

ENERGY GENERATION SITING POLICY COMMISSION

THIRD PUBLIC HEARING

February 12, 2013

5:00 p.m.

Lowell Graded School

52 Gelo Park Road

Lowell, Vermont

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Jan Eastman, Chairwoman

Chris Recchia

Scott Johnstone

Gaye Symington

Louise McCarren

Tom Bodett

Linda McGinnis, Director

REPORTED BY: MARILEE JAYE YOUNG, CSR

1 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Good evening.
2 Thank you for coming. My name is Jan Eastman. I
3 live in Peacham, Vermont, and I'm chair of
4 something called the Energy Generation Siting
5 Policy Commission. This is our third public
6 hearing. We started -- we were a commission
7 appointed by the Governor last October. We
8 started our work October 31 -- yes, I do know what
9 day that was, but we weren't dressed -- and we've
10 been gathering information and starting some
11 deliberations about our work, but this is our
12 third public hearing. We've had one in
13 Brattleboro, one in Burlington, and now we're here
14 in the Northeast Kingdom. The purpose of the
15 commission is to provide recommendations to the
16 Governor and the legislature on best practices for
17 improving the processes surrounding siting
18 approval of electric generation projects and for
19 public participation and representation in the
20 siting process. For this purpose, electric
21 generation project relates to all facilities other
22 than net metered and group net metered facilities.
23 In the back of the room is a copy of the Executive
24 Order, for those of you who want more detail on
25 what the -- on what we're here to do or supposed

1 to be doing.

2 Our work is supposed to be done by the
3 end of April, April 27. As I say, this is our
4 third public hearing in the preliminary stages.
5 We will be continuing deliberations over February
6 and March. Our next deliberative session is
7 February 20 in Montpelier. We do have a website:
8 Sitingcommission.vermont.gov. All of the
9 information that we have received, all of our
10 discussions, any of our site visits, we have a
11 videographer for those, all that information is on
12 the website. We also have a public comment
13 process on the website, and every week or so the
14 public comments are -- they are categorized by
15 subject matter and sent to us as commission
16 members for our -- for our review. As I say, we
17 have deliberations over February and March. Our
18 goal is to have some draft recommendations
19 probably by the end of -- end of March when we'll
20 have two more public hearings, one probably in the
21 Rutland area, because we haven't been there, and
22 one in Montpelier, where we'll also make use of
23 Vermont Interactive Television, once we have draft
24 recommendations, and our report is due to the
25 legislature before the end of April. And, as I

1 say, I use that timing seriously because my
2 daughter's getting a master's degree and a law
3 degree in Michigan in early May, so I'm leaving.

4 So the purpose of this hearing is to give
5 you, you the public, an opportunity to comment in
6 person regarding our -- our deliberations and the
7 energy siting process in Vermont and, as I say, we
8 hope that you focus on energy siting, and it's
9 all -- in all types of energy generation that
10 we're interested in hearing.

11 We have sign-up sheets in the back.
12 We've already completed a couple. So what I'm
13 going to do is ask you tonight to limit your
14 comments to two minutes. I know that's not a lot
15 of time, but we want to hear from as many of you
16 as we can, and we have just until seven. As I
17 say, if there's more you need to say, please, you
18 know, send it to us in writing; you know, go to
19 the website. The other thing, this hearing, as
20 all of our public hearings are, we have a court
21 reporter here, and so we're going to ask whoever's
22 speaking to come up here in the front and, please,
23 I will mispronounce your name, that's very likely.
24 It's both me and maybe handwriting, so please
25 repeat your name and spell it for the court

1 reporter so that we have all that information. So
2 all the comments are also on the website, so you
3 can go and review not only what's said tonight but
4 what people told us in Brattleboro and Burlington.

5 We are a five-member commission with two
6 ex officio members, making seven. And Tom Bodett
7 is to my left, he's from Dummerston and select
8 board member; Gay Symington, former -- well,
9 former speaker of the House, that's how I know her
10 best; Scott Johnstone from Burlington, who is a
11 former secretary of the Agency of Natural
12 Resources; and then on my far right is Chris
13 Recchia, our current Commissioner of Public
14 Service; and Louise McCarren, our former chair of
15 the board, Public Service Board. Our seventh
16 member, Secretary of the Agency of Natural
17 Resources, Deb Markowitz, finally has that winter
18 cold or flu, so she's not with us today.

19 So anything else before we get started?

20 Okay. So, first up, what I'm going to do
21 is what we did in Burlington when we had a number
22 of people, so I'm going to call out about three or
23 four names so that we can get people sort of
24 queued up, so we're not waiting for somebody to
25 walk to the front. Which side do you want them

1 on?

2 So, okay, over there. So you're going to
3 go to that side. Thank you very much.

4 So Rhoda Bedell, Justin Lindholm, Steve
5 Therrien.

6 THE SPEAKER: I think I'm going to
7 pass.

8 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Okay. Are you
9 Rhoda?

10 THE SPEAKER: Yes.

11 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Okay. So
12 Justin Lindholm, Steve Therrien, and Dawn
13 Ferguson. Oh, excuse me, I'm sorry. I apologize,
14 I've already screwed it up. Thank you.

15 And we do have someone over there who's
16 timing. I so apologize. So Anne Morse, David
17 Rodgers, Ron Holland, Eric Wallace -- Sneff?

18 MR. SENFT: Sent.

19 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Sorry about
20 that.

21 THE SPEAKER: All set? My name is
22 Anne Morse, A-n-n-e-M-o-r-s-e. I live in
23 Craftsbury. In the 1920's Aldo Leopold
24 synthesized an ethic for use of the land: A thing
25 is right when it tends to preserve the integrity,

1 stability and beauty of the biotic community. It
2 is wrong if it tends otherwise.

3 We are part of the biotic community. We
4 need integrity in our public dialogue, and we must
5 avoid deception. There is a national guideline
6 for discussing renewable energy that has been
7 violated thousands of times in Vermont. It was
8 violated when the Lowell project was first
9 presented to the public; it was violated when the
10 citizens of Lowell were mailed descriptions of
11 this project before their vote; it has been
12 violated in testimony before the Public Service
13 Board. The guideline is simple and best
14 illustrated with an example. The example comes
15 directly from the Federal Trade Commission, the
16 national institution charged with assuring
17 integrity in the marketplace. This is the
18 example. A toy manufacturer places solar panels
19 on the roof of its plant to generate power and
20 advertises that its plant is 100-percent solar
21 powered. The manufacturer, however, sells
22 renewable energy certificates based on the
23 renewable attributes of all the power it
24 generates. Even if the manufacturer uses the
25 electricity generated by the solar panels, it has,

1 by selling renewable energy certificates,
2 transferred the right to characterize that
3 electricity as renewable. The manufacturer's
4 claim is, therefore, deceptive. It also would be
5 deceptive for this manufacturer to advertise that
6 it hosts a renewable power facility, because
7 reasonable consumers likely interpret this claim
8 to mean that the manufacturer uses renewable
9 energy.

10 Climate change is a global problem and,
11 for all the world's citizens to effectively
12 address this problem, we must address it with
13 integrity. I recommend that the State of Vermont
14 adopt the Federal Trade Commission guidelines for
15 describing renewable energy in all its work,
16 legislation, publications, and deliberations, in
17 place of the current practices fostered by the
18 energy corporations and their lobbyists that serve
19 private and not global interests.

20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you. So
22 David Rodgers. Thank you.

23 THE SPEAKER: Hello. David Rodgers.
24 I live in East Craftsbury.

25 The FTC's, Federal Trade Commission,

1 guideline is simple: To refer to energy as
2 renewable it must be coupled by renewable energy
3 certificates, also called REC's. Anne Morse
4 claimed that the guideline has been violated
5 thousands of times in Vermont with the implication
6 that the violations are of consequence. She has
7 given you an envelope with additional materials of
8 documents. Document No. 1 is a copy of the
9 financial statement presented by Green Mountain
10 Power to the Public Service Board for the Lowell
11 wind project. The last item in paragraph 3 reads,
12 "REC's sold percentage: 100 percent. Green
13 Mountain Power intends to sell the REC's.
14 Document No. 2 is a copy of the written testimony
15 of Mary Powell, CEO of Green Mountain Power, to
16 the Public Service Board. Does she refer to the
17 energy generated by the Lowell project as
18 renewable with full knowledge that the REC's will
19 be sold? Page 2, line 20, Renewable Energy
20 Development Here in Vermont: There are six
21 additional direct references to renewable energy
22 with clear implications the Lowell project is
23 renewable energy. I conclude that violations of
24 this basic guideline are both obvious and
25 prevalent. Similar deceptive statements have been

1 made by Governor Shumlin, Senator Bernie Sanders,
2 Randall Pratt, of Burlington Electric Department,
3 and Bill McKibben, in his recent presentation to
4 the joint session of the Vermont legislature, on
5 invitation of the House Speaker, Shap -- Shap
6 Smith. These deceptive statements have also been
7 made in the presence of legal counsel to the
8 Public Service Board and Department of Public
9 Service.

10 I recommend that the role of the Public
11 Service Board and the Department of Public
12 Service, as citizens advocates, assure that the
13 integrity of the public dialogue on renewable
14 energy meet the standards of the Federal Trade
15 Commission.

16 Thank you for your attention.

17 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.
18 Next up: Ken Holland, and then Eric Wallace
19 Senft, and then Lynn? Ryan Gillard. Sorry, Ryan.
20 Thank you.

21 THE SPEAKER: My name is Ron
22 Holland. I live in Irasburg. You now know the
23 substance of the FTC guideline and that its
24 violation is prevalent and tolerated by government
25 officials. So is this a violation of significant,

1 financial, and environmental consequence? Are we
2 talking about something that is just a technical
3 legal issue, okay? Well, the recent average price
4 for REC's is \$58.50 per megawatt hour; and, from
5 the financial statement that's been provided you
6 in paragraph 3, you will see that the predicted
7 annual output for the low impractic is 197,000
8 megawatt hours. Doing the math comes up to a
9 revenue of \$11.5 million per year times 25 years
10 is \$289 million. Recall that the construction
11 cost for this project is \$155 million; recall that
12 there's an additional \$46 million in production
13 tax credits; and we have not yet sold a bit of
14 electricity. So \$289 million and four hundred
15 sixty -- and \$46 million is a significant economic
16 issue. So this violation of the Federal Trade
17 Commission guideline has major financial
18 significance.

19 Next question is, Does it have
20 environmental consequence? When you sell -- if
21 you're an environmental -- a renewable energy
22 generator and you generate renewable energy and
23 you sell the REC's, you don't get off scot-free.
24 You assume the residual emissions of the grid.
25 The last publication of the residual emissions for

1 the New England grid is 639 pounds per megawatt
2 hour. So how much emissions do -- does Vermont
3 absorb because Green Mountain Power has received
4 \$11.5 million and we receive the carbon burden?
5 The answer to that question is 57,000 metric tons
6 are assumed by Vermont.

