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MS. KYLE: Dotty Kyle K-Y-L-E. My next door neighbor is poor as a church mouse and she's also disabled. She lives in a 150-year-old drafty farmhouse. She has been on the waiting list for low income weatherization for nearly three years. There isn't any money for the program that Capstone so generously offers to low income people. They have been able to weatherize some homes, but that waiting list grows and grows, and this is a plea for a carbon pollution tax where some place between 10 and 20 percent of the income from that tax could be used to fund programs that help low income people stay in their homes comfortably, and that's my statement.

Plea for carbon pollution tax.

DR. HOPKINS: Eric Brattstrom.

MR. BRATTSTROM: Eric Brattstrom B-R-A-T-T-S-T-R-O-M. I'm also from Warren and recently in the Town of Warren there is a crib dam that's been there for 150 years. We are trying to reconfigure that crib dam into hydro producing, and we have run into nothing but trouble with the state to try to renew that dam, keep it in the shape it is or better, remove the silt from behind the dam, and we've run into nothing but roadblocks from the state using every excuse possible, and it gets very, very
frustrating. I can imagine what -- the frustration you must see trying to work with different agencies in the state, and it seems to me that the state should try to put clean energy, especially something like hydro where -- and especially where a town is trying to do its best to do its share, and we find that we may have to stop trying it's getting so frustrating, and I wonder if you can't get the different agencies to work together to make clean energy without greenhouse gases work and actually meet the goals that we're trying to get to with the Comprehensive Energy Plan. Thank you.

DR. HOPKINS: Some folks put question marks. I'm just going to call your name and you can yell out if you want to speak. Jim Ashley now and then Norm Etroid with a question mark. Not Norm. So next Bill Nolan also a question mark. All right. So then Jim Ashley and then Eric Esselstyn probably yes. So Jim and then Eric.

MR. ASHLEY: I'm not as tall as he is, but he certainly leads us all and has done a great job with the Comprehensive Energy Plan. I participated also in the 2011 and at that time, as I will now, bring up geothermal heat pumps. I think they are not being adequately addressed. Like on
page 98, 35,000 cold climate heat pumps by 2025. Well there's also geothermal that should be mentioned. The -- what was it -- S202 failed to mention geothermal. We had to get that put into the legislation. It mentioned such as coal plant and heat pumps and there is no alternative.

The geothermal heat pumps I think can play a very major role in accomplishing our goals in many ways. They are -- and I learned this from Diane Hopans (phonetic) they are not a displacement product. They are a replacement. In other words, they replace. You replace your furnace. You don't need to keep using an old furnace or other things that are inefficient, and you can replace it entirely rather than like an Energy Star, like an E-house in Rutland that was mentioned in an article in the Atlantic that in the last part of that the homeowner mentioned the fact that they were great about their energy reduction, but now they had to replace the furnace that was their backup.

Also I think a very important thing is for us to start getting into thermal RECs which can be credited to geothermal, and in New Hampshire a four ton unit will produce 18 to 20 million megawatthours of thermal per year equating to 18 to
20 RECs, and 25 dollars per REC is 4 ton, annual of
450 to 500 dollars that could go prepaid, like in
Massachusetts, a long ways toward helping to finance
which is a big question with geo.

DR. HOPKINS: Eric Esselstyn and then
Anne Jameson.

MR. ESSELSTYN: Eric Esselstyn
E-S-S-E-L-S-T-Y-N from Montpelier. I just want to
mention something about the crackle and the
commitment and the emotional energy that's going to
play a huge role whether this thing goes forward or
has a hard time going forward, and I would like to
speak up for sort of rekindling the town energy
committees.

Four years ago there were all kinds of
stuff in East Montpelier about insulating the old
four corner schoolhouse, insulating the town office,
making sure the trucks and graders and stuff were
turned off in waiting periods. Those tiny little
things four years ago there was a lot of excitement
about that. I just think there's an enormous asset
in rekindling the espirit of those town energy
committees. Also in identifying the people --
helping state agencies identify the people who need
it the most -- who may need the most help. They
can't all just come down to the state.

    I would suggest the possibility of
competition between towns done on a percentage basis
about the number of buildings that have been
retrofitted or the number of electric cars and the
amount of solar energy. Obviously you have to be
sensitive to the huge variation and income levels of
various communities, but set up a little competition
to add a little, what can I say, crunch, crackle, and
more than just stuff coming from the state. I'll
leave it at that. As an old coach I think you will
play a huge role.

