

STATE OF VERMONT  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE

VERMONT COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY PLAN

October 7, 2015  
7 p.m.

---  
Lyndon State College  
Lyndon Center, Vermont

Public Hearing held before the Vermont  
Department of Public Service, at the Moore Community Room,  
Lyndon State College, Lyndon Center, Vermont, on October  
7, 2015, beginning at 7 p.m.

P R E S E N T

DPS Staff: Asa Hopkins, Director of Planning and  
Energy Resources  
Jon Copans, Deputy Commissioner

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

	<u>PUBLIC SPEAKERS</u>	Page
1		
2		
3		
4	Mark Whitworth	4
5	Kim Fried	6
6	Noreen Hession	9
7	Daniel Cmejla	14
8	Larry Labor	20
9	Madeline Winfield	23
10	Sen. Joe Benning	25
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1                   MR. HOPKINS: We will just go down the  
2 list, I guess, in the order people arrived. So just  
3 going down the list we will have Steve Wright, and  
4 then Mark Whitworth, then Kim Fried. We will do a  
5 preview. Noreen Hession, Daniel -- pronounce it how?

6                   MR. CMEJLA: Cmejla.

7                   MR. HOPKINS: I was not going to get  
8 that. And Senator Benning I think makes the six  
9 folks that we have heard from. And Larry Labor and  
10 Madeline Winfield were maybes, and happy to have you  
11 slot in as we can.

12                  So why don't we start with Steve and  
13 then Mark. And then Kim.

14                  MR. FRIED: Can we talk about the  
15 logistics of making comments? How much time are you  
16 giving us?

17                  MR. HOPKINS: I think if we could  
18 target five minutes or less for that would be -- make  
19 sure that we have time even with maybes, and we will  
20 still fit within the time slot. Ben will flash one  
21 minute, and if you have something written that you  
22 want to work from, and you don't get all the way  
23 through, or you just want to give us a flavor of it,  
24 and then if you can give anything written to Kim, and  
25 she can make sure the transcript is correct and can

1 get the full scope of comments into the transcript  
2 rather than just whatever we might have time for.

3 So let's go for five minutes and go  
4 from there. Steve and then Mark.

5 MR. WRIGHT: I'm going to defer to my  
6 colleague, Mark. My head's still spinning and my  
7 muse has deserted me for the moment.

8 MR. HOPKINS: We probably have time to  
9 put you back in.

10 MR. WRIGHT: Put me at the end of the  
11 line.

12 MR. WHITWORTH: Thanks Steve.

13 MR. WRIGHT: You're welcome.

14 MR. WHITWORTH: I'm Mark Whitworth.  
15 I'm from Newark which I think is the heart of the  
16 Kingdom. And I want to thank you for coming to the  
17 Kingdom to get your fair share of abuse.

18 And my comments deal primarily with  
19 siting, and I think that defining electricity goals  
20 without developing siting standards is kind of like  
21 designing a single payer health care system without  
22 figuring out how to pay for it.

23 So anybody who has ever been involved  
24 in an energy proceeding before the Vermont Public  
25 Service Board knows the communities have no authority

1 to influence the siting of electrical power plants.  
2 The Public Service Department has opposed nearly  
3 every attempt or every attempt to grant a more  
4 meaningful role to our cities and towns in  
5 electricity siting. Energy developers are building  
6 power plants that violate zoning regulations and town  
7 plans. They are cutting forest, compromising  
8 wetlands, jeopardizing head water streams,  
9 encroaching on neighboring properties, and bullying  
10 their neighbors. This has created an energy  
11 rebellion in Vermont, and I'm maintaining a map of  
12 this rebellion. Let the record show that I'm waving  
13 a piece of paper around. By my count there are 67  
14 Vermont towns directly involved in the rebellion.  
15 Some have adopted resolutions that call for the  
16 reform of our siting policies. Some have adopted  
17 municipal plans that restrict some types of energy  
18 development. Some have voted against specific  
19 projects. In addition to these 67 towns, there are  
20 two regional planning commissions that have plans  
21 that would restrict wind development. This brings an  
22 additional 45 towns into the rebellion. That's a  
23 total of 107 towns. If you want to see this map,  
24 which I'll wave around again, visit Energize  
25 Vermont's Web site. [EnergizeVermont.org](http://EnergizeVermont.org).