7 Now, how does that compare with Vermont's
8 current emissions from the local sector? The
9 current emissions are the lowest in the country.
10 8,100 metric tons. And so this project puts on
11 the shoulders of Vermont in terms of its carbon
12 footprint an additional 57,000 metric tons.

13 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

14 THE SPEAKER: I'm not quite done.

15 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Your time is
16 up, though.

17 FROM THE FLOOR: He can have my
18 time.

19 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: No, we're not
20 seeding time. I think you're doing a very
21 creative job, and I appreciate that, but.

22 Will you sit down here so they can see
23 you.

24 So Eric, then Ryan, then Suzanne Jones.

25 THE SPEAKER: My name is Eric

1 Wallace Senft, E-r-i-c-W-a-l-l-a-c-e-hyphen-
2 S-e-n-f-t. I live in West Woodbury.

3 I want to talk about the implied
4 deception and how Vermont policy makers have
5 ignored this FTC guideline. When and how did this
6 deception of Vermont begin? Document No. 3 is one
7 page of 30, chapter 89, entitled "Renewable Energy
8 Programs" that includes 31 pages of hard-to-read-
9 and-understand legislative language. Paragraph
10 B(2) reads: Maximize the benefits to rate payers
11 for the sale of tradeable renewable energy credits
12 or other credits that may be developed in the
13 future. This hard-to-discover paragraph is a
14 permissive legislation that allows the deception
15 of Vermonsters. This paragraph enables the mining
16 of Vermont ridgelines as REC's factories to
17 satisfy others' demands for REC's so they may
18 continue to burn fossil fuels.

19 This legislation was passed by the 2005
20 legislature. Who has been aware of this
21 deception? Document No. 4 is a self-written
22 resume of the chairman of the committee who was
23 responsible for this legislation, Robert Dostis,
24 the current government affairs director of Green
25 Mountain Power. It is reasonable to assume that

1 he understood the implications of the legislature
2 that he husbanded.

3 Please note in the testimony of Mary
4 Powell, page 2, lines 4 through 6: This project
5 is demonstrating new strategies in how utilities
6 and other energy developers can build wind
7 projects in Vermont. Also note, in the testimony
8 of Robert Dostis, page 1, lines 10 and 11, that he
9 was a lead strategist in developing renewable
10 energy supplies. The appearance of conflict of
11 interest is vivid.

12 I recommend that Vermont develop
13 legislation that prevents the revolving door
14 between government and industry officials. I
15 recommend that the state renewable energy
16 legislation be written to comply with FTC
17 guidelines and that the existing legislation be
18 rewritten to comply with the FTC guidelines.

19 Thank you for your attention.

20 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

21 Ryan, and then Suzanne Jones, then Mabel
22 Houghton.

23 THE SPEAKER: Good evening. My name
24 is Ryan Gillard, G-i-l-l-a-r-d. Thank you for
25 hearing my comments tonight. I live in

1 Plainfield, a long drive up, but I'm glad to be
2 here.

3 January 1, 2012, was to be a great day of
4 celebration for Vermont's energy community,
5 environmental community, too. Document 5 is a
6 copy of "Vermont's Greenhouse Gas Reduction
7 Goals." You will note that January 1, 2012,
8 Vermont's greenhouse gas emissions were to be 25
9 percent below their 1990 level of 8.11 million
10 metric tons. Was there a celebration? Does
11 anyone know the magnitude of Vermont's current
12 greenhouse gas emissions? Did we reach the goal?

13 When measured in 2008 Vermont's emissions
14 were 3 percent higher than the 1990 levels, 28
15 percent above the goal. Then in 2010 the EPA
16 reported CO2 emissions to be 10 percent above the
17 1990 levels, 35 percent above the goal. Certainly
18 in two years there wasn't a 35-percent drop. So
19 it's easy to espouse to big lofty goals for carbon
20 emission reductions and, as Donella Meadows said,
21 you can fool the voters but you cannot fool the
22 atmosphere. I recommend that each new energy
23 project be characterized as accurately as possible
24 by its actual versus theoretical impact on
25 Vermont's carbon footprint. And, in a siting

1 recommendation, as you all are charged with giving
2 recommendations to the Public Service Board and
3 the Governor, I think we need to be looking at
4 these projects as, you know, who has the burden of
5 proof in this project? Is it on the burden of all
6 of us citizens here it to prove that, ah, this
7 project shouldn't go through for X, Y, and Z, or
8 is it really on the burden of the corporation
9 that's presenting a massive project of increased
10 energy that's doing not a lot of good for our, you
11 know, high-alpine ecosystems, where's the burden
12 of proof lie? And I think it should be on the
13 corporations, and we should really have a stricter
14 siting process.

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

17 Suzanne Jones, Mabel Houghton, and Stacy
18 Burke, I think.

19 THE SPEAKER: Hi. My name is
20 Suzanna Jones. I'm from Walden. S-m-i-t-h.

21 The wind industry has cleverly
22 manipulated the concerned public into believing
23 that industrial wind is a solution to climate
24 change, but nothing could be further from the
25 truth. In fact, Wendell Berry says we used to

1 call this lying. The assumption that this
2 build-out has been operating on is that wind
3 factories displace dirty energy elsewhere. This
4 assumption, which is generated by the profiting
5 industry, has so far remained unchallenged, but
6 tonight we've examined one of the many ways
7 industrial wind is contributing to carbon
8 emissions while the build-out of dirty energy
9 continues. One of the key problems is that the
10 industry has been embedded by political
11 and environmental leaders who want to appear green
12 without challenging the underlying causes of the
13 problem.

14 Today environmentalism is everywhere.
15 You can't even open the phone bill without seeing
16 a plea for saving the planet. But there's a
17 terrible hollowness to it all. I guess we can say
18 now that environmentalism has successfully
19 mainstreamed, but at the cost of its soul. This
20 co-opted version isn't about protecting the land
21 base from the ever-expanding empire of humans;
22 it's about sustaining the comfort levels that we
23 feel entitled to without exhausting the resources
24 required. It's an entirely human-centered thing
25 and empty, and it serves corporate capitalism

1 well. What makes people happy isn't the stuff
2 provided by an ever-growing destructive economic
3 system. Experts say that authentic happiness
4 comes from a healthy relationship to nature and
5 community; and, as Vermonters have discovered,
6 industrial wind destroyed both. What industrial
7 wind represents should be obvious to everyone by
8 now: This is business as usual disguised as
9 concern for the planet. The argument for
10 effective solution to climate change, it's only
11 the same profit and growth-given destruction
12 that's at the root of every crisis we face. We've
13 been hearing a lot about Vermont being a leader
14 lately, and I think Vermont can lead. Vermont can
15 lead by re-insisting that we have honesty, and I'm
16 not just talking about honesty in the abstract;
17 I'm talking about honesty that's produced by
18 people, real Vermonters who live together in
19 community, and real communities, and without the
20 influence of these corporations, foreign
21 corporations, and their agenda of exploitation and
22 their bribes. And I also think Vermont can lead
23 by showing the world that we can take meaningful
24 action on climate change without sacrificing our
25 beloved mountains on the alter of profit-driven

1 economics.

2 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

3 So Mabel and then Stacy Burke and then
4 Peggy Sapphire, I think.

5 THE SPEAKER: My name is Mabel
6 Houghton, M-a-b-e-l-H-o-u-g-h-t-o-n. I live in
7 Craftsbury.

8 I would like to read you the words of the
9 Vermont state song. "These green hills and silver
10 waters are my home. They belong to me and to all
11 of her sons and daughters. May they be strong and
12 forever free. Let us live to protect her beauty
13 and look with pride on the golden dome. They say
14 home is where the heart is. These green mountains
15 are my home. These green mountains are my home.

16 (The song was sung.)

17 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Okay. So next
18 we have Stacy Burke, Peggy Sapphire and then
19 Karen -- Karen Jenne from the Derby Select Board.

20 THE SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Stacy
21 Burke. I'm from Craftsbury, and I would like to
22 thank the commission for coming to Lowell tonight.
23 We really appreciate you coming and listening to
24 us.

25 I wanted to point out a statement from

1 Vermont Electric Co-op's CEO, David Hallquist, who
2 David has a lot of experience in wind energy. He
3 says, in his Vermont Electric Co-op newsletter,
4 "Learning from experience VEC recommends a pause
5 on additional renewable mandates. Vermont
6 Electric Co-operative's board of directors passed
7 a resolution recommending that the Vermont
8 legislature impose a moratorium for a period of up
9 to two years on further renewable power supply
10 mandates. Concerns about impacts on costs and
11 reliability, the VEC board expressed a need to
12 address grid instability along with health impacts
13 as Vermont moves to adopt higher levels of such
14 resources. It should be noted that VEC has taken
15 a different position from some other groups and
16 organizations that are calling for a wind
17 moratorium. As leaders in the adoption of
18 renewable energy, we have learned through
19 experience that intermittent renewable power
20 generation behaves differently from traditional
21 generation. We believe this issue should be
22 explored more fully before Vermont's utilities are
23 required to adopt additional renewable power."

24 And, again, david Hallquist is an expert.
25 I am not. I can only fight for the mountains that

1 we are decimating with wind. She's telling me to
2 stop.

3 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

4 MS. McCARREN: She's got the hardest
5 job.

6 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Peggy, Karen --
7 you said?

8 THE SPEAKER: Jenne.

9 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Jenne. And
10 then Vicky Farrand-Lewis.

11 THE SPEAKER: Thank you. Peggy
12 Sapphire S-a-p-p-h-i-r-e. We live in Craftsbury.

13 I'm going to speak relating to your
14 Whereas No. 5 related recommendations in the 2011
15 comprehensive energy plan. I would like to
16 suggest the siting commission consider the siting
17 not of industrial wind turbines but of innovative
18 transportation systems for Vermont and Vermonsters.
19 As it stands, Vermont's major carbon emissions
20 come from fossil fuel cars and trucks and equals
21 47 percent of our state's contribution to the
22 global climate crisis.

23 Other than some areas in Washington and
24 Chittenden counties, Vermont offers no
25 alternatives to the many miles we each must travel

1 for our essential groceries, doctor visits, work,
2 pharmacies. Here in the Northeast Kingdom where
3 tens of miles separate us from essential services,
4 we spend hours burning gas, miles emitting carbon,
5 all of this on back roads, dirt roads, and a few
6 state highways. Your work should find you
7 surveying residents in every county in this state
8 to learn where the needs are and what for -- and
9 what is currently not available and nonexistent.
10 If you to these things, if the Governor really is
11 committed to cutting emissions rather than
12 committing to corporations, you will truly serve
13 the climate change efforts. What you're doing
14 now, as you plan to put even more destructive
15 corporate wind turbines on our ridgelines, is
16 nothing short of climate crime.

17 Thank you for your attention.

18 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you. I
19 am going to ask that we not applause. It's going
20 to just take time out from hearing people. Okay?
21 Thank you.

