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

MR. CMEJLA: Cmejla.

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

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

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

MR. HOPKINS: I think if we could target five minutes or less for that would be -- make sure that we have time even with maybes, and we will still fit within the time slot. Ben will flash one minute, and if you have something written that you want to work from, and you don't get all the way through, or you just want to give us a flavor of it, and then if you can give anything written to Kim, and she can make sure the transcript is correct and can
get the full scope of comments into the transcript rather than just whatever we might have time for.

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

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

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

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

MR. WHITWORTH: Thanks Steve.

MR. WRIGHT: You're welcome.

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

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

So anybody who has ever been involved in an energy proceeding before the Vermont Public Service Board knows the communities have no authority
to influence the siting of electrical power plants. The Public Service Department has opposed nearly every attempt or every attempt to grant a more meaningful role to our cities and towns in electricity siting. Energy developers are building power plants that violate zoning regulations and town plans. They are cutting forest, compromising wetlands, jeopardizing head water streams, encroaching on neighboring properties, and bullying their neighbors. This has created an energy rebellion in Vermont, and I'm maintaining a map of this rebellion. Let the record show that I'm waving a piece of paper around. By my count there are 67 Vermont towns directly involved in the rebellion. Some have adopted resolutions that call for the reform of our siting policies. Some have adopted municipal plans that restrict some types of energy development. Some have voted against specific projects. In addition to these 67 towns, there are two regional planning commissions that have plans that would restrict wind development. This brings an additional 45 towns into the rebellion. That's a total of 107 towns. If you want to see this map, which I'll wave around again, visit Energize Vermont's Web site. EnergizeVermont.org.
In the last couple of weeks I've added two towns to the map. At an informational meeting in Morgan citizens voted 62 to 7 to oppose a solar development proposed by David Blittersdorf. The Town of Irasburg held a special town meeting, and they voted 274 to 9 to oppose a wind development proposed by the same David Blittersdorf. 274 to 9.

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

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

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

MR. FRIED: My name is Kim Fried. I'm the Chair of the Planning Commission from Newark,
Vermont, an active member of NVDA. And a lot of what I prepared to say Mark has already covered.

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

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

I have found my experience, which was a nearly two-year experience with the Public Service Board, to be an embarrassment. I felt insulted, and
I felt that the Public Service Board is incompetent in this modern age of renewable energy siting. And I would certainly ask the Public Service Board based on what Mark's comments were, that the -- and I understand public good. I understand that we are talking about the entire state, but when you have votes of 274 to 9, 62 to 7, okay, just this past week, okay. And for Seneca Mountain Wind we had Brighton at 544 to 320, 170 to 107 for UTG. And 169 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
they are in a cloud bank that you can't even see them.

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

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

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

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

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

So I want to talk a little bit about four things. One is RECs. So Asa spoke about RECs tonight. They are renewable energy certificates also
known as renewable energy credits. They are created -- one REC is created for each megawatt-hour of renewable electricity that's generated and delivered to the grid.

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

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

I found on the graphs that Asa put up, they are on page 172 it says that eight percent of renewable energy's from wind, but with adjustments with RECs -- for RECs holding zero percent of our renewable energy is generated by wind. So here's my
question. On page 278 there is a table that says Wind Projects in Vermont's Electric Portfolio. So Vermont sells all of its RECs from these wind facilities. The primary driver of H40 last session's reset, was to get us to stop claiming that Vermont's industrial wind plants are creating renewable energy since all the RECs are being sold out of state, claiming that the industrial wind turbines on top of Lowell Mountain are generating renewable energy for Vermont while simultaneously selling those RECs out of state, that's double counting. So the label on page 278, it's misleading, because it implies that the energy created by those plants is renewable energy. It's not.

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

The second comment I have is on page 287 of the draft. The Vermont -- it states that the Commission on Wind Energy identified Section 248 as
the appropriate vehicle for siting wind generation projects. Commission made two recommendations. One was increased public involvement. And two, encourage developers to collaborate early with stakeholders.

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

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

I understand the plan is to extend to the regional Planning Commissions as soon as possible. It should be up here in the Kingdom. The
Kingdom's regional plan was the only one in the state to receive a grade A in a recent review by the Agency of Commerce and Community Development. This is the place where people have the most knowledge on wind development and energy development. This is the place with the most benefit from it.

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

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

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

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

MS. HESSON: Okay.

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

MR. LABOR: I have a couple comments.

MR. HOPKINS: We will do Daniel.

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

I'm going to briefly go through some of the language that I saw there and talk about something that I think is fundamentally missing from this plan. If we are going to have a Comprehensive
Energy Plan, we should have a policy that applies to the whole state that's part of it. What I put forward is what's lacking is we really should be looking on how we can put a price on carbon pollution and then use that to localize energy production, have a bunch of other benefits as well.

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

A third of our coral reefs are destroyed. We have storms like Irene. These costs aren't there. We need to recognize the very status quo of how we value carbon in our economy is not reasonable, and by our own standards we can ship that. We also want an economically vibrant economy encouraging green entrepreneurs and green business. You said that's something you wanted to put more in the final draft. Do that, that's awesome. Another way to do that, we can put a price on carbon pollution so we can keep money locally. Look at our economy. What do we not have a lot of? Oil. All
these things that are fossil fuels. What do we have a lot of? We have a lot of skiing, apples and maple. These are huge industries for us, industries that are threatened by climate change, which if Vermont doesn't take aggressive action on, might cost us a lot economically.