1                   In the last couple of weeks I've added  
2 two towns to the map. At an informational meeting in  
3 Morgan citizens voted 62 to 7 to oppose a solar  
4 development proposed by David Blittersdorf. The Town  
5 of Irasburg held a special town meeting, and they  
6 voted 274 to 9 to oppose a wind development proposed  
7 by the same David Blittersdorf. 274 to 9.

8                   A friend of mine from Irasburg said  
9 that he was surprised that the vote was so close.  
10 Vermont's energy plan requires small distributed  
11 power plants throughout the state's communities. And  
12 I want to ask that the Department put into the  
13 Comprehensive Energy Plan an acknowledgment that  
14 community support is an important factor in achieving  
15 our energy goals.

16                  I would like to see an assessment of  
17 the community support that we have for these energy  
18 goals. In my opinion it's not very great. I would  
19 like to see the Department address or put together a  
20 plan for winning back the support of the communities  
21 that it has lost. Thank you.

22                  MR. HOPKINS: Thank you, Mark. Kim  
23 Fried and then Noreen Hession.

24                  MR. FRIED: My name is Kim Fried. I'm  
25 the Chair of the Planning Commission from Newark,

1 Vermont, an active member of NVDA. And a lot of what  
2 I prepared to say Mark has already covered.

3 I would like to thank the Department of  
4 Public Service for coming up to the Kingdom. It  
5 would be interesting to see a show of hands of how  
6 many people, speed readers, have read the 400 pages  
7 of the Comprehensive Energy Plan. And maybe we don't  
8 want to embarrass ourselves. I'll admit that I was  
9 fairly familiar with the 2011 plan, so going through  
10 the 2012 was a little bit easier, and I got through  
11 most of it. And I found the first 250 pages pretty  
12 interesting. A lot of statistics, a lot of different  
13 scenarios. By the way, I like scenario B.

14 But when I get to the siting issues,  
15 okay, that final 150 pages, I have some specific  
16 comments that I would ask you to consider. On page  
17 287 under siting, you talk about many interveners and  
18 wind project matters have voiced concern that the  
19 Public Service Board process makes it too complex and  
20 expensive for them to effectively participate. And I  
21 think that the 107 towns or whatever Mark has got  
22 listed, we have found that incredibly true.

23 I have found my experience, which was a  
24 nearly two-year experience with the Public Service  
25 Board, to be an embarrassment. I felt insulted, and

I  
2 I felt that the Public Service Board is incompetent  
3 in this modern age of renewable energy siting. And I  
4 would certainly ask the Public Service Board based on  
5 what Mark's comments were, that the -- and I  
6 understand public good. I understand that we are  
7 talking about the entire state, but when you have  
8 votes of 274 to 9, 62 to 7, okay, just this past  
9 week, okay. And for Seneca Mountain Wind we had  
10 Brighton at 544 to 320, 170 to 107 for UTG. And 169  
11 to 59 for Newark in terms of industrial ridgeline  
wind.

In our area of the state has more  
experience than any other area. We have the two  
largest commercial areas. You add those numbers up  
that's 1,219 to 396 or 76 percent that -- citizens  
that have a problem. And I would ask the Department  
of Public Service to start thinking more of the  
public. Because the public certainly has something  
to say, and we aren't being heard.

And I saw Mark took his map with him,  
that I would like to enter the map into today's  
proceeding. If I look at page 281 you have a picture  
of Crystal Lake, and it's similar to the picture that  
we saw Seneca Mountain with the lake and a beautiful  
ridge behind it, 490 foot towers behind that, but

1                   they are in a cloud bank that you can't even see  
2                   them.