22 So Karen.

23 THE SPEAKER: Karen Jenne,
24 J-e-n-n-e.

25 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

1 THE SPEAKER: I am on the Derby
2 Select Board. However, this is my opinion
3 tonight.

4 First of all, I want to thank the members
5 of the commission for coming here tonight and
6 listening to all of our concerns. I'm going to
7 address and respond to some of the concerns you
8 have a heard on the former Derby line wind
9 project. The siting of this particular project,
10 in my opinion and many others, was totally
11 inappropriate. Its proposed location on the
12 international borders within the source protection
13 area for the international water system and
14 located within such close proximity to as many
15 primary residents as in the United States as
16 Stanstead, Quebec, was questionable. As this
17 project was withdrawn by the developer, we never
18 heard from the State's water supply division what
19 their opinion was about this proposal.

20 The entire 248 process is a challenge for
21 towns to meet within too short a period of time.
22 Town boards are basically volunteers trying to
23 understand voluminous amounts of technical
24 information within the statutory guidelines or
25 they have to hire experts and go over budget and

1 face the ire of taxpayers. Towns should have the
2 same options as developers and have the expertise
3 of the Public Service Board at their disposal or
4 state funds available to them. As soon as the
5 project is proposed, the entire town should be
6 made aware of it, not just a few.

7 248 certainly needs to be amended so that
8 proper notification can be given and public
9 hearings to any projects that take place near the
10 Canadian border. By the time many Canadian
11 abutters received notice of the Derby Line
12 project, the meetings and statutory deadlines to
13 intervene, for example, had already gone by. How
14 can people participate in proceedings they know
15 nothing about if they're taking place in their own
16 backyard? The difference is their yard happens to
17 be in a different country, separated from my house
18 in Vermont by a few hundred feet.

19 I hope the siting commission addresses
20 the concerns presented by others such as NVDA,
21 VELCO, and ISO regarding health issues, property
22 values, and the grid. I have experienced first-
23 hand what a small, industrial-sized proposed wind
24 project could have done to my community. The
25 wounds it has inflicted may never heal and, yet, I

1 would do it all over again for the people I
2 represent. People are our most important
3 resource. They should not be sacrificed for a few
4 who want to gain from the system.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

7 Please. Okay, next up is Vicky
8 Farrand-Lewis, then Glenda Nye and Susan Houston.

9 THE SPEAKER: Hello. My name is
10 Vicky Farrand-Lewis, and I'm a resident of Derby.
11 I'll make this short

12 I state to you, it is my belief that the
13 248 process is an unconstitutional process. This
14 state statute allows an unelected, appointed body
15 that has no judicial review or legislative
16 oversight to change the rules as they see fit on
17 behalf of developers only. This must change. The
18 248 process needs to be dismantled, allowing for a
19 process that allows for a level playing field for
20 towns and residents.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thanks.

23 Glenda?

24 THE SPEAKER: Good Witch, I think,
25 that's my opinion. Um, I reside in Derby Center,

1 and I would like to thank this commission for
2 conducting these public hearings on energy siting.

3 I have but only one major point to make,
4 that being Vermont does not need industrial wind
5 turbines. We presently have a glut of
6 electricity. The population of the -- of this
7 state is decreasing, we have little to no
8 industrial development, and we rank as the oldest
9 in age population in the United States. What we
10 are doing by blasting ridgelines is selling the
11 renewable energy credits to out-of-state, coal-
12 fired electric plants, which is the biggest thorn
13 in my side, so that on paper they claim
14 alternative energy production. This is truly the
15 definition of insane. Why would Vermont need to
16 construct a mammoth industrial wind turbines and
17 blow up ancient Vermont ridgelines when, in fact,
18 it ranks last in CO2 emissions in the whole United
19 States. The total CO2 for electricity generation
20 measured in millions of metric tons is, for
21 Vermont, is so low that it rounds to zero. In a
22 article of January 30, 2013, ISO New England
23 issued an order to wind projects to curtail or
24 ramp back power because they can't put electricity
25 onto the network because it would destabilize the

1 grid. As we all know, there's no way to store
2 electricity produced by wind power. Also, one of
3 my major concerns is construction of grid lines
4 and the sporadic building and that wind -- these
5 wind turbines are in remote places. Why wouldn't
6 you have -- I don't understand why the State of
7 Vermont does not consider hydro power as
8 alternative and green power.

9 What I would lastly like to say is put
10 the subsidy money going to industrial wind where
11 it would really benefit: Weatherization,
12 insulation of residential and commercial
13 structures. That would reduce the CO2 emissions.

14 There is an old saying in Vermont, You
15 can afford -- and I have learned this after 45
16 years, I wasn't born here -- you can afford to
17 come to Vermont, but you sure as hell can't afford
18 to leave. This applies to long-term Vermont
19 residents who, through the years, have seen their
20 expendable income constantly diminished. That is
21 the No. 1 charge out of the seven charges of the
22 Executive Order from the Governor that this siting
23 commission should be considering.

24 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

25 THE SPEAKER: Thank you.

1 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

2 Next, Susan, Susan, then Carol Irons, and
3 then Ned Houston.

4 THE SPEAKER: Hi. I'm Susan Houston
5 H-o-u-s-t-o-n from Craftsbury Common.

6 Vermonters are indeed a diverse group of
7 people, as we know. They represent maybe a legacy
8 of seven generations or a newly-arrived transplant
9 all, robust of life and wide assortment of
10 opinions. One common thread, though, that runs
11 through almost all Vermonters is a sense of pride
12 and a belief that this little state is rooted in
13 deep, deep values and worthy traditions. Yet,
14 recently a sadness has crept into this
15 conversation and into these beliefs, a sadness we
16 are noticing at these gatherings and the hearings
17 and all the testimonials. People are feeling
18 undermined, an erosion of what we thought this
19 state stood for, a loss that is sometimes even
20 hard to put into words. Others, with different
21 values possibly, often from somewhere else, are
22 beginning to tell our stories and to shape our
23 history, and we may not like the way the story is
24 unfolding, and people of power within our state
25 are endorsing these stories, citing public good in

1 the unfolding. Some of us are puzzled, indeed;
2 where is the good in this erosion of who we are.
3 Let us once again, as the state song sings, "Look
4 with pride on the golden dome." A plea to you,
5 this commission in power, let's step back and just
6 take that breather so we can really look and
7 listen and learn to be sure that the history we
8 continue to create is indeed the legacy we choose
9 to leave.

10 I close with yet more words of Aldo
11 Leopold, that great naturalist, very broad thinker
12 about the land and land ethics. This is his
13 quote: We abuse land because we regard it as a
14 commodity belonging to us. When we see land as a
15 community, a community to which we belong, we may
16 begin to use it with love and respect.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

19 So Carol.

20 THE SPEAKER: Carol Irons C-a-r-o-l
21 I-r-o-n-s. I live in Albany. I'm having to skip
22 some here, so I'll do as well as I can. We're
23 fully aware that this corrupt admission has
24 stacked the deck and predetermined the outcome of
25 every step of this whole process; you've heard

1 this over and over. That raises a concern about
2 your role, not attacking anybody as individuals
3 but you were appointed by this Governor and
4 there's an obvious role and there's a hidden
5 agenda, and we're well aware of it. You were
6 established to be one part of the sham that
7 Governor Shumlin and the giant corporations have
8 used with this whole process in order to destroy
9 Vermont ecosystems for greed. Your focus is on
10 how to improve the process. The assumption
11 underlying the assumptions of those -- the
12 assumption underlying the specifics of your
13 charges is that this process should continue. The
14 hidden agenda is to create the illusion that our
15 concerns will be addressed while you derail the
16 push for a moratorium.

17 I have just four recommendations. One,
18 begin adopting the plan put forward by Energize
19 Vermont, which talks about small energy generation
20 controlled by local communities to help local
21 economies. Two, take down these turbines. Send
22 those corporations away. Three, reducing non-
23 essential energy use, especially in the
24 transportation and home heating areas. And, my
25 last one, learn again the values which honor earth

1 as a living, pulsing being. Know the waters as
2 life blood and keep those waters safe and clean.
3 See brother wind as the sacred breath of this
4 world and refuse to use wind as an excuse for
5 greedy destruction. Protect the habitat of all
6 our relatives, those standing ones, the plant
7 nation, the four-leggeds, the wingeds, the creepy
8 crawlies, the swimmers. They are vital for
9 holding the web of life intact, and that web of
10 life in this rural area nurtures and sustains our
11 way of life. This is a different way. We've made
12 a choice. Some of us have been arrested, people
13 have lost acreage. Now it's your term. We ask
14 that you step away from the shame. We ask that
15 you step outside the assumption that this kind of
16 thing has to continue. We ask that you have the
17 courage to resist all that and recommend a very
18 different way.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

21 Next is Ned Houston. Then Ann Ingerson,
22 Steve Wright, and John Lewandowski.

23 THE SPEAKER: My name is Ned
24 Houston, H-o-u-s-t--o-n. I live in Craftsbury.

25 I just have several brief points, some of

1 which have been raised before but I think they're
2 wore restating. No. 1, I think the criteria for
3 these large projects, the large corporate,
4 industrial-scale things should not be less
5 stringent than those applied to small individuals.
6 That speaks to the Act 250 process and the Act 248
7 process. In my own experience, the higher
8 standards are applied to my application to do a
9 waste water treatment plant than often get applied
10 to these very large ones. I think that's
11 inappropriate, to say the least. Second of all,
12 large projects should be announced well enough
13 ahead of time so people can prepare testimony and
14 background information. When things are done
15 behind backs and people are asked to respond, they
16 don't often have enough time to be convincing and
17 to actually look at the research. No. 3, projects
18 which have impact beyond the individual town in
19 which they are to be sited, need to allow for a
20 full participation by all those affected. They
21 cannot be -- I'm sorry, I can't be two minutes; I
22 just started.

23 THE TIMER: You have one minute
24 left.

25 THE SPEAKER: All right. Thank you.

1 So you need to allow the opportunity for
2 all the towns and all the people affected to have
3 full input and capacity. And in presenting their
4 testimony and input, the information should be
5 solicited and it should be formatted in a way that
6 does not require expensive legal counsel, which
7 puts a very big burden on the individuals and
8 towns which can ill afford this, especially
9 compared to large corporate interests.

10 Finally, the assumptions on which these
11 expected cost analyses of large projects are
12 conducted need to be examined carefully. The
13 industrial wind projects, for example, have not,
14 in the last two years of production, by the
15 information published on the web, they have not
16 come close to their projected levels of
17 production, often by as much as 50 percent. So
18 that clearly is a very skewed benefit if it's not
19 supported by research, so we should look carefully
20 at those.

21 Finally, I wanted to say that we need to
22 put our money on the projects that have the most
23 return in terms of carbon reduction, and I think
24 that's part of the cost benefit analysis that
25 needs to be looked at carefully.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you. Ann
3 Ingerson?