    DR. HOPKINS: Anne Jameson.

    MS. JAMESON: I too am not as tall as
Asa. I'm Anne Jameson J-A-M-E-S-O-N. I live in
Marshfield. I thank you for the opportunity to
comment this evening. I've noticed that within the
proposal for the CPE this year it does not contain a
carbon pollution tax and I respectfully request that
that be considered.

    I firmly believe that our climate is
changing to a degree which is endangering the future
of ourselves and our children's children. We can't
ignore the growing reality of the destructive weather
patterns such as has brought us Irene and Sandy, or the
warming temperatures will ultimately decrease our apple harvests, hurt or possibly destroy our maple fields, and shorten our winter sporting season. Ignoring these warnings will leave our children with the Vermont that we probably wouldn't want them to live in. I don't want to see this happen.

Immediate and effective action is needed to curtail the pollution which is adversely contributing to these climate changes, especially the use of fossil fuel. Putting a price on the use of that in the form of a carbon pollution tax is a levy on distributors and wholesalers based on the amount of potential carbon pollution they create is a good way to both reduce emissions and help meet our state goals for greenhouse reduction.

Vermonters' dependence on fossil fuels also drains dollars out of Vermont's communities. Alternative energy sources will help keep more of those energy dollars here working with Vermonters and Vermont businesses. I hope my ideas and comments will help you consider a carbon tax. Thank you.

DR. HOPKINS: Dee Gish and Deb Stoleroff.

MS. GISH: My name is Dee Gish. I live -- G-I-S-H. I live in Sharon. I'm also working for
Two Rivers Ottaquechee Regional Commission in Woodstock. We are one of the three regional planning commissions that are working with the Department on the regional energy plans. I also chair the Sharon Energy Committee, and I serve on the Board of Vermont Interfaith Power and Light, and also on the Board of Bayo (phonetic) Building, a local company out of South Royalton, but tonight I'm here as a mom, hence, my attire because I came directly from my son's soccer game. So I'm not wearing any of those hats. I'm coming as a mom and I share a lot of other comments that you just heard tonight.

So with regards to the Comprehensive Energy Plan I want to thank the Department and all of the other agencies that put so much thought into this plan because I think it is truly comprehensive, but I also want to share with some of the other commenters that we do need a price on carbon and that is not in the current plan, and we also need to avoid any more investments in fossil fuel infrastructure because once that infrastructure is in place we've committed to those dirty sources of energy, and finally there's no mention of hydro, again, fuel cell vehicles in the plan, and I know Toyota just came out with a plan that said that they are not going to be producing
gasoline vehicles as of 2050, and that they are putting more of their emphasis on hydrogen fuel cells. So I would like to see that mentioned in the plan, and again thank you all for coming.

DR. HOPKINS: Deborah Stoleroff and Elizabeth Parker.

MS. STOLEROFF: My name is Deborah Stoleroff and I'm from Plainfield, Vermont. I recently had a conversation with a middle school student about her recollection of Vermont climate. She notices that the summers have been warmer, but the winter, spring, and fall were already changing by the time she became aware of climate, and our longer springs, summers, and autumns are her norm so she doesn't necessarily relate to climate change.

It reminded me of the burden that -- and responsibility that protecting our planet has on our shoulders of the older generation. We as an older generation have carried the knowledge and the -- and keep that knowledge of the diversity and the beauty that our earth has had in the past. However, most of the populous is not and will not voluntarily take responsibility for the planet. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the lawmakers and policymakers to develop policies and incentives that will protect all
aspects of the environment.

Vermont's energy plan, though a good start, is not bold enough. Our energy plan needs to set the most rigorous goals. I would call for one hundred percent renewable energy use in Vermont by 2030, a carbon pollution tax on the larger polluters, shutting down Vermont Gas's pipeline that will transport fracked gas through our state, and allocating more funds for mass transportation. If we want to leave a habitable planet for our children and grandchildren, we need to stop at this point toeing around the harder solutions we know will keep our environment stable.

So I urge you to write the strongest and boldest of energy plans. One that will protect the planet for our future generations. Thanks.

DR. HOPKINS: Elizabeth Parker and then Thomas Weiss.