3                   Okay. On the second page I'm sure that  
4                   was supplied to you by REV or some other  
5                   organization. On the second page, 282, we have a  
6                   nice small farm windmill with a nice blue sky to show  
7                   it. And I agree, I would like to -- I would like my  
8                   skies to be blue, but I would like wind towers not to  
9                   be 500 feet tall.

10                  The rest I guess I'll have to submit to  
11                  you on break. Thank you.

12                  MR. HOPKINS: Thank you. Noreen I'll  
13                  go with and then Daniel.

14                  MS. HESSION: Is it okay if I use this  
15                  lectern? I would like to lean on something. Okay.  
16                  Can you guys hear me? I'm just more comfortable  
17                  leaning on something when I talk.

18                  I'm Noreen Hession. I'm from Newark.  
19                  I can give you my comments in writing if that will  
20                  help you. I haven't read the entire 379 pages. I  
21                  dove right into the wind section because that's what  
22                  happened to us up here in the Kingdom.

23                  So I want to talk a little bit about  
24                  four things. One is RECs. So Asa spoke about RECs  
25                  tonight. They are renewable energy certificates also

1 known as renewable energy credits. They are created  
2 -- one REC is created for each megawatthour of  
3 renewable electricity that's generated and delivered  
4 to the grid.

5 On page 277 of the draft it says that  
6 six percent of Vermont's electric power from the  
7 state comes from wind, and that includes Sheffield  
8 and Lowell. The draft that goes on to tell us that  
9 this equals 199 megawatts of installed capacity or  
10 300 gigawatts of annual production. By purchasing a  
11 state -- a REC, a state, not Vermont, can meet their  
12 requirements set by the laws of that state. So wind  
13 energy in Vermont can be used to offset the use of  
14 fossil fuels in another state, let's say coal burning  
15 in Ohio.

16 Another way of saying this is by  
17 selling RECs, Vermont allows other states to meet  
18 their requirements while still burning fossil fuels.  
19 So Vermont wind projects are not creating renewable  
20 energy for Vermont.

21 I found on the graphs that Asa put up,  
22 they are on page 172 it says that eight percent of  
23 renewable energy's from wind, but with adjustments  
24 with RECs -- for RECs holding zero percent of our  
25 renewable energy is generated by wind. So here's my

1 question. On page 278 there is a table that says  
2 Wind Projects in Vermont's Electric Portfolio. So  
3 Vermont sells all of its RECs from these wind  
4 facilities. The primary driver of H40 last session's  
5 reset, was to get us to stop claiming that Vermont's  
6 industrial wind plants are creating renewable energy  
7 since all the RECs are being sold out of state,  
8 claiming that the industrial wind turbines on top of  
9 Lowell Mountain are generating renewable energy for  
10 Vermont while simultaneously selling those RECs out  
11 of state, that's double counting. So the label on  
12 page 278, it's misleading, because it implies that  
13 the energy created by those plants is renewable  
14 energy. It's not.

15 The DPS should add an additional  
16 column, let the Vermonters know when RECs are being  
17 sold, why they are being sold, when they are being  
18 kept in state, what they are being sold for, how much  
19 they are selling them for. So -- and there are  
20 inconsistencies. You know, your slide says 16  
21 percent. And once -- page 172 says eight percent,  
22 another slide says six percent. It's zero percent.

23 The second comment I have is on page  
24 287 of the draft. The Vermont -- it states that the  
25 Commission on Wind Energy identified Section 248 as

1                   the appropriate vehicle for siting wind generation  
2                   projects. Commission made two recommendations. One  
3                   was increased public involvement. And two, encourage  
4                   developers to collaborate early with stakeholders.

5                   As we have seen recently, with Swanton  
6                   and with Irasburg, developers are not only not  
7                   collaborating early with stakeholders, they are  
8                   actually skipping the 246 process. They are putting  
9                   up net net towers without getting CPGs. Blittersdorf  
10                  did this in Irasburg, and I can't remember, but it's  
11                  also done in Swanton.