4 THE SPEAKER: Hi. I'm Ann Ingerson.
5 I'm from Craftsbury, that's I-n-g-e-r-s-o-n, and I
6 work with the Wilderness Society. We're
7 submitting some comments in writing, but I just
8 wanted to highlight a couple of points tonight.
9 One of them is that one of the criteria under
10 Act -- under Section 248 has to do with
11 efficiency, and I just wanted to read a phrase
12 from that. It requires that a project must,
13 quote, meet the need for present and future demand
14 for a service which could not otherwise be
15 provided in a more cost effective manner through
16 energy conservation programs and measures and
17 energy efficiency and load management measures.
18 And I've seen the Public Service Board interpret
19 that pretty narrowly to say that a project should
20 happen unless efficiency could meet the entire
21 electrical need. I doubt that was the intent of
22 that language, and I would like to see the
23 commission take a look at how the Public Service
24 Board can seriously consider demand site measures
25 as alternatives to a proposed project.

1 Another major point has to do with the
2 transformation we're talking about here. I think,
3 if Vermont's going to reach our energy goals,
4 we're going to have an unprecedented change in how
5 we generate energy in our state, and that's going
6 to have a tremendous landscape impact. It seems
7 kind of undemocratic to me to make those decisions
8 about our -- what our landscape will look like in
9 100 years by a three-person appointed board. And
10 so I'm suggesting that we need to do something
11 outside the permitting process, a more
12 comprehensive land use plan that has lots of
13 public input. Think ahead 20, 40, 50, 100 years
14 and make some serious decisions now so that we end
15 up with the energy system that we can live with in
16 the long run.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you. So
19 Steve Wright, John Lewandowski, then Leon
20 Whitcomb.

21 THE SPEAKER: My name is Steve
22 Wright. I live in Craftsbury, and, no, we do not
23 bring the entire town of Craftsbury with us, but
24 there's a great representation from all of our
25 area towns. Thank you. Thank you folks for being

1 here, for enduring what must have been two
2 interesting site visits. I gave credit for that
3 time, please.

4 I want to do two things. One, I want to
5 ask a -- answer, ask and answer a question; and,
6 two, I want to talk about brook trout fishing.
7 No. 1, why -- let me open up with a statement.
8 This project, this action, was approved by the
9 Public Service Board. That photo was taken on
10 April 19 of 2012, the construction phase. It
11 represents about three-quarters of a mile, a 3.2
12 miles of ridgeline road. I would like to use it
13 as a reminder of where we're going and what we're
14 talking about.

15 Ergo the question, why are we here? I
16 would offer that we are here because humans have
17 screwed up the world and now we're trying to
18 figure out what our role is in fixing our part.
19 It seems to be that our role is to do two things,
20 or at least one thing, find a way to reduce our
21 share of carbon emissions. I would offer that
22 that is not the way to reduce carbon emissions.
23 Carbon emissions -- and here comes the brook trout
24 fishing -- looking for carbon emissions and
25 catching carbon emissions and then dealing with

1 carbon emissions is a lot like going brook trout
2 fishing. You do not go brook trout fishing on a
3 football field, you do not go brook trout fishing
4 in a parking lot; you go brook trout fishing where
5 the trout are. You limit emissions by going where
6 the emissions are. The emissions are not there.
7 The emissions are in four other sectors of which
8 you know very well. So, if we're going to do
9 things like that or -- thank you. We get the
10 point.

11 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you. So
12 next, John, and then Leon Whitcomb, then Rhoda --

13 THE SPEAKER: No, I'm going to pass.

14 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Okay. So then
15 Justin Lindholm and Steve Therrien.

16 THE SPEAKER: I'm John Lewandowski
17 from Newark.

18 Lately in the news and it's been
19 mentioned also here today, curtailment of wind
20 power, which is an inherent problem with
21 intermittent power, which has also been mentioned,
22 is that it's hard on the grid because the grid has
23 to keep stable with how much power is being used.
24 It has to be very close. Otherwise, the voltages
25 vary. I've been in the electric industry for 27

1 years.

2 There's no control over when the wind
3 blows or how hard it's going to blow, so you don't
4 know how much you have to stay with this thing,
5 which brings us to the point of maybe there should
6 be a commission first on whether we should site
7 wind anywhere around here as opposed to someplace
8 that is windy on a more regular basis before we
9 talk about where it's sited.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you. So
12 next, Leon Whitcomb.

13 THE SPEAKER: I'm Justin Lindholm
14 from Mendon, Vermont, L-i-n-d-h-o-l-m. I have a
15 lot of knowledge of the Lowell Mountain range;
16 I've been up there a lot, extensively photographed
17 the place.

18 Vermont used to be known for a couple of
19 things; one was our super environmentalists
20 compared to all the other states and regions of
21 the world, and also the other thing was we really
22 looked out for the little guy. You can see it in
23 the Vermont Constitution.

24 On Lowell Mountain they used, I will
25 guarantee, over one million pounds of explosives

1 up there. I saw that place before it was blown
2 up. What you saw today was very little, because
3 they probably didn't take you the full three miles
4 and it was probably covered with snow, all the
5 devastation up there. I would call that mountain,
6 mile for mile, the No. 1 most destroyed spot in
7 North America, and I would like to have Green
8 Mountain Power tell us how much explosives they
9 used.

10 The other thing, about the little guy, we
11 have these big companies making millions per year
12 off these sites, basically with government
13 handouts and whatever with requirements of the
14 people that buy the power. We are requiring
15 people like the Therrien family to suck it up and
16 take the devastation, take the lack of sleep,
17 every night that these things where the wind blows
18 hard toward their houses, for absolutely no
19 compensation. That is not Vermont, never was, and
20 we should be ashamed of ourselves to not allow
21 compensation to those people.

22 Thank you.

23 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

24 We skipped over Leon Whitcomb. Sorry
25 Mr. Whitcomb.

1 THE SPEAKER: I never spoke over one
2 of these things before. Just an old Vermont boy,
3 born in Vermont, lived here all my life, and, when
4 I was a kid in school, I remember when the
5 legislature turned down a proposal by President
6 Roosevelt to put a road all the way up through the
7 Green Mountains, and I was so proud of my state.
8 It's gone. This makes me ashamed of what's going
9 on up here. You know, it's sad to me. I'm going
10 to be 71 next week, and I've got to do something
11 about what's going on.

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.
14 It's true it's a public meeting and you can use
15 the time the way you wish, but, as I say, that
16 just means I have less time for people.

17 Steve Therrien, then Donna Ferguson, Rod
18 Ferguson, and Richard Pion. Thank you.

19 THE SPEAKER: I handed in my copy
20 because we've covered a lot of the subjects that I
21 did have written down, so I don't believe in
22 asking back by again. Steve Therrien, Sheffield,
23 Vermont, not too proud of it. Like a bad
24 neighbor, big wind is there.

25 Our family is sick, and I know there's

1 other people in this audience that are probably
2 already feeling the effects of this syndrome that
3 has been denied by the State that it even exists.
4 There has been studies done; they were totally
5 ignored. In the paper they said they are poking
6 holes in the study. Well, darn it, they're poking
7 holes in me. I'm going to tell you, if you're not
8 impacted now, with the reckless abandonment the
9 State is doing business, there might be a project
10 at your door next. So, if you're not impacted now
11 or if you are impacted, we all have to stand
12 together. If we stand together, we'll get through
13 it; divided we will fall.

14 What they have done to us, the State has
15 forsaken my family. We have cried out to them for
16 over a year and have gotten nothing, zero, except
17 sickness. This is unacceptable; this is not the
18 Vermont way. Charity, huh, I see the bottom line,
19 the charity is that some of these corporations I
20 guess need another third home in, uh, that's the
21 charity, that's it.

22 I wish I could be a little cheerier on
23 everything. My head hasn't stopped going
24 throbbing for almost two months now. I've been
25 put out of work because I can't think, I can't

1 sleep. We wake up in a panic state at night.
2 See, your adrenalin is rushing, so you're not
3 going to go back to sleep right off, and this is
4 the reality of all this. But I'm going to end it
5 there, because my head's pounding.

6 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

7 Next is Donna Ferguson.

8 THE SPEAKER: My name is Donna
9 Ferguson, F-e-r-g-u-s-o-n, and I think I'm the
10 first one from Lowell.

11 Um, my mother was a little bit of a snob.
12 She used to say, "My ancestors came over on the
13 Mayflower and helped settle Peacham." And my
14 father said, "Mine were here to meet 'em."

15 Okay. I believe in my father's way of
16 thinking many, many ways, I believe in our earth,
17 but I believe that you don't just look at this
18 town or the next town or the next town. You have
19 to set examples for everybody, and Vermont does
20 that, and Vermont has always done that, and I
21 believe in the wind towers, and I believe in
22 renewable energy. Is it perfect? No, but there
23 is no energy that's perfect. The only way to not
24 have any kind of emissions from any energy is to
25 not have any. There's nothing perfect. Are there

1 flaws in this? Yes. Are there flaws in Green
2 Mountain Power? Yes. But we have to start
3 somewhere. Do we need it necessarily right here
4 in Lowell? Maybe not. But do other places need
5 it? Are we responsible just for ourselves? I
6 don't think so.

7 That's all I have to say.

8 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you very
9 much.

10 So next, Rod Ferguson, Richard Pion,
11 and -- is it Dany Jourdan and Giselle Chevallay?

12 THE SPEAKER: Hi, folks, and
13 commission, appreciate your being here.

14 There's several different areas of
15 concerns here. One that hasn't been addressed too
16 much so far, and I'm kind of surprised, is
17 property values. My wife and I run a bed and
18 breakfast here in Lowell, so we're Lowellites, I
19 guess you'd say. Sad to say, in the last twelve
20 months we've lost four regular customers. They
21 all bought property here in Lowell.

22 The wind farm is not affecting property
23 values or people's intentions to live in a really
24 nice community. The folks here are really nice,
25 as are most all of you, probably 99 percent of you

1 very nice. The other thing I would like to
2 address is that there have been some remarks about
3 the REC's, renewable energy credits. If you're
4 unhappy with that kind of program, show it up on
5 election day. Use your vote to put the people in
6 office that you want. Don't just keep voting the
7 same old people in there that are going to do the
8 same old thing. Exercise your right to vote.
9 That's the only way you'll get change.

10 And I think that's concludes my
11 statement.

12 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

13 THE SPEAKER: I'm sorry I didn't
14 have a chorus to back me up. I liked that, real
15 nice touch.

16 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: It was nice.

17 Richard Pion?

18 THE SPEAKER: Yes.

19 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Okay. Thanks.

20 THE SPEAKER: My name is Richard
21 Pion.

22 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: I'm sorry.

23 THE SPEAKER: P-i-o-n. I'm chairman
24 of the Lowell select board, and I would like you
25 to know that we changed our select board meeting

1 tonight so as to be here to testify.

2 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Well, thank
3 you.