MS. PARKER: Hi. I'm Elizabeth Parker P-A-R-K-E-R. First I would like to thank everyone who is involved in bringing this plan to this point. It's an amazing job and just at the beginning of a very long road. I have been using public transportation for four years due to a medical condition, and as to rural state planning public
transportation is a challenge, but it's not impossible. Look at Europe. They have got -- the cost of gasoline is much higher there than what we are paying here in Vermont and yet they have excellent public transportation. Public transportation costs money which we at this point do not have to put into it, and it is also a huge cultural shift.

I believe that a carbon pollution tax will be good for Vermon ters providing much needed money for a change in how we do transportation. Vermonters need to change behavior dramatically in a very short period of time and it is going to take incentives to help change behavior and also marking a culture of energy efficiency.

I would like to see things such as access, bus access, back from Burlington for after late evening meetings, and on the weekends access to the Northeast Kingdom, Hardwick and beyond. These are only a few of the transportation changes that can be funded by revenues from a carbon pollution tax. A carbon pollution tax is an important step in achieving Vermont's transportation goals. Thank you.

DR. HOPKINS: Thomas Weiss and then Rick Wackernagel.
MR. WEISS: Hello. I'm Thomas Weiss W-E I-S-S from Montpelier. I like numbers and I don't see the numbers I'm looking for in the report. What does this all achieve? We've got greenhouse gas reduction goals. We know that we started at a certain amount. In transportation if we're going to cut greenhouse gas emissions by a certain percentage by a certain year, how much does each of the steps get us there. I would like to see that, some kind of numbers in the plan that shows that we're actually going to get where we're supposed to be going with what's recommended in the plan.

Secondly, carbon tax, where is it. I think those words are mentioned three times in the entire plan. I remember being in this room four months ago where it seemed that carbon tax was listed as a high priority to be included in the plan for those people who were here.

Transportation. I was surprised when I saw the slide that said that Agency of Transportation was one of the people who participated in the development of the plan because when I read the transportation section I didn't see that at all. I didn't see that they provided any guidance, that they bought into any of the recommendations, or how the
recommendations in this plan relate to the various transportation plans that there are.

That's a summary of the bulk of my comments. Also the report doesn't point out that we've made no progress on the greenhouse gas emission reductions based on 1990 and 2012 which I think is the latest year available. I think it was just a little bit above what we were emitting in 1990. So we have had all these plans but no action, or I should say no results.

DR. HOPKINS: Eric Wackernagel and Pete Ketcham.

MR. WACKERNAGEL: I'm Rick Wackernagel W-A-C-K-E-R-N-A-G-E-L from Burlington, and I'm glad to see that the plan includes a section on, and support for, policies that will compliment the market based instruments such as a carbon pollution tax that we have heard about so far quite a bit.

I think it's important to look at investing in technology development, providing information, technical assistance, financing. Those things will be most effective if those efforts are coordinated. So I would like to see the plan call for establishment of a council to set priorities and coordinate efforts in those areas. I would include
in the council organizations that are active in
technology development and dissemination from the
council, private, and non-profit sectors. Thank you.

DR. HOPKINS: Pete Ketcham and then
Jonathan Besett. So Jonathan and then Robb Kidd.

MR. BESETT: Jonathan Besett
B-E-S-E-T-T. I'm from Hardwick, Vermont originally.
I studied Act 56 while I was at UVM, Charlie Ross
Environmental Public Service Practicum, and focusing
on the transportation and heating sectors the Lincoln
Renewable Gas Project mentioned in the report uses
2400 cows from 3 different farms to produce 130
square feet of compressed biomethane per minute. 129
is the gallon of gas equivalent for biomethane, and
that will be used by Middlebury College for heating.

I would like to emphasize the potential
for the use of biomethane production for
transportation and heating where there are fewer
renewable options than exist in the electric sector
which has like solar and wind. Biomethane production
would bring the added benefit of significantly
reduced runoff from farms feeding into Lake
Champlain, as well as increase revenues to farmers.

My current understanding of tier three
leads me to believe that electric utilities could
invest in biomethane to satisfy their requirement if
the fuel was used for heating, and transportation
does make it available -- significantly more capital
available for these projects. Thank you.

DR. HOPKINS: Robb Kidd and then Bob
Achinson.

MR. KIDD: I am Robb R-O-B-B K-I-D-D of
Montpelier. I am the Vermont Chapter of the Sierra
Club Conservation Program Manager. On behalf of our
10,000 members and supporters we appreciate the
opportunity to offer testimony on the 2015
Comprehensive Energy Plan. The Vermont Chapter will
be submitting more elaborate written comments.
However, in the meantime we are pleased that the
state continues to recognize the urgent need for a
radically different energy future powered by clean
low carbon renewable energy sources.

