18 if you would read it?

19 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: And could you perhaps
20 identify Bill?

21 MS. BELL: I will. Bill Dunkel, D-U-N-K-E-L.

22 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Okay, Mr. William
23 Dunkel?

24 MS. BELL: Yes, and he is the chair of the
25 planning commission as well as the head of the energy

1 committee.

2 MR. BELL: Head of the energy committee,
3 yeah.

4 MS. BELL: And he says: "To the PSD, I
5 regret that I will be out of town and unable to attend
6 tomorrow evening's public hearing in Townshend on the
7 Windham Regional Commission's request for energy
8 compliance determination. As a commissioner to the
9 WRC", which I left out, "from the Town of Windham and a
10 member of the WRC Energy Committee, I am familiar with
11 the Windham Regional Plan and the Regional Energy Plan
12 in particular. I voted to adopt the Regional Energy
13 Plan at full commissioners' meeting on April 24th.

14 "I know that Marion Major and other members of the
15 WRC staff have done a great deal of meticulous work to
16 develop the plan. I would like to go on record in
17 support of it. With assistance from the WRC, the
18 Windham Town Energy Committee, which I chair, has
19 developed an enhanced energy element which we plan to
20 submit to the WRC if the PSD determines that the
21 Regional Energy Plan is compliant with the State's
22 Comprehensive Energy Plan.

23 "It is my sincere hope that tomorrow evening's
24 public hearing will expedite this process and validate
25 the good work being done by Chris Company and his

1 dedicated team at the Windham Regional Commission.
2 Sincerely, Bill Dunkel."

3 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Well, I found Mr.
4 Dunkel's statement most persuasive until he mentioned
5 Mr. Company's work. I'm very familiar with Mr.
6 Company's work from --

7 MS. BELL: I hope you're teasing.

8 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: -- a great deal of
9 litigation involving the Yankee site, and, yes, I am
10 very much teasing. So, when I was in law school, I had
11 this great professor named David Firestone who was
12 really more of an actor than a teacher, though he was
13 an amazing contracts teacher, and he showed me ten
14 hundred million ways to stall, and what he taught us
15 was that, when somebody is stalling like this, it's a
16 good opportunity to organize your thoughts because
17 you're about to get called on.

18 So, you know, Vance, I've given you every
19 opportunity to prepare yourself. Let me go home a
20 happy person with my 1,000 batting average intact.
21 What can you tell me tonight?

22 MR. BELL: Well, being at several of the
23 local meetings for the Windham Regional and airing all
24 my thoughts at those meetings, I didn't really feel
25 that I had to air any particular thoughts here since I

1 have aired all of them at Marion in the past.

2 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: But, Vance, I'm a
3 special person.

4 MS. BELL: Yeah, June made a special trip
5 here.

6 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: How frequently do you
7 talk to the Commissioner in person? So air away, just
8 a little.

9 MR. BELL: Well, being part of Windham and,
10 as Bob alluded to, problems with wind development in
11 our town --

12 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Yes?

13 MR. BELL: -- we felt that the compromise
14 that was put in this plan should adequately protect us
15 from having development on our ridgelines at any point
16 and allow other towns to develop, Readsboro and others
17 on the west coast of the Windham town, town area, allow
18 them to develop if they want on those ridges. I am
19 happy with the plan the way it has been written, and I
20 think it is a good plan to go forward with.

21 COMMISSIONER TIERNEY: Excellent. Well,
22 listen, thank you sincerely for sharing that with me
23 because you really actually have given me insight I
24 didn't have into the community that's very important to
25 me. Because I, I come in here from Montpelier, and

1 what I know about your dynamics is a combination of
2 what I read in the media and what I've gathered over my
3 career as a public servant doing energy work in the
4 state for the past two decades, more or less, and so
5 it's, it's instructive to me to better understand how
6 it is that you can sit in the room with Mr. Farwell and
7 be as cordial as you're being.

8 The reference to the west coast of your community
9 is not lost on me being by birth a Californian. So and
10 I, I commend all of you for your energy and interest in
11 the subject matter. It's complex, but it's also about
12 your values, and that's not quite as complex. So thank
13 you.

14 I feel compelled to just share a little bit of my
15 own view about some of this. I work for a governor who
16 does, who wants to see communities come together, and
17 what we have in common is the sadness both of us feel
18 when we consider how communities can be torn apart by
19 these kinds of debates. There are people of good faith
20 on all sides. I moved here because I grew up in
21 Bavaria which has heartbreakingly beautiful mountains,
22 and there, too, they have had exactly the same debate
23 about what to do about wind energy.

24 I also come to this as a soldier, and, when I
25 think about kids being put in uniform and sent overseas

1 because we have compelling interests in energy
2 elsewhere, it really brings home to me the virtue of
3 looking to our own resources first and considering how
4 perhaps we can produce sufficient energy to meet our
5 needs without having to put their lives in jeopardy.

6 I was struck by your overview, Ms. Major, in that
7 you mentioned the aggressive energy efficiency that
8 your communities are interested in doing, and I think
9 our Yankee forebears would be very pleased to hear that
10 because that certainly is a good step in the right
11 direction.

12 We have now had comments from everybody tonight,
13 and you've been courteous and allowed me to give you my
14 thoughts here. That would bring our proceeding to an
15 end, unless you have additional questions. One thing I
16 would encourage you in the community is to let folks
17 know that we're always amenable to written comments.
18 It was good of you to read Mr. Dunkel's statement. You
19 could also pass that up here, and we can take it home.

20 But, when you're talking to your neighbors who
21 tell you they couldn't make it tonight because of a
22 softball game or because it threatens to rain or
23 because they really didn't know about my star qualities
24 and, therefore, didn't realize they should have come to
25 the best public hearing you folks are going to see all

1 year, just tell them that all is not lost. I will
2 happily read the comments that are sent to -- what's
3 the address, guys? psd.planningstandards@vermont.gov,
4 care of Daniel Potter. No, it's
5 psd.planningstandards@vermont.gov, and we will leave
6 this up here in case anybody wants to have a look at
7 it, and, with that, I pronounce this meeting ended.
8 Thank you.

9

10

11 (Whereupon at 7:43 p.m. the hearing was adjourned.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