12                  The draft states that many of the  
13                  recommendations have been subsequently implemented by  
14                  the PSB. So I would like the DPS to provide a list  
15                  of those recommendations, if any evidence that would  
16                  confirm that the PSB has implemented them. There is  
17                  also a statement that the recommendations that don't  
18                  require statutory changes are now underway. I'm  
19                  assuming this is the RPC planning pilot that you were  
20                  discussing. If there are any other things that  
21                  you've done, I would love to know what those are. I  
22                  would like to see these listed as well.

23                  I understand the plan is to extend to  
24                  the regional Planning Commissions as soon as  
25                  possible. It should be up here in the Kingdom. The

1                   Kingdom's regional plan was the only one in the state  
2                   to receive a grade A in a recent review by the Agency  
3                   of Commerce and Community Development. This is the  
4                   place where people have the most knowledge on wind  
5                   development and energy development. This is the  
6                   place with the most benefit from it.

7                   The other thing I just want to say is  
8                   on page 288 the draft talks about the generation of  
9                   wind power itself produces no emissions. That goes  
10                  on to quote the AWEA which is the U.S. Wind  
11                  Industries' Annual Marketing Report. This is  
12                  misleading. Miscalculations fail to account for  
13                  carbon emitted during turbine manufacture, during  
14                  transportation, during site preparation, during  
15                  construction. The numbers also fail to account for  
16                  emissions resulting from support operations such as  
17                  the running of a synchronist condenser and providing  
18                  spinning reserves.

19                  So acknowledging these admissions --  
20                  these emissions would reduce or perhaps even  
21                  eliminate any carbon savings that the industry  
22                  claims. So I would like to see the Department review  
23                  the reduced emissions section of the draft and  
24                  include calculations that I've listed above, not just  
25                  the calculations that the wind industry would like to

1 see you calculate.

2 I have more things, but you're waving  
3 your hand, so I will stop. So that's it for me.

4 Thanks.

5 MR. HOPKINS: Thank you. We look  
6 forward to seeing the rest of your comments if you  
7 give them to Kim or submit them separately.

8 MS. HESSION: Okay.

9 MR. HOPKINS: We have Daniel, and then  
10 is Larry Labor here and would you like to take -- are  
11 you a maybe still or a no, or a question?

12 MR. LABOR: I have a couple comments.

13 MR. HOPKINS: We will do Daniel.

14 MR. CMEJLA: Daniel Cmejla. Seems like  
15 the place to be. C-M-E-J-L-A. Really simple. So  
16 first I would like to just applaud the efforts of the  
17 commission for having an energy plan. A couple  
18 things I think that are great. We are close to a  
19 consensus on deciding that climate change is real,  
20 something we want to tackle. I couldn't agree more  
21 with that.

22 I'm going to briefly go through some of  
23 the language that I saw there and talk about  
24 something that I think is fundamentally missing from  
25 this plan. If we are going to have a Comprehensive

1 Energy Plan, we should have a policy that applies to  
2 the whole state that's part of it. What I put  
3 forward is what's lacking is we really should be  
4 looking on how we can put a price on carbon pollution  
5 and then use that to localize energy production, have  
6 a bunch of other benefits as well.

7 So the first thing in Title 30 Section  
8 202a it says we need something reasonable for our  
9 energy process. Well what is not reasonable is the  
10 current state of how fossil fuels are valued in the  
11 economy. If we have fossil fuels come in through  
12 Lake Memphremagog and then it spills, none of that  
13 policy is going to be there.

14 A third of our coral reefs are  
15 destroyed. We have storms like Irene. These costs  
16 aren't there. We need to recognize the very status  
17 quo of how we value carbon in our economy is not  
18 reasonable, and by our own standards we can ship  
19 that. We also want an economically vibrant economy  
20 encouraging green entrepreneurs and green business.  
21 You said that's something you wanted to put more in  
22 the final draft. Do that, that's awesome. Another  
23 way to do that, we can put a price on carbon  
24 pollution so we can keep money locally. Look at our  
25 economy. What do we not have a lot of? Oil. All

1 these things that are fossil fuels. What do we have  
2 a lot of? We have a lot of skiing, apples and maple.  
3 These are huge industries for us, industries that are  
4 threatened by climate change, which if Vermont  
5 doesn't take aggressive action on, might cost us a  
6 lot economically.