The state's 2015 draft Comprehensive
Energy Plan provides a clear outline of the path to
90 percent renewable energy and lays the groundwork
for Vermont to lead in the clean energy revolution
that will ultimately be environmentally and
economically beneficial for the state. However, as
with any plan of complexity of the Comprehensive
Energy Plan there are opportunities for improvement.
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Specifically we believe that the plan could be strengthened by, one, clearly articulating an incentive based system as a carbon pollution tax to drive the behavior changes needed to achieve these targets; two, explicitly tying biofuel parties to scientifically determined lifestyle emission estimates; and, number three, requiring utilities to gauge in public outreach and education about renewable energy credit trading.

The Vermont Chapter of the Sierra Club is very optimistic that Vermont can and will lead in the transition to a low carbon future. We look forward to seeing the final Comprehensive Energy Plan. Thank you.

DR. HOPKINS: Bob Achinson.

MR. ACHINSON: Good evening. I'm Bob Achinson. I'm the Plainfield energy coordinator and I have a few thoughts that may seem rambling, but they are hitting at the same point.

Number one, whose got the remote to the projector? Turn it off. It is a hundred watt bulb in there. All right. The state has to be the leader. It's really nice to put this all together and you put it in a pretty document and send it out here and everybody has earned a good salary producing
it, but until the state and the citizens of the state learn to share and work together there's nothing that's going to happen.

Some of the selling points that are coming off is kind of renewing ignoring the fact that the carbon pollution tax is a way to generate revenue to help low income housing. We all talk about in the Legislature that we're going to have a Comprehensive Energy Plan, however, the Legislature has to go about it and put the teeth into it so that we can all benefit from it, and particularly those who can't afford to put things into place.

We have commercial and residential building standards which are not enforced. We, as energy coordinators, go to the zoning administrator and hand out the things about the Comprehensive Energy Plan. You can't even download a copy of it. You have to read it online. So you can't put that in the hand of a contractor who is building a building. You can't put it in the hands of somebody who wants to have an energy efficient house.

Stand up and look for zero net energy homes. That can happen. And a couple more. One is gasoline increases in price. We could be adding tax to the top of it and because everybody as soon as
things get less expensive goes out and drives more. State retirement investments. It's time to stop being in bed with fossil fuels. Beth Pierce get a clue. And the last thing is the fracked gas hypocrisy. We banned fracking of gas in this state, yet we have all kinds of welcoming things to build a big pipeline to bring it in from somebody else's backyard. Wrong. Learn Vermont and put teeth in it. Thanks.

DR. HOPKINS: Elliott Deegan and then Casey Whiteley. Casey Whiteley and then Mark Kelly. MS. WHITELEY: Hi. My name is Casey W-H-I-T-E-L-E-Y. I'm a Montpelier resident and an active volunteer and board member with 350 Vermont which is a climate change organization.

The science is still evolving, but we know that we need to keep approximately 4/5's or about 80 percent of all fossil fuels in the ground if we hope to stem the tide or slow down the advance of climate change.

Last week in anticipation of the Paris climate talks world leaders, including Angela Merkel and Jim Yong Kim, who is the President of the World Bank, called on all countries to impose a price on carbon as the only way to effectively reduce global
emissions. Of course we haven't seen much of this in our news media, but I read about this today.

By levying a fee on carbon pollution I believe Vermont can turn the climate crisis in an economic opportunity, and it's probably one of the single most important and effective things that we can do to reduce carbon emissions. Others have pointed to the -- well others haven't. I thought they would have by now, but British Columbia has achieved great success by doing this. The rebate or dividend they are getting on their fee on carbon emissions has lowered their personal income taxes to being the lowest in all of Canada. This is since 2008. Their fossil fuel use has dropped by 16 percent while the rest of Canada's has jumped by 3 percent. Phased in over a 10-year period we can keep our money in-state, we can lower taxes, and fund critical energy conservation programs like home weatherization that have seen decreases and cuts in the last few years. So please include a carbon pollution tax or fee in the Comprehensive Energy Plan. Thank you.

DR. HOPKINS: Mark Kelley and then Michael Bender. Something. Handwriting. Michael Bender perhaps after Mark.
MR. KELLEY: Mark Kelley K-E-L-L-E-Y.