4 THE SPEAKER: But, in particular, I
5 want to say how well the process worked in
6 engaging the people of Lowell in the decision of
7 whether to build Kingdom Community Wind or not.
8 The select board told GMP that it wanted the
9 people of Lowell to vote on this project. That
10 was in January of 2009. GMP said it welcomed the
11 vote and, if the town voted "No," GMP would not
12 build the plant. This showed real respect to the
13 town and the people of Lowell. GMP spent the next
14 year talking with and providing information to
15 town residents, including presenting at meetings
16 organized by the select board, and also organized
17 by GMP They spent a lot of time in Lowell and
18 even went door to door to talk with the residents.
19 It was a very thorough process, and the people of
20 Lowell had the information they needed to make an
21 informed decision about the project. The people
22 of Lowell voted overwhelmingly in favor of the
23 project. I understand people in other towns say
24 that they wanted an opportunity to vote. Nothing
25 stopped them from doing that, but none did, other

1 than Albany who voted not to oppose the project.
2 If other towns put the project up to a vote, I
3 suspect GMP would have spent time in those
4 communities doing exactly what they did here; that
5 is, making sure people had the facts so they could
6 make an informed decision. It was GMP's respect
7 of the town, the process of engaging us, the trust
8 they built with us, and the information that they
9 provided that led to such a positive feeling about
10 the project and about GMP. Now that the project
11 is built, I can tell you that GMP has lived up to
12 its promises, and what they built is exactly what
13 they described. The Town of Lowell is proud to
14 support renewable energy in Vermont. This is the
15 best thing that happened to the Town of Lowell
16 since the asbestos mines went out of business.

17 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

18 So Dany Jourdan, Giselle Chevallay --

19 THE SPEAKER: That was me, but I
20 wanted to let Kathleen take my place, if you don't
21 mind.

22 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Yes, it's fine,
23 because we'll have time. And then Paul Stuart,
24 Allison Cassavechia, and Elinor Osborn.

25 THE SPEAKER: Hello, my name is Dana

1 Jourdan, last name is J-o-u-r-d-a-n. I'm a
2 teacher at the Green Mountain Tech Center. I
3 teach electrical there. I have a full classroom
4 of students that are not against this wind tower
5 scenario or any other green energy power. I'm in
6 my mid thirties; I've lived here all my life and
7 multi-generation Vermonter. I love the mountains,
8 I love riding bicycles, I love being outside, but
9 I do see our power needs are needing some other
10 change. Burning coal, doing all the other things
11 that we do to make power are not going to work
12 forever. Everyone in my classroom embraces these
13 projects. Maybe they don't happen the right way,
14 as I have seen tonight, but I don't believe that
15 most of the government things I've ever seen in
16 the right way. So, with that being said, I want
17 you to know that there are a lot of young
18 Vermonters that were born here and love this place
19 that don't see this as a negative; they see it as
20 change and somewhere that we do need to head.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

23 THE SPEAKER: My name is Kathleen
24 Nelson. I'm from Brighton, Vermont, and I want
25 the people of Lowell to know how much trouble they

1 caused in Brighton, Vermont. Okay, 30 miles away,
2 126 times the Town of Brighton was closed down to
3 run trucks from Lowell, from the rail yard through
4 the Town of Brighton to get out here. They shut
5 the town down for at least an hour every single
6 time those trucks went through. Okay, and then
7 one of the trucks, of course, rolled itself over
8 on Route 91. We had to haul that sticking thing
9 back through Brighton and pile it up in the rail
10 yard. We had to listen to foul, stinking behavior
11 from the truck drivers. We watched the truck
12 drivers slam into the town bank three times.
13 Okay. We're 30 miles away, and I can stand on
14 Route 105 in our neighboring Charleston and look
15 out at what used to be a beautiful view and see
16 the Lowell turbines. That's 25 miles away. We're
17 impacted, okay, out here, out in Brighton.

18 We've been attacked by a wind developer
19 named Eolian Renewable Energy out there. They've
20 been thrown out of Frankfort, Maine; they just got
21 thrown out of Antrim. We're going to throw them
22 out of Brighton, too, and we need your help to do
23 it.

24 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: So next is -- I
25 have Paul Stuart, and then Allison Cassavechia.

1 THE SPEAKER: Good evening. My name
2 is Paul Stuart. I live in Stanstead, Quebec.

3 I'm here to talk about the Derby Line
4 project that was going to go last summer and how
5 people that live just a few thousand feet from the
6 proposed Derby Line wind site were either
7 forgotten or omitted because they were in another
8 country. I find this an insult and lack of
9 respect for us Canadian neighbors. I have been
10 involved in the fight for recognition since the
11 Derby Line project was introduced and have heard
12 many negative comments about us Canadians and I
13 find this disturbing. We share water -- yes, we
14 still do share water -- and other facilities with
15 the people of Derby Line, and we would like to
16 keep a good relationship going. We do not wish to
17 acquire all the negative aspects that go along
18 with having such a large turbines next to our
19 homes.

20 The Derby line project was in the process
21 of affecting more homes in Canada than in the U.S.
22 I am urging the siting commission to be sure and
23 take a better look at setback distances for these
24 turbines and realize that, when they're looking at
25 projects that are so close to the border, that

1 they recognize us as neighbors and give us the
2 same rights as Vermonters have, even though we're
3 in a different country.

4 Thank you for your time.

5 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

6 Next, Allison Cassavechia.

7 THE SPEAKER: Good evening. I'm
8 Allison Cassavechia. It's A-l-l-i-s-o-n
9 C-a-s-s-a-v-e-c-h-i-a, and I live in Newark so I
10 came about an hour to get here.

11 And, basically, what I would like to say
12 is, since the project was proposed in the town of
13 Newark and in Ferdinand and Brighton, basically
14 had to spend the last, oh, close to a year now
15 just trying to understand what this is all about.
16 And, really, the concern that I had is, you know,
17 right from the beginning our planning commission
18 had 30 days to respond, and we really just didn't
19 have enough time to understand what was going on.
20 So, really, what I would like to say to the siting
21 commission, just to put it out there, is we need
22 more involvement, we need more notification, we
23 need more education as a state. I really try to
24 have a light footprint on everything I do, and I
25 just feel really strongly that it's just not a

1 fair shake. You know, we're not being heard, and
2 it just really feels like the stack is, you know,
3 the deck is stacked against us. So I would just
4 like to say that there should be more community
5 involvement, and the town plan should matter.

6 Thanks.

7 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

8 Next, Elinor Osborn, and then I think
9 it's Kathleen Goodrich, Kim Fried, um, is it
10 Don -- oh, Don Nelson.

11 THE SPEAKER: I'm Elinor Osborn from
12 Craftsbury, E-l-i-n-o-r O-s-b-o-r-n.

13 And, before deciding where to put
14 industrial wind, we should be deciding if it is
15 feasible for Vermont. Therefore, I feel the
16 siting commission should be put on hold until many
17 questions can be answered. A moratorium will give
18 time to answer those questions, which will best be
19 done by independent scientific studies of Lowell
20 and Sheffield. Some of these questions are: What
21 is the grid capacity and how will it handle
22 intermittent power? Currently turbines are being
23 shut down when power production surpasses demand.

24 Green Mountain Power is currently
25 installing a \$10.5 million voltage regulator to

1 stabilize the grid. Who pays for this? What is
2 the legal status of REC's? Selling them to out-
3 of-state utilities allows those utilities to
4 continue burning fossil fuels, so there is no net
5 gain on carbon reduction.

6 What is the bird and bat kill? We have
7 three endangered bats in Vermont. What changes
8 have occurred in storm water runoff and water
9 quality? What is the output of the installed
10 turbines compared to the utilities protected
11 output? What is the temperature change of ground
12 surface and of head water streams after a forest
13 is clear-cut? Is increased temperature adding to
14 global warming? How much carbon sequestration is
15 lost by clear-cutting the mountain-top forest?
16 How much carbon is emitted in the manufacture,
17 transport, site construction, operation,
18 maintenance, and decommissioning of Lowell and
19 Sheffield? Total carbon emissions and lost of
20 carbon sequestration should be compared to any
21 amount of carbon saved, if there is any, since
22 intermittent power does not cause any baseload
23 fossil fuel plants to be decommissioned? What are
24 the health effects of the noise? Are the World
25 Health Organization noise guidelines suitable for

1 rural, quiet Vermont, away from traffic? What are
2 the effects of forest fragmentation? Act 248, how
3 can it be changed to evaluate environmental
4 effects and give them equal weight? How can it be
5 changed to make citizen input equal with
6 corporation input? What monetary means can be
7 given to help citizens before the Public Service
8 Board, or what take the place of the Public
9 Service Board?

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Kathleen
12 Goodrich? Kathleen?

13 THE SPEAKER: My name is Kathleen
14 Goodrich. I live in Albany, Vermont.

15 I face 21 wind turbines. Approximately
16 the closest ones are a mile or maybe a little
17 further away from me. I can see all 21 of them.
18 I can hear all 21 of them. It has drastically
19 changed our lives. So I have one thing I would
20 like to extend to you as a recommendation. I
21 think the best way for you to decide accurate,
22 proper siting for this kind of a project would be
23 for you to experience what it's like to live where
24 one was poorly sited. So I would like to extend
25 to each of you, individually or as a group, please

1 come to my house. Don't come for an hour, don't
2 come for a day. I am inviting you to come for as
3 long as it takes until you understand what I am
4 experiencing. And that's all I have to say.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you. So
7 next is Kim Fried, then Don Nelson, Shirley
8 Nelson, Robbin Clark, and I have a few more names
9 on the list but, if there are still people who
10 want to sign up, there's a sheet in the back.

11 THE SPEAKER: Good evening. I would
12 like to thank the siting commission for coming to
13 the Northeast Kingdom. Thank you for the great
14 music. And my name is Kim Fried. I'm the chair
15 of the planning commission in Newark, Vermont.

16 And I think now the siting commission,
17 although it wasn't a clear day today, you were in
18 Sheffield and you were also at the Lowell
19 industrial ridgeline, and I would like to make
20 sure that in your minds you compare those sites to
21 the visit to the gas facility, to the visit to the
22 South Burlington solar field, and the visit that
23 we made to the bio chip facility in Burlington.
24 And I guess I don't have to argue with you that
25 the scale of these projects are hugely different

1 and that -- and from your report that you're
2 studying now, I would say I would recommend the
3 tiering approach. When you have this type of
4 impact, we need to -- we need to have a tier
5 approach towards the permitting process.

6 I would also like to say that, when you
7 have these huge environmental impacts, I would
8 suggest that also, from your opportunities and
9 option report, that you look at the membership of
10 the Public Service Board. The recommendation that
11 you have an environmental expert and that you have
12 a regional person on these boards, decisions for
13 these large, tiered projects, I think it's a very
14 good idea.

15 I would like to remind the siting
16 commission that what you saw today in Sheffield,
17 if you add that to Lowell, that's what's being
18 looked at for the town of Newark and Brighton, a
19 facility that's larger than the two.

20 The recommendation to include regional
21 and town planners I think is a legitimate option,
22 and you should seriously look at it.