7                   Also we talked about financing how we  
8 need to find ways to finance these things. A lot of  
9 the grievances that I've heard from people already is  
10 that they are financed by these folks from the  
11 private sector that are trying to particularly prey  
12 on the Northeast Kingdom. That's why we need our own  
13 sources of financing, and putting a price on carbon  
14 pollution would give us money so we can focus on not  
15 these big industrial projects alone, but local things  
16 like weatherizing homes, like putting solar on  
17 someone's home, small one-acre solar community  
18 arrays, things like that. We could finance that  
19 within our state which would give us more of an  
20 ability to control where that money is directed  
21 versus relying on these out-of-state corporations.  
22 Another reason we should totally put a price on  
23 carbon pollution.

24                   The last thing I want to talk about is  
25 we should really look at other states. Well they are

1 looking at us. We are Vermont. We were the first  
2 state to legalize same-sex marriages. I heard we  
3 first declared war on Louisiana before the Civil War.  
4 That's pretty cool. So beyond looking at other  
5 states we need to realize we are really an industry  
6 leader here. They need to be looking at us. We  
7 should look at other countries.

British Columbia put a price on carbon back in 2008. They were able to cut their property taxes and their income taxes and their corporate taxes. They now have a vibrant economy, and they have cut their per capita consumption of fossil fuels by 30 percent. We could do that here as well if we look to other states. We are looking at a failed energy policy nationally. So we need to lead that.

I want to look at why are we so opposed  
to wind here. A lot of times it's because we see it,

1 and that's why you have increased opposition to wind  
2 in areas where there is proposed wind. People aren't  
3 opposed to the principle of it, they don't like to  
4 see it. They say we are not actually getting  
5 renewable energy in Vermont. That's displacing  
6 someone else's renewable energy. We may not like to  
7 see the energy. There are communities throughout  
8 Appalachia who have entire mountaintops removed. Who  
9 beyond having to see it and get stressed out about it  
10 and maybe losing sleep, they have higher cancer  
11 rates. There are indigenous communities whose entire  
12 life, everywhere they live, their whole land is  
13 displaced by hydro. So before we say no to all these  
14 things about energy, let's look at the cost of our  
15 current energy system and it could very well be the  
16 destruction of our planet.

17 A third of our coral reefs have been  
18 destroyed. 50 percent of fish in the oceans come  
19 from those. We can't just ignore these things, and  
20 as a leader, as one of the few states who has  
21 potential, we really need to stand up and do more.  
22 We need to realize that when we say no to something,  
23 we say yes to something somewhere else. And while  
24 these renewable energy credits may be moved outside  
25 of Vermont, the very fact of the matter is in a whole

1           we need to be moving away from mountaintop renewable,  
2           need to be moving away from coal, we need to be  
3           moving away from coal ash. The best way for us to do  
4           that is to show that we are strongly in favor of  
5           renewables.

6           Lastly, I know that we say we don't  
7           want to talk about statistics from these anti-wind  
8           groups, anti or pro wind groups. We have the same  
9           thing. A lot of these committees are dominated by  
10          folks who are in a coalition to oppose wind, and I do  
11          feel that a lot of cases the younger generation isn't  
12          acknowledged as much. They don't go to these as  
13          much, but it doesn't mean they are not as passionate  
14          about it. And ultimately it's them who are going to  
15          be able to decide someday what they perceive as  
16          beautiful. I think our world is beautiful now. And  
17          I think wind is beautiful. I think if we are going  
18          to get away from wind, we should probably control  
19          that financing ourselves and look for many ways to  
20          decentralize our energy mix, which is why we highly  
21          recommend rather than saying we hit those goals,  
22          let's include a policy on how to hit them. Let's put  
23          a carbon pollution tax in this. We will be able to  
24          take the lead economically throughout the industry.  
25          And also it's morally the right thing to do for

1                   Vermont, the country and the world. Thank you.

2                   MR. FRIED: Can you tell me what that  
3                   green -- you have a green sticker on.

4                   MR. CMEJLA: There is a box with a  
5                   check in it. It says check, I value Vermont's  
6                   environment.