Mark K. About 35 years ago Jay Forrester, who is the MIT professor and an inventor of computer memory in the field of system dynamics, wrote an article about energy in the technology review that he talked about adding a fee of 50 cents on to the cost of a barrel of oil. That was effectively a carbon tax, and one of his points was that he expected the cost of a barrel of oil to increase and the 50 cents would get buried as the price went up. Back then of course the cost of a barrel was $40 and so as you can imagine the price went way up and it would have disappeared, but in the meantime we would have generated enormous amounts of money that would have been available for energy conservation. So now that the cost of oil is practically down at the same level it's a great time to consider doing the same thing.

Now what do you do with that large amount of money that's going to be generated? From what I have seen here we have -- the building sector is one of the largest sectors, about a third of all the energy, and we are essentially ignoring low income weatherization. We're saying well it should happen, but there isn't any plan to make it happen. This is a good way to do it. I think that the idea
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of having a zero energy building for all new buildings may not be a great idea because, first of all, it's going to make it very expensive to build those new buildings. It's going to make it prohibitive for low income housing to be low income. It's going to make it difficult for middle income housing to exist, and only very wealthy people are going to be able to build zero income housing. So I think the best thing is to try and go back to the drawing board and figure out how to get the low income weatherization to happen. Thanks.

      DR. HOPKINS: Michael Ben something.

      MR. BENDER: Hi. My name is Michael Bender. I'm the Director of the Mercury Policy Project. I was a member of the State Mercury Advisory Committee for ten years. I was Chair of that committee. I was also a member of the United Nations Enlightened Program which promotes energy efficiency around the world.

      Today my comments are limited to focus on the continuing use of mercury added lighting products and why that should be phased out, and I'll specifically reference comments to the European Commission last week where we explained some of the rationale for that, and given that I believe I have a
few minutes I need to make this really quick.

What we're calling for with the European Commission is to eliminate the mercury exemption for CFLs with less than 30 watts by September 2018, eliminating other mercury exemption for lighting products. The energy efficiency performance, design, and affordability of LED lamps has dramatically and consistently improved over the last few years and these promise to keep on improving. Today even without further improvement LED lamps have advantages. One minute? I just got here. Okay.

You guys can have fun reading it.

DR. HOPKINS: We'll take the written comments.

MR. BENDER: Okay. They use less energy to emit the equivalent lighting output. They are more easily dimmable. They are considered environmentally preferable to a CFL's life cycle cost perspective, and they are mercury free, and we were in conversations last week with IKEA who is no longer selling CFLs as of September of this year, and according to IKEA, and I quote, LED is a light source which uses 85 percent less energy than incandescent bulbs and can last up to 20 years. LED offers high quality light and solutions for different lighting.
IKEA LED bulbs are mostly all dimmable and come in all shapes and sizes.

And then just finally a very short quote from World Wildlife Fund expressing support for the phase out. In order to move away from our dependency on fossil fuels we need to take advantage of all the opportunities. Almost 20 percent of global electricity consumption comes from lighting. So shifting lighting to LED technology is a cost effective way to get changes. IKEA converting its lighting range to LED will have a real impact in reducing the energy use in many households. Thank you.

DR. HOPKINS: George Drew of Barre.

MR. DREW: George Drew from Barre and it is a honor to be with so many people that care. I can't understand why it isn't packed. 43 years ago we built a nursing home and we heated it with electricity. That nursing home is now heated with oil. Something happened. I haven't been able to figure out exactly what it is, but I'm on the verge of getting some information that may relate to the state's giving up some of its control in hydroelectric power some time ago. Now if there's someone in the audience that knows that to be a fact,
I would appreciate knowing about that.

Another thing Canada's got all kinds of electric power. Anybody who knows chemistry or physics you all know all you have to do is run electricity through water to get hydrogen. You may not be using the electricity, but you can store it and make hydrogen out of it. Then you can ship the hydrogen. I think the hydroelectric is a secret and that's a foundation of survival of our future generations because anyone with any brains at all is smart enough to realize we're going down the tube as far as global warming is concerned.

DR. HOPKINS: Guess I didn't give a heads up to Bill Brown and then Madison Dell with follow Bill.

MR. BROWN: Hi. My name is Bill Brown and I live in Montpelier, and I want to thank the state, the staff, and everybody who is involved in doing the plan, though I do think it could be more aggressive.