23 Thank you for your time.

24 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

25 So Don Nelson.

1 THE SPEAKER: All right. Thank you
2 for coming. I am Don Nelson.

3 I've been against wind farms for ten
4 years, and I'm proud of it. I think it's the
5 worse sham that they've ever caused on -- on the
6 world, not just United States, not just Vermont,
7 Maine, New Hampshire, but Denmark and England and
8 Australia and all of them. They're having hellish
9 trouble trying to get this stuff to work on the
10 grid. It doesn't work, and now a lot of them are
11 saying it's the biggest boondoggle they ever
12 entered into. As far as -- I was an intervener.
13 I've got a mile and a half of land along the
14 Lowell Mountain wind farm. The setbacks -- well,
15 first, the legislative -- the process of Public
16 Service Board. I went down there thinking we
17 could -- we could make some sort of a dent in
18 Green Mountain Power's business, and the first day
19 the Public Service Board said it was their duty to
20 carry out the wishes of the Vermont state
21 legislature with their energy policy, that's
22 probably the worse thing that any state in the
23 union has got because, No. 1, they sell all the
24 green credits. So anything we put up here doesn't
25 make a damn bit of difference as far as carbon is

1 concerned. And then the setbacks, the setbacks to
2 the Lowell project are 200 feet. With a 459-foot
3 turbine, two of them are within -- depending on
4 which survey you believe, mine or the other
5 guy's -- they're either -- the tips of the blades
6 are either 20 feet from my property line or 120
7 feet over my property line. So that gives you an
8 idea of what they were thinking about setbacks
9 when they can throw ice for over a thousand feet.

10 I don't know how you're going to work
11 this siting committee out, how you're going to
12 come up with anything that's going to change that,
13 because Vermont is -- is a small state, and one of
14 the biggest -- one of the biggest sayings I hear
15 that scared me the most is Vermont's going to lead
16 the way. A little state like this is going to
17 lead the way for the United States and the world
18 on how we're going to get out of this global
19 warming business. It's not going to happen. It's
20 going to happen -- we're not going to stop it.
21 The experts say, if we didn't put another bit of
22 carbon into the atmosphere, it would take 500
23 years before we turn around.

24 Now, I heard one of the speakers
25 tonight -- in fact, I'm living with the noise,

1 too, just like the rest of these people here. One
2 of the guys tonight said that we have to get off
3 oil and coal because it's going to run out. We've
4 got 200 years of oil and coal. These turbines are
5 going to be long gone before we ever run out of
6 either one of them, and oil and coal and gas are
7 so much cheaper than wind. Another thing is --

8 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Mr. Nelson, I'm
9 sorry. If there's time at the end, I'll let you
10 come back up again, but I just want to be sure I
11 get every body.

12 THE SPEAKER: Okay. Good enough.

13 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Shirley Nelson,
14 Robbin Clark, and Noreen Hession.

15 THE SPEAKER: Hi. I'm Shirley
16 Nelson. I live in Lowell. We're one of the
17 people that are affected by the noise. It's
18 continuous. My head still aches and my ears are
19 ringing tonight. It just doesn't go away that
20 quick.

21 I wanted to talk a little bit about the
22 248 process. At this time the people of Lowell,
23 Albany, Craftsbury, and Sheffield are being held
24 captive by this experiment called Section 248. It
25 has created a venue in which expert witnesses are

1 the only factor that has any value in the process
2 of siting, and somewhere along the line has become
3 only the experts that have been hired by the
4 developers. In our case the person taking names
5 that we wanted to -- when we wanted to speak,
6 crossed our names off and the names of other
7 interveners off the list of speakers, with a
8 laugh, and told us we would have our chance at the
9 technical hearings. We weren't -- didn't have
10 much of a chance then, either.

11 Then next comes the arduous task of
12 processing all the information that was thrown to
13 the residents outside of the loop of the
14 closely-knit group has -- which has formed around
15 the developers. A majority of people at that
16 point haven't even been in a process like this and
17 are not prepared in any way for the terms like
18 discovery and interrogatories and were left
19 treading water because now we have to hire a
20 lawyer.

21 Now fast forward through the legal maze
22 of the technical hearings. Even though
23 interveners have been given the chance to provide
24 written testimonies, they have no way, time, or
25 money to match the parade of lawyers and experts

1 hired by the developers.

2 The task of the siting commission should
3 look very carefully at the areas being considered
4 for utility development and the concerns of the
5 people being sacrificed every day in the end
6 results of the industrial developers. The effects
7 of noise are just being tested in areas of
8 Sheffield and Lowell and will be in Milton and
9 Georgia. The newer studies from around the world
10 are showing that much greater setbacks are needed
11 for the health and safety of the people in the
12 communities around these areas.

13 You the members of the siting commission
14 have been given the position where you could say,
15 Slow down, let's look at what's been done, see
16 what we can salvage from the package the
17 legislature has delivered.

18 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Excuse me, Mrs.
19 Nelson, I'm really sorry, but we can hear what's
20 going on in the back of the room, and we're here
21 to hear what's going on in the front.

22 MR. RECCHIA: You guys need to take
23 that outside if you're not going to listen to what
24 people are saying.

25 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: We're here for

1 the public hearing. Excuse me. Sorry, Mrs.
2 Nelson. I'll give you an another 30 seconds.
3 Okay?

4 THE SPEAKER: I lost my place.

5 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: I'm very sorry.

6 THE SPEAKER: The human Guinea pigs
7 may show that 45 decibels of continuous noise is
8 not realistic. It isn't the noise of a library in
9 a quiet conversation, in a bedroom at night, like
10 we were told. It's disrupting lives, sleep,
11 making people irritable, driving away the
12 wildlife, and increasing health costs for
13 families. Many people live in the valleys created
14 by the mountains of Vermont, the Green Mountain
15 State that they are adversely affected by the
16 noise and flow of water created by these
17 mountains. In the fabric of the communities -- if
18 the fabric of the communities are truly inspected,
19 the whole issue would be put aside for any energy
20 solutions that would fit the surroundings. The
21 way these mega projects are sited are tearing
22 apart the lives, families, towns, marriages, and
23 quality of life for its residents.

24 I have copies here.

25 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

1 Thank you very much. Sorry for the interruption.

2 Next is Robbin Clark, then Noreen
3 Hession, and then I think it's Robert Naramore,
4 and Steven Gorelick

5 THE SPEAKER: I'm Robbin Clark,
6 Lowell, Vermont.

7 I am writing to you to let you know that
8 siting these projects in rural communities is
9 wrong. It is travesty what has happened in Lowell
10 and Sheffield. We participated in the technical
11 hearings for the Lowell project through the Lowell
12 Mountains Group and the Ridge Protectors. Two
13 noise experts testified on behalf of the
14 interveners. Both recommended noise levels way
15 below what the Service Board has approved, and now
16 we have noise levels that are not bearable. We
17 have a project with turbines so large that, if
18 they run at capacity, neighbors are driven from
19 their homes due to the noise. Setbacks for these
20 projects are way too close. The developer
21 underestimated the amount of noise that these
22 turbines made. We live a mile and a half from the
23 project to the north, and we were told we would
24 not hear it past 1,000 feet. We can hear it loud
25 and clear. I am not looking forward to the summer

1 months when we have windows open and want to enjoy
2 our front yard.

3 The other problem is placing them in the
4 wilderness where critical wildlife habitat is
5 lost. We learned through technical hearings that
6 Lowell Mountain had critical bear habitat, deep-
7 wooded nesting areas for birds. "Mitigation" was
8 the word we heard a lot. The problem with that is
9 that wildlife is not aware of this word. They
10 just don't know, their habitat is gone. We heard
11 almost every night on the news or in the newspaper
12 about bear sightings, and the State's going to
13 spend thousands to do a study on why we have a
14 bear problem. Just look at what has happened in
15 the Kingdom. Bears have lost acres and acres of
16 habitat between construction at Jay Peak, Lowell,
17 and Sheffield, and now you're considering Newark
18 and Brighton and Ferdinand. It is unfortunate
19 that you visited these sites during the winter
20 with a nice blanket of snow. This softens what
21 has happened when 700 to 100,000 pounds of
22 explosives are used to level and clear the ridge,
23 not to mention that 150 acres have been cleared,
24 clear-cut and grubbed; you can't see the mounds
25 and mounds of fly rock with a sprinkle of mountain

1 on it to produce greenery; you can't see that
2 vernal pools have been filled in and wetlands
3 lost; you can't see that the headwater streams are
4 gone. We were up there this past summer, and it
5 felt like 7 miles of it -- it felt like a desert,
6 7 miles of exposed rock, cuts in the mountain more
7 than 50 feet high. I thought for sure that I
8 would find them playing in the mud, but it was the
9 opposite; the water was gone, it was hot and very
10 dry. On May 29, 2012, Lowell experienced the
11 worse flooding on record in more than 100 years.
12 I truly believe that these projects do more harm
13 than good and do very much contribute to global
14 warming. This is no longer a mountain; it is an
15 industrial park.

16 Lastly, I find it quite sad that these
17 projects tear communities apart. You have
18 neighbor against neighbor, family members are not
19 speaking to another, and towns against towns.
20 Elected legislator has such lack of empathy and
21 compassion for those who are affected by these
22 projects.

23 Please keep these words in your thoughts
24 when making your decision: These green mountains,
25 these green hills and silver waters are my home,

1 they belong to me. All to her sons and daughters,
2 may they be strong and forever free. Let us live
3 to protect her beauty and look with pride upon the
4 golden dome. They say our home is where our heart
5 is. These green mountains are my home. These
6 green mountains are my home.

7 Please let Lowell be the last. Restore
8 my faith in the golden dome.

9 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

10 Next is Noreen Hession, and then Robert
11 Naramore, Steven Gorelick, and is it Annegret
12 Pollard.

13 THE SPEAKER: Hi. I'm Noreen
14 Hession H-e-s-s-i-o-n.

15 I want to thank the committee for coming
16 to Lowell. I hope you're planning on coming to
17 Newark at some point; it's gorgeous up there and
18 it's our intention to keep it that way. We would
19 like your help.

20 I want to talk a little bit about Charge
21 No. 2, what's the opportunity for town
22 participation in these projects. I want to say
23 that we in Newark saw what happened in Lowell and
24 saw what happened in Sheffield and, when the
25 developer came the day after Town Meeting to try

1 to slip a met tower in, we organized ourselves
2 quickly. We have a fabulous planning commission,
3 and we have a great town. I'm really proud of
4 Newark. Newark spent a lot of time throughout the
5 spring and the summer educating themselves about
6 industrial wind. Mr. Recchia was invited there.
7 We had the Department of Public Service, Agency of
8 Natural Resources. We had people from around the
9 state come in and talking to us about industrial
10 wind. We had a Public Service Board hearing, a
11 public hearing in Newark where 53 out of 54 people
12 spoke and said, No, they didn't want industrial
13 wind. At the end of the summer we voted 74
14 percent against the met towers. Seventy- four
15 percent of the town, the largest meeting in
16 anybody's memory in the Town we voted against
17 industrial wind. Our neighbors in Brighton voted
18 2 to 1 against industrial wind. The Governor
19 says, if the Town doesn't want it, they shouldn't
20 have to have it. So what do we do? We tell the
21 Governor; the Governor tells the Department of
22 Public Services, the Department of Public Services
23 tells the Public Service Board; the Public Service
24 Board ignores us all. The Public Service Board
25 heard from everybody, and they ignored the

1 recommendation of the DPS lawyers, they ignored
2 our amended town plan. Newark remains under
3 attack, and we're tired.