7                   MR. FRIED: Okay.

8                   MR. CMEJLA: I sometimes wear it when  
9                   I'm not presenting at things.

10                  MR. HOPKINS: So Larry, and then  
11                  Madeline Winfield. Did you decide you wanted to --

12                  MS. WINFIELD: Yes.

13                  MR. HOPKINS: Larry, we will give you a  
14                  chance, and then back to Steve.

15                  MR. LABOR: Good evening. And thanks  
16                  for coming up here.

17                  I'm Larry Labor. For those that  
18                  haven't met me, I'm from the town of Morgan. I'm the  
19                  Chair of the select board there. And I can say that  
20                  I have been on a very rapid learning curve for the  
21                  last 21 days thanks to the Public Service Board. And  
22                  thanks to Dave Blittersdorf for putting us in that  
23                  position.

24                  The Town of Morgan is not against solar  
25                  and we are not against wind, for residential use. If

1 you look at our Town Plan which you can get off of  
2 the NVDA Web site, or you can come to the Morgan Web  
3 site and click on it, you'll find that we  
4 wholeheartedly support alternative energy at the  
5 residential level. If you want to put in your own  
6 solar or your own wind tower to fit your use, that's  
7 just fine so long as it doesn't disturb your neighbor  
8 and it fits within our zoning and within our  
9 planning.

10 What we are really against, and I've  
11 heard from other members here tonight, is the roll  
12 over, that the Public Service Board has the power to  
13 roll over your Town Plan committees and to roll over  
14 your town zoning at the express desire of a developer  
15 who has supreme financial incentive both federal and  
16 state.

17 We would like to see in the Public  
18 Service Department stronger language that returns to  
19 towns local power for siting and for the respect of  
20 their neighbors. That went away. It should come  
21 back. We look at the macro economics of our area,  
22 and there aren't skiing destinations, there aren't  
23 wedding destinations. Morgan is a small town. We  
24 consider it a tourist destination. If you look at  
25 our beautiful lake, all except the southwest portion

1                   is ringed with high mountain ridges. Substantial  
2 acreage have been purchased by the developer for the  
3 sole purpose of putting in alternative energy; some  
4 for solar, some for wind, although he hasn't  
5 announced it yet. Wind monitoring devices are on the  
6 top of that ridge. I have photographed them by  
7 plane, and I've photographed them by land. They are  
8 very clear. The wind anemometers are spinning, and  
9 the vanes are showing the direction of the wind. I  
10 would suggest they are not there for personal use.

11                   If we lose our tourist base, which is  
12 our economic engine for our community, our Board of  
13 Civil Authority is going to be so inundated with  
14 residents looking for a reduction in their taxes  
15 which will probably bog down in superior court, and  
16 then bog down the residents who are remaining with  
17 higher tax rates. To me that's not the community  
18 spirit and not fair. And that's why we are in  
19 intervener status. It's not what is proposed now.  
20 That's just a camel's head under the tent. We know  
21 what's coming in the future.

22                   So at this opportunity I would like to  
23 implore your Department to put stronger language in  
24 that brings the Public Service Board into  
25 accountability to towns instead of the other way

1 around.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. HOPKINS: Thank you. Madeline  
4 Winfield and then Senator Benning.