I believe that climate change is an extremely urgent problem. People are dying now. Many more will die. Many of Vermont's downtowns and whole villages will be destroyed. I'm very concerned about Montpelier's downtown, for instance. I very
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strongly support a carbon tax phased in over time. Maybe a long time if necessary, maybe over the life of this plan, but to get it started.

I also support a miles driven fee tied to motor vehicle registrations partly to fight sprawl which is one of the key ingredients in excessive use of all forms of energy, also conceivably phased in over a long period of time, and I support backup for the electrical grid possibly at the community or the neighborhood level, maybe even at the household level, especially as we load more of the heating load on to electricity and the transportation load in terms of home charging, and this might work very well in connection with new technology, batteries, and a smart electrical grid, and in closing I would say that I think very ambitious goals oftentimes produce really great results. There were people who said that individuals would never use seat belts in cars or that you could never get rivers clean enough to fish in or swim in and lots of other things, and a great deal has been accomplished with ambitious souls. The Apollo program is another example. Thank you.

DR. HOPKINS: Madison Dell. So then Michael Nadeau and then Dan Jones.
MR. NADEAU: Hi everyone tonight. My name is Michael Nadeau. I have a question mark by my name because I wasn't sure if I'd get a chance to speak tonight. I'm also new to the area. I just moved here recently from Keene, New Hampshire. I'm familiar with Montpelier. For the last five to seven years I've come up often and it's a true pleasure to live in this area. I feel supported quite strongly by this community.

We've heard this a lot tonight. I just want to say it one more time that I also strongly support a tax on carbon. I'm sort of doing a crash course on all this as I try to catch myself up to speed, and the tax on carbon just makes so much perfect sense. There seems to be so little to debate about it. What I read in the REMI report, which was just released by the Energy Independent Vermont Coalition, was that $5 per metric ton of CO2 be taxed -- for every, you know, ton of CO2 you get taxed $5. That's 9 cents a gallon I think is what I read and it equates to about 9 cents a gallon. I'm happy to pay 9 cents a gallon if that's going to turn things around and that's the beginning of a 10-year phase in which turns into a longer phase. I think after 10 years I read 50 dollars per ton. That's 90 cents on
a gallon and that's ten years from now, and again I'm happy to do that as well, and I think probably everyone here is happy to do that, and I wonder how many more people maybe hear some of these simple numbers that can garner the support for one of these laws being passed quickly. I think we really need to do it.

Someone else also mentioned the success in British Columbia. I also read that. It's fantastic it works so we should do it. Lastly, I just want to say I think people really do need boundaries. We need the structures so we need this tax. The freedom to consume as desired doesn't really work when it imposes on others freedom to survive.

DR. HOPKINS: Dan Jones and then a gentleman -- I would add one more on the end, but we'll go with.

AUDIENCE: Dan Jones left.

DR. HOPKINS: All right. So I know there was at least one gentleman who spoke to me about tacking on to the end. So we'll do one or two more if there is anybody interested in a couple additional speakers who weren't able to sign in. So if you want to come up and introduce yourself and
have your two minutes.

MR. BARNES: Howdy. Garfield Barnes B-A-R-N-E-S from Plainfield, and I've lived in Africa and Australia and all kinds of places. I'm happy to be back in Vermont and see so many people who are aware and active, but there's one thing that concerns me in that our awareness is not shared by everyone and it should be and it would be great to. So I guess it is -- there's some things that I see like the wind and solar areas where in our travels to the southwest I mean you could pave lots of Arizona and New Mexico with solar panels, and North and South Dakota and lots of places with wind, and really, really have the benefit without our passion saying we can do or change everything.

I don't want to dissipate any of the -- because things like carbon tax there's a lot of things that we do that shove other people away, but sometimes our religion and this gets in the way of being realistic, and possibly we could put together some money and send those who are true believers out to Arizona in the wintertime and spread the word because it's really great to be Vermonter, but sometimes we can overdo it a bit. Thanks.

DR. HOPKINS: I think we are two minutes
shy of 8 and I think that's probably a good indication that we should actually just try to end on time. So thank you all very much for coming out this evening and for all of your comments. A reminder to visit energyplan.vt.gov and fill in -- send us your written comments as well. What you think of just as you get to the car and oh I wish I had said that, go and fill out the form, send it in, make sure we get it. Tell your friends, colleagues, neighbors to submit their comments as well. Thank you very much and we look forward to appropriating your comments as we can into the best plan we can and hope you all read it when it comes up. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the proceeding was adjourned at 8 p.m.)
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