4 I recently spoke with Tony Klein, who's
5 chair of the house energy committee. Kim Fried
6 and Nancy Fried were there during the
7 conversation. I asked that lawmaker, How do we
8 let the Public Service Board know, we've had our
9 vote, because he agreed, the Town has a vote, they
10 shouldn't have to have it. And he said the
11 process, you know, Governor talks to DPS, DPS
12 talks to PSB. We said, We did that; they're
13 ignoring us. He said, Oh, that's impossible.
14 It's not impossible; that's what's going on. So,
15 if the head of the House of Rep -- the
16 Representatives' commission on energy doesn't know
17 what the process is, my guess is there is no
18 process for stopping it. You've got small towns
19 and communities who are educating themselves, who
20 are against this, who are exhausted. We've told
21 everybody we don't want it. We're still going
22 through something that I've learned, thanks to
23 you, is called contested case. So -- and the only
24 reason we're going through all of this is because
25 the citizens of Newark have dipped into their

1 pocket and started paying for it. It's expensive.
2 So small towns getting beat up by multi-national
3 corporations and absolutely no process in place
4 for us to protect ourselves or be heard.

5 So my recommendation is, No. 1, that,
6 when a town says "no," it means "no," end of
7 story. Whatever process you come up with, make
8 sure that's No. 1. No. 2, if a developer has
9 plans for a town and the Town isn't prepared for
10 it, why doesn't have the Town get two years to
11 prepare for it? There are other laws on the
12 books, I don't understand them, but it appears
13 that, in other situations, developers come to
14 towns, they propose projects, the Town should get
15 two years, minimally, in order to determine
16 whether or not they're really interested in it.
17 And, No. 3, I am not sure this is appropriate, but
18 this is a recommendation for the siting
19 commission, which is when you're having your
20 deliberations, I would love to see Annette Smith
21 or -- or Steve Wright or someone from one of the
22 towns in the community sitting at the table with
23 you, participating, and not just lawyers; because,
24 frankly, the lawyers who sit at the table with you
25 guys, those are the guys who have been fighting

1 the small towns.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Next we have
4 Robert Naramore, Steve Gorelick, and then Jack
5 Lazor -- Lazor.

6 THE SPEAKER: Thank you. It's Rob
7 Naramore N-a-r-a-m-o-r-e, and I'm a real estate
8 broker here in the area and a resident of the Town
9 of Lowell, and I see 17 of those towers every day
10 from my house, and I don't have a complaint about
11 that. I feel bad for the people who are here and
12 not here tonight who are experiencing sound and
13 noise and the visual pollution from them. I want
14 to start by saying, Ben Franklin said "everything
15 in moderation." I'm for this project, but I don't
16 believe that every ridgeline in the state of
17 Vermont should have a wind tower on it. I think
18 developers are jumping into this full tilt and
19 there needs to be some brakes put on that process.
20 That being said, I've also been acting on other
21 projects in the state, current Vermont Gas project
22 that I've been involved in that, and there is a
23 new energy future coming to this country. These
24 meetings are going on all over the United States;
25 it's not just Northeast Kingdom of Vermont. It

1 doesn't matter what the project is; there's
2 opposition. New Hampshire has Northern Pass.
3 That's a massive 500-foot-wide right-of-way down
4 the length of that state running Hydro-Quebec
5 power, and there's a lot of opposition to that,
6 and it's not going to be very pretty. You know, I
7 don't know what the solution is. I do know that I
8 don't want to use imported oil and dirty fuel,
9 coal. I know some of the tradeoff here is the
10 coal companies are getting a credit and so it's
11 kind of prolonging the burning of coal, but the
12 point I guess I want to make by this is, as a
13 resident, I think this ultimately will be an
14 economic benefit to our town. And the grass isn't
15 even seeded on that mountain yet, so it's too
16 early to make assumptions or predictions about
17 what that will be, but I think, if the revenues
18 from the project are used to lower property taxes
19 in this town, I think it will be a benefit.
20 That's all I have to say.

21 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

22 Next Stephen Gorelick, and then Jack
23 Lazor.

24 THE SPEAKER: I'm Steve Gorelick
25 from Walden. It's G-o-r-e-l-i-c-k.

1 It seems to me that the main rationale
2 for any renewable energy project is its
3 environmental benefit, so it stands to reason that
4 no project should be approved if its environmental
5 costs are greater than its benefits. We've
6 already heard about the ecological costs of a
7 project like Lowell, clear-cutting, bulldozing
8 topsoil, blasting, filling wetlands, head water
9 streams compromised, wildlife habitat lost, and so
10 on. These are real costs and they can't really be
11 mitigated.

12 Against this, against all this, there is
13 one presumed environmental benefit and that is the
14 displacement of fossil fuels. In Bill McKibben's
15 words, every turn of the blade reduces fossil fuel
16 consumption somewhere, and I hope you realize by
17 now that that's not actually true, that there are,
18 with the selling of the REC's, with ramping up and
19 down of natural gas to make up for the
20 intermittency, that it's even possible that the
21 turn of the blade is replacing another renewable;
22 but, even if you grant that they displace fossil
23 fuels, there's another problem. For a wind
24 project to make a difference in fighting climate
25 change, any fuels -- fossil fuels that are

1 displaced must stay in the ground and remain
2 unburned. Unfortunately, that's not likely to
3 happen. In 2012, for example, the U.S. exported a
4 record amount of coal, 124 million tons, making
5 America the fourth largest coal exporter in the
6 world. If domestic demand drops, even more coal
7 will be exported. Already, new coal-shipping
8 terminals are being planned for the west coast
9 that would allow exports to double. Even natural
10 gas exports are expected to top 2 trillion cubic
11 feet next year, and new gas exporting facilities
12 are also being planned.

13 So what's this got to do with ridgeline
14 wind in Vermont? It means we are allowing the
15 very real environmental costs like Lowell just so
16 that the coal and natural gas can be burned in
17 China, Japan, or Europe, rather than New England.
18 Since the climate is affected equally no matter
19 where the fuels are burned, we're industrializing
20 our precious mountains for nothing.

21 Does this mean we can't do anything about
22 climate change? There are plenty of things we can
23 do and they are urgent. They have to do with
24 reorienting our economy away from needless
25 consumption so we aren't promoting an

1 energy-intensive growth in places like China, and
2 I might add Jay Peak and Newport. But this is a
3 discussion that will never happen so long as the
4 public and policy makers are duped into believing
5 that all will be fine so long as our destructive
6 economy is run on renewable rather than fossil
7 fuels. This is a lie, and one that I hope the
8 siting commission can see through.

9 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

10 Jack Lazor and then Arlon Warren and then
11 Dave -- Dave, you're from Lowell -- Robitille.
12 Thank you.

13 THE SPEAKER: Jack Lazor from
14 Westfield, Butterworks Farm, and I have a
15 mini-version of one of these big windmills that I
16 put up in 2005. It's a 30-kilowatt Bestes wind
17 turbine, so I know a little bit about wind energy,
18 and actually it's not working right now, sad to
19 say, but I'm pretty friendly with these people
20 from South Dakota that work on these things a lot,
21 and these guys -- his name is Nick Siddens, and he
22 tells me that, you know, a wind turbine is a
23 major, major project. It's not some feel-good
24 little thing; it's like putting a dam on a river.
25 I mean, it's going to have environmental impact.

1 And it sure did here on the 29th of May when, you
2 know, my corn down at the bridge on Route 58 was
3 about 4 inches tall and had 7 feet of water
4 rushing over it and which, you know, people have
5 never seen a flood like that, you know, in -- on
6 the 29th of May. So it kind of boils down to like
7 high-elevation development. It seems like our
8 state policy, until Governor Shumlin got into
9 office, was that everything above 2,000 feet in
10 elevation was sacred; there was no logging above
11 2,000 feet, you know, no, you know, no
12 clear-cutting above 2,000 feet. And all of a
13 sudden that seems like it's gone, and it's this
14 high-elevation development that is really having a
15 major impact. If you're a farmer with river
16 bottom land, like I am, because I have a lot of
17 land in North Troy, I've seen more flooding in the
18 last five to ten years than we ever did before
19 that, so just wanted to bring that to your
20 attention, and I would like to see more emphasis
21 being placed on smaller projects, like maybe like
22 my wind turbine all over the place, non-corporate,
23 maybe communities investing in wind turbines,
24 small ones that don't have such a large
25 impact --so and the other last thing I would like

1 to say is that, with these big industrial
2 projects, we just may not be able to put up small
3 projects anymore because these big wind turbines
4 will have such a bad name for putting up little
5 projects. So please let little projects keep
6 happening.

7 Thank you very much.

8 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

9 It says Arlon Warren. Warner, sorry.

10 THE SPEAKER: Yes, thanks for
11 coming. My name is Arlon Warner, A-r-l-o-n,
12 Warner like Warner Brothers.

13 Yeah, we did not come here to hear some
14 folks singing an off-key song. There are already
15 extensive --

16 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Please be
17 respectful. I'm embarrassed for my region.

18 THE SPEAKER: There are already
19 extensive, extraneous PSB rules on the books that
20 GMP, VEC had to follow before the Lowell Mountain
21 wind project was approved. The Town voted 75
22 percent in favor of this project; and, yes, thanks
23 for the PSB and for their approval and so forth.
24 They did follow the wishes of the Town. We do
25 live in a democratic state where a majority of the

1 people should prevail.

2 I did not vote for President Obama two
3 months ago or four years ago; but, yet, I had to
4 live by the wishes of the majority of the people.
5 I didn't go to Washington, DC, set up a tent on
6 the White House lawn, to prevent President Obama
7 from moving in. If I had, I would have been in
8 jail.

9 This area and surrounding towns will be
10 undergoing extensive growth from Jay Peak and
11 Newport-Derby areas where, hopefully, a new
12 Walmart store can be built. This area has --
13 these towns have voted both in favor of that new
14 Walmart store, and there's a committee that's
15 totally against that. There again, they're going
16 against the wishes of the people, which is not a
17 democracy state or how it should work.