5 MS. WINFIELD: I'm Madeline Winfield,  
6 can you hear me? And I am from St. Johnsbury. I  
7 have been living here for the last four years. And  
8 lived in West Charleston, Vermont for 40 years. So  
9 I'm -- I am a Northeast Kingomer. And I'm really  
10 grateful that I am here today. I hardly know how I  
11 landed here, but all of this is extremely emotional  
12 and informative, and it is always a quick education  
13 when you're in the presence of people who have been  
14 working really hard to understand things.

15 And the Public Service Board seems to  
16 have a very wide-ranging perspective, but it seems to  
17 happen over there whereas the rest of us in Vermont  
18 are here. And we really need a new way to do things.  
19 It's quite clear that's what's been expressed,  
20 certainly I feel that.

21 And I have two children who are not  
22 children, one of my children has a daughter who is  
23 four years old, and she lives not in this state but  
24 on the other side of the country, but I look at her  
25 and I think about the opportunities that my children

1 had growing up here in Vermont. And I'm very  
2 concerned that she has the same opportunities as we  
3 were talking about how beautiful Vermont is. We were  
4 able to drill from our land and drink good pure  
5 water. And I'm not so sure she can do that in --  
6 where she lives in Seattle. I know that now that I  
7 live in St. Johnsbury I have to go travel with jars  
8 of water -- gallon jars to places where I can find  
9 good clean water, because St. Johnsbury -- I don't  
10 feel safe drinking the water in St. Johnsbury.

11 So I'm very moved by some of the young  
12 voices, I think that we have so much to learn from  
13 the people who are growing up now. And I really  
14 support the -- I don't know what you're feeling now,  
15 it's a very different sort of meeting since all of us  
16 started to talk from what you presented. And it is a  
17 -- I haven't looked at it, I have to tell you, and I  
18 probably won't. I don't do that sort of thing, I'm  
19 not very good at looking at big pieces of written  
20 material, but I do have a lot of -- I think I have a  
21 lot of wisdom about what's really how we have to pay  
22 attention to each other.

23 And we are in a crisis situation, and  
24 Vermont is a really opportunity, and we are a leader  
25 in lots of ways, and I'm going to shut up really

1 quickly. I think I made my point. Thank you very  
2 much.

3 MR. HOPKINS: Senator Benning. And  
4 then is there anybody else who hasn't spoken who  
5 would like to? Okay. I think Senator Benning would  
6 be the final commenter.

7 SENATOR BENNING: Asa, could you pull  
8 up page 10 of the Power Point presentation?

9 Before you start timing me, I was  
10 hoping to be able to simply say the same thing that  
11 Cola Hudson a representative of this town once said  
12 in the legislature after listening to a long  
13 discussion. His statement was Mr. Speaker, I think  
14 everything has been said that needs to be said, but  
15 everybody hasn't said it yet. And there is one thing  
16 here that I haven't heard and that's why I am getting  
17 up to speak, and it appears on this page. Dan, I  
18 just want to come right back; you're very passionate.  
19 I want you to know that there is a dominant theme in  
20 this room that for me in 1973 it started when I was  
21 sitting in a gas station at 4:30 in the morning  
22 waiting to see if they were going to put up a green  
23 flag or a red flag. You probably don't know what  
24 that means. But what it meant at the time was if it  
25 was a green flag, the station had gas. If it was a

1 red flag, the station didn't have gas. And I was the  
2 oldest kid in the family and I was a sucker that got  
3 sent down to the gas station to sit in the cold and  
4 wait to see which it would be, and at that moment in  
5 time I knew fossil fuels was a good thing to move  
6 away from. And I've never forgotten that.

7                   But before the words climate change  
8 ever came into our lexicon, those of us in this room  
9 who were a little bit older than you are spent a  
10 whole lot of time protecting these ridgelines from  
11 something known as acid rain. And your generation  
12 and our generation need to be cohesive in how we  
13 approach this conversation.

14                   I'll also disagree with you strongly on  
15 one thing because I'm a student of Vermont history,  
16 we never declared war on Louisiana. The Governor of  
17 Georgia did suggest that some able-bodied Irishmen be  
18 sent to Vermont and dig a ditch around the state and  
19 float it out into the ocean. That did happen but we  
20 never declared war on Louisiana.