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

The last thing I want to talk about is we should really look at other states. Well they are
looking at us. We are Vermont. We were the first state to legalize same-sex marriages. I heard we first declared war on Louisiana before the Civil War. That's pretty cool. So beyond looking at other states we need to realize we are really an industry leader here. They need to be looking at us. We 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.

And then lastly, I would like to talk a little bit about what I've seen here. I think the Kingdom is the gem of Vermont. I care more about it than anywhere else in Vermont. If Vermont is to the country something great, I would say the Kingdom is to Vermont that as well. And a lot of the rest of Vermont's kind of like New York anyway. But Vermont's just truly amazing.

I want to look at why are we so opposed to wind here. A lot of times it's because we see it,
and that's why you have increased opposition to wind in areas where there is proposed wind. People aren't opposed to the principle of it, they don't like to see it. They say we are not actually getting renewable energy in Vermont. That's displacing someone else's renewable energy. We may not like to see the energy. There are communities throughout Appalacia who have entire mountaintops removed. Who beyond having to see it and get stressed out about it and maybe losing sleep, they have higher cancer rates. There are indigenous communities whose entire life, everywhere they live, their whole land is displaced by hydro. So before we say no to all these things about energy, let's look at the cost of our current energy system and it could very well be the destruction of our planet.

A third of our coral reefs have been destroyed. 50 percent of fish in the oceans come from those. We can't just ignore these things, and as a leader, as one of the few states who has potential, we really need to stand up and do more. We need to realize that when we say no to something, we say yes to something somewhere else. And while these renewable energy credits may be moved outside of Vermont, the very fact of the matter is in a whole
we need to be moving away from mountaintop renewable, need to be moving away from coal, we need to be moving away from coal ash. The best way for us to do that is to show that we are strongly in favor of renewables.

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

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

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

MR. FRIED: Okay.

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

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

MS. WINFIELD: Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

We would like to see in the Public
Service Department stronger language that returns to
towns local power for siting and for the respect of
their neighbors. That went away. It should come
back. We look at the macro economics of our area,
and there aren't skiing destinations, there aren't
wedding destinations. Morgan is a small town. We
consider it a tourist destination. If you look at
our beautiful lake, all except the southwest portion
is ringed with high mountain ridges. Substantial acreage have been purchased by the developer for the sole purpose of putting in alternative energy; some for solar, some for wind, although he hasn't announced it yet. Wind monitoring devices are on the top of that ridge. I have photographed them by plane, and I've photographed them by land. They are very clear. The wind anemometers are spinning, and the vanes are showing the direction of the wind. I would suggest they are not there for personal use.

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

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

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

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

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

And I have two children who are not children, one of my children has a daughter who is four years old, and she lives not in this state but on the other side of the country, but I look at her and I think about the opportunities that my children
had growing up here in Vermont. And I'm very concerned that she has the same opportunities as we were talking about how beautiful Vermont is. We were able to drill from our land and drink good pure water. And I'm not so sure she can do that in -- where she lives in Seattle. I know that now that I live in St. Johnsbury I have to go travel with jars of water -- gallon jars to places where I can find good clean water, because St. Johnsbury -- I don't feel safe drinking the water in St. Johnsbury.

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

And we are in a crisis situation, and Vermont is a really opportunity, and we are a leader in lots of ways, and I'm going to shut up really
quickly. I think I made my point. Thank you very much.

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

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

Before you start timing me, I was hoping to be able to simply say the same thing that Cola Hudson a representative of this town once said in the legislature after listening to a long discussion. His statement was Mr. Speaker, I think everything has been said that needs to be said, but everybody hasn't said it yet. And there is one thing here that I haven't heard and that's why I am getting up to speak, and it appears on this page. Dan, I just want to come right back; you're very passionate. I want you to know that there is a dominant theme in this room that for me in 1973 it started when I was sitting in a gas station at 4:30 in the morning waiting to see if they were going to put up a green flag or a red flag. You probably don't know what that means. But what it meant at the time was if it was a green flag, the station had gas. If it was a
red flag, the station didn't have gas. And I was the oldest kid in the family and I was a sucker that got sent down to the gas station to sit in the cold and wait to see which it would be, and at that moment in time I knew fossil fuels was a good thing to move away from. And I've never forgotten that.

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

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

Let me point to a provision on this page that nobody has spoken about yet, that is the words right in the middle of the page towards the end, rely on Vermont resources. This provision has tremendous potential to divide everybody in this
room. It is akin to saying suddenly Vermonters should only eat oranges that are produced in Vermont. Energy is a commodity, a tangible commodity. It is produced in lots of places including renewable, and it can be bought and sold across state and international boundaries.

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

This provision is guiding us in a whole new direction that has only begun to scratch the surface with people who are convinced that that has to happen. And I can speak of two people individually, I probably shouldn't say their names, one of them has been mentioned here. But the other one is a legislator. And if that conversation is what's driving the legislature, then those
industrial-sized wind plants, solar plants, are going to start appearing left and right, and the Public Service Board will be granting those applications simply because they are trying to reach the overall objectives of a given amount of renewable energy in a specific year.

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

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

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

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

MR. HOPKINS: It wasn't done until just before I left the office today. We will get this up -- this presentation itself will also be on that Web site, so folks who are coming to future meetings who are getting the details there will be able to see the slides in advance.

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

Capitol Court Reporters, Inc.
(802) 863-6067
If you're from the Northeast Kingdom I very much appreciate your hospitality, and I look forward to your comments. Thank you.

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