21                   Let me point to a provision on this  
22 page that nobody has spoken about yet, that is the  
23 words right in the middle of the page towards the  
24 end, rely on Vermont resources. This provision has  
25 tremendous potential to divide everybody in this

1 room. It is akin to saying suddenly Vermonters  
2 should only eat oranges that are produced in Vermont.  
3 Energy is a commodity, a tangible commodity. It is  
4 produced in lots of places including renewable, and  
5 it can be bought and sold across state and  
6 international boundaries.

7 Now I agree with you, Dan, that it is a  
8 shame that indigenous people were misplaced when  
9 Hydro-Quebec came into play. If you lived here long  
10 enough you would know that over at Moore dam there is  
11 an entire village where a bunch of white people got  
12 thrown out of their town when that dam got put up.  
13 You and I cannot turn the clock back to fix those  
14 problems. But we would be pretty stupid to turn away  
15 energy that's being produced at either location, if  
16 it can be gotten, if we can sustain it, and it's at  
17 reasonable cost.

18 This provision is guiding us in a whole  
19 new direction that has only begun to scratch the  
20 surface with people who are convinced that that has  
21 to happen. And I can speak of two people  
22 individually, I probably shouldn't say their names,  
23 one of them has been mentioned here. But the other  
24 one is a legislator. And if that conversation is  
25 what's driving the legislature, then those

1 industrial-sized wind plants, solar plants, are going  
2 to start appearing left and right, and the Public  
3 Service Board will be granting those applications  
4 simply because they are trying to reach the overall  
5 objectives of a given amount of renewable energy in a  
6 specific year.

7 I would beg the Public Service Board to  
8 recognize that it is not a sin to accept renewable  
9 energy from across state lines or across  
10 international lines when it is available and when it  
11 can be trusted to be sustained. To do otherwise  
12 threatens those very natural resources that we have  
13 worked very long and very hard to protect.

14 Let me close with this comment. The  
15 last thing any of us want to do is become divided on  
16 the subject of whether we need to move toward  
17 renewable energy. Whether we get to these goals or  
18 not, nobody knows. We want to reach for them, that  
19 is important, but we shouldn't become so blind to  
20 what is happening at the industrial level with  
21 profiteers who are coming here to take advantage for  
22 their own purposes at the expense of what we have  
23 worked so hard to protect. Thank you very much for  
24 the time.

25 (Applause.)

1 MR. HOPKINS: So thank you all very  
2 much for your comments. And just one more reminder,  
3 anything you think of on the way out the door after  
4 Kim packs up her machinery over there, or anything  
5 you think of for the next month and a day, you know,  
6 we really very much want to hear it. And the form to  
7 do that is here on the Web site.

8 MS. HESSION: Can I just make a  
9 suggestion? The slide presentation was really  
10 helpful. It would have been helpful to have that  
11 before I sat down to tackle a 400-page document. If  
12 you are having distribution lists where you're  
13 inviting people around the state to comment on the  
14 energy plan point, send a point of the slide  
15 presentation. I don't know if you've done that  
16 already.

23 So thank you very much for the  
24 suggestion, and we will do our best on that front.  
25 So thank you all very much for a pleasant evening.

1 If you're from the Northeast Kingdom I very much  
2 appreciate your hospitality, and I look forward to  
3 your comments. Thank you.

4 (Whereupon, the proceeding was  
5 adjourned at 7:39 p.m.)

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

## C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Kim U. Sears, do hereby certify that I recorded by stenographic means the Public Hearing re: Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan, at the Moore Community Room, Lyndon State College, Lyndon Center, Vermont, on October 7, 2015, beginning at 7 p.m.

I further certify that the foregoing  
testimony was taken by me stenographically and thereafter  
reduced to typewriting and the foregoing 30 pages are a  
transcript of the stenograph notes taken by me of the  
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.

Kimber bears

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