18 This area is one of the most depressed
19 areas and one of the highest unemployment rates in
20 the state. It's just common sense that Vermont
21 can be and should be totally energy independent
22 from additional -- so, therefore, it can be
23 additional windmills installed, solar panels
24 installed, hydro sites, and so forth. We need to
25 keep our hard-earned energy dollars from going out

1 of state and given out of the U.S. for people that
2 want to kill us. So, hopefully, we can lower
3 unemployment rates with these new projects
4 hopefully on board.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

7 Next is Dave, and then Mike Nelson, Jim
8 Rademacher, Cynthia Barber. Dave -- thank you. I
9 just can't -- I'm sorry. Then Mike Nelson, Jim
10 Rademacher, Cynthia Barber, and Peggy Struhsacker?
11 We'll get it.

12 THE SPEAKER: It's Dave Robitille
13 R-o-b-i-t-i-l-l-e. I'm from Lowell. I lived
14 through the infamous vote.

15 And my understanding is that you are
16 charged at looking at further sitings, so why
17 we're sitting here talking about what's been done
18 boggles my mind, and I think it boggles a lot of
19 people's minds who are silent tonight, because
20 this is a done deal for us. We made our decision;
21 we'll live with it. Thank you very much. But
22 what I do object to is every time I come to these
23 hearings, and I understand there are a lot of
24 people who don't want this, that's fine, but I
25 hear all these things about Lowell from people who

1 don't live in Lowell and about how terrible it is,
2 and I have lots of friends in Lowell, and a lot of
3 them don't agree with me about the wind project.
4 We're not secretly planning each other's demise;
5 we just agree to disagree. And I think that's the
6 way a lot of this goes is that there's just a lot
7 of high emotion and not a lot of fact.

8 I see a lot of factoids being thrown at
9 you all the time; but, in my case, and I'm a
10 landowner who is affected, what it came down to
11 was the factoids, when I researched them, just
12 simply weren't true, in almost every case, and
13 what was true was that, when I sat down with this
14 evil corporation, VELCO and GMP, to negotiate the
15 work they had to do on my land, they were straight
16 up, even if they knew I wouldn't like the answer;
17 and, if I put up an objection, they changed it.
18 That's being a good neighbor, as far as I can see.

19 And so all I want to say is that I trust
20 you, I believe that you are citizens of this state
21 who have been charged to make a decision by the
22 legislature, part of which I elected, and I don't
23 see you as an evil commission of some sort to
24 cover up anything. I trust that, when the time
25 comes, you'll make the right decision, and I think

1 everybody agrees that there won't be a great rush
2 to windmills on every ridgeline in Vermont, we
3 pretty well can see that, but I encourage you to
4 learn from what we learned from the windmills on
5 Lowell ridge. Whether they turn into a boom or a
6 bust, we will learn something from it. And if it
7 comes 25 years, I know, dear, and they are taken
8 down, they will be taken down, we already know
9 that, not at our cost but at the company's cost,
10 and we still will have learned something.

11 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

12 Mike Nelson.

13 THE SPEAKER: Hello. Thank you for
14 coming and listening to everybody here tonight.
15 My name's Mike Nelson. I think you can guess how
16 to spell it.

17 The reason I am here, or one of the
18 things I got into this early on is I was elected
19 or appointed, rather, to be intervener for the
20 Town of Albany. Well, we threw a lot into the
21 case. I always felt that this was primarily an
22 issue on health effects. We've looked at this.
23 We had a what I thought was a very strong case
24 before the Public Service Board. We were ignored,
25 and the -- what we are learning on our side of the

1 mountain, and I grew up in Lowell, I live in
2 Albany now, is that it's actually worse than we
3 expected. We didn't expect to hear -- or I
4 certainly didn't expect to hear a jet engine over
5 my house when those things are roaring 3 1/2 miles
6 away. I didn't expect that the Lafonts over in
7 South Albany would be able to hear it at 6 1/2
8 miles. When we talked about this, we put a sound
9 expert up, and we were arguing for 30 decibels
10 outside the home at night. GMP's own expert said
11 he would like 35 if it was his house. What did
12 the Board decide? Double that, 45 decibels. That
13 isn't up just a little bit. When you go up 10
14 decibels, you double the sound.

15 Okay, two other things: Mr. Warner said
16 that he didn't believe that it was democratic to
17 come and object afterwards, after people had
18 voted. To me that means sit down and shut up. I
19 don't agree with that. I think a democracy means
20 that you get to be heard. And to address
21 Mr. Robitille, we're talking about this Lowell
22 project because we don't want that to happen
23 elsewhere.

24 Thank you.

25 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you. So

1 the last ones I have are Jim Rademacher, Cynthia
2 Barber, Peggy Struhsacker, and Pat O'Neill. Just
3 sit right there. Thank you.

4 THE SPEAKER: Thank you. I'm Jim
5 Rademacher, R-a-d-e-m-a-c-h-e-r. I'm from
6 Pittsford.

7 I got involved with wind a little while
8 ago when a developer was planning to put some
9 windmills along the Grampa's Knob, Pittsford ridge
10 area. Houston, we have a problem. The Apollo
11 astronauts and the NASA engineers quickly
12 recognized that there was a problem. It was a
13 scary problem, it was a big problem, but they also
14 recognized, We've got to keep cool heads because,
15 if we don't, our fear is going to lead to
16 irrational solutions. I had the opportunity to
17 read Mr. McKibben's remarks to the legislature.
18 After that he gave a talk at Rutland. I had an
19 opportunity to go to that. And he was reported in
20 the newspaper a day later as saying that he looks
21 forward to having a wind turbine up on the ridges
22 of Ripton where he lives as a symbol to the people
23 taking responsibility for their reactions. I
24 guess I would submit to you that that is a
25 decision on his part based upon fear.

1 We've heard many things here this evening
2 about how wind is going to be very poor at solving
3 our CO2 problem, a very expensive way of solving
4 our CO2 problems, making this much cheaper. I
5 think these turbine towers will not be a symbol
6 for our taking responsibility, but they will be a
7 symbol of our foul for letting those things go up
8 on our ridgelines. Industrial wind is an
9 irrational reaction to a scary problem; industrial
10 wind is a terrible solution to a terrible problem.

11 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

12 Cynthia Barber. Would you like to sit
13 down?

14 THE SPEAKER: No, I'm okay. Thank
15 you.

16 Cynthia Barber B-a-r-b-e-r from Newark.
17 I carefully prepared notes; I jotted them down a
18 minute ago.

19 I want to talk about the process, not the
20 siting and not the I don't want wind, even though
21 that's true, the process for the decision-making
22 body, and that is to add some requirements to the
23 body. I would like them to incorporate thinking,
24 common sense, understanding, and reading, and
25 listening to the issues. A moron would say there

1 are no issues. There are issues; one side or the
2 other, there are issues. They need to listen and
3 to -- and to learn from it, learn what the issues
4 are and how they are affecting people. Their
5 biggest role is to protect people. They should
6 welcome evidence, they should welcome new ideas
7 and look into them. I remember many, many years
8 ago, when I was fighting another project, we
9 submitted a lot of good studies to the Department
10 of Public Service, the Public Service Board, and
11 everybody else, saying, Just look at this, just
12 read this. And, when we finally push came to
13 shove, somebody said to me, "I'm not paid to
14 read."

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

17 So Peggy Struhsacker, I love it, and then
18 Pat O'Neill.

19 THE SPEAKER: I expect you want me
20 to spell that for you. It's
21 S-t-r-u-h-s-a-c-k-e-r, and I'm from Morrisville.
22 I'm a wildlife biologist. I've worked for years
23 on endangered species issues across the United
24 States and at the federal level and, when this
25 project first started, I basically had my head in

1 the sand, but I also felt, as a Vermonter for all
2 my life, that our environmental laws and our
3 environmental groups would look out for our
4 wildlife on that mountain top. As I drive to Jay
5 to go skiing now, it just, the gut of my stomach,
6 I look at all the displacement and how many
7 wildlife species have been displaced up there. I
8 also read the information that was put out like
9 that, and I've never seen a worst-prepared, if you
10 want to call it an environmental impact statement,
11 for wildlife species. It was terrible. I've
12 worked at the federal level on endangered species,
13 and I expected that some endangered species could
14 have been addressed up at that issue at the
15 federal level, but that's never came in on any of
16 it. And in Lowell and Island Pond, I mean, in
17 Island Pond and Newark, that will be a whole
18 different story if that happens. But, that being
19 said, as a Vermonter, I have been -- I'm so sad,
20 because I came in here, came into this whole, how
21 it's just destroyed communities, people against
22 people. I don't believe the Public Service Board
23 has the credential or capability to look at
24 projects of this size. They don't have the
25 knowledge. Three people to look at something like

1 this, the impact it's going to do to our
2 environment is huge, mostly -- and then I was
3 flabbergasted how fast this went through and that
4 Act 250 isn't even a part of it. Act 250 above
5 2,000 feet -- 2,000 feet has to -- I mean, it's
6 like, no, you can't do anything above 2,000, no
7 roads, no nothing. I knew these laws, and I felt,
8 as a Vermonter, this will be addressed. It
9 wasn't. I was dumb-founded at how fast this whole
10 process went through.

11 So I ask that you, as the siting
12 commission, really address these issues, because
13 people don't understand in our state that Act 250
14 isn't part of these siting -- isn't part of the
15 siting, and that you take into consideration that
16 Vermont doesn't need this. I mean, there was so
17 much information before. I'm looking out for the
18 wildlife. And, lastly, I know I'm supposed to
19 stop, the incidental pay permit was the last thing
20 that came on-line. Incidental pay is, if a bat
21 gets hit up there, its monitoring is by the
22 company. It should be monitored by outside
23 people. Any incidental pay permit is to be
24 monitored either by a U.S. Fish and Wildlife
25 service biologist or somebody outside of the

1 company.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

4 THE SPEAKER: Hi. My name is Pat
5 O'Neill. I live in Westfield
6 O-apostrophe-N-e-i-l-l. And I appreciate that
7 having the draft report. I will be presenting
8 some more-extensive comments, but I wanted to give
9 you these tonight, knowing that this is an
10 evolving process. And what is -- I know that you
11 talk to other states about their permitting
12 process, and I would ask you to expand that to a
13 couple of the countries that have already banned
14 on-shore industrial wind, because they have a lot
15 more experience with this technology, and we don't
16 need to make the same mistakes that other places
17 have made. So I hope that you can -- that there's
18 some time, space, whatever's required, in order to
19 do that; in particular, I would say Denmark and
20 the U.K., because of geography and weather
21 comparisons that can be made there.

22 Also, a recommendation that the Board or
23 whoever's going to be reviewing all the projects
24 have to use established protocols and metrics to
25 determine public good. There's some assumptions

1 about public good that are being made, and there
2 is a rigorous and transparent cost-to-benefit
3 analysis process that is part of determining
4 public good, and that currently, as far as I know
5 with the Lowell project and Sheffield and Georgia
6 Mountain was not part of that process, and this is
7 what we need is some very hard data to demonstrate
8 whether something is public good. Something that
9 hasn't been mentioned is about assigning
10 transmission costs for all projects that require
11 new transmissions, socializing transmission costs,
12 particularly if it's a for-profit project. Right
13 now industrial wind projects are causing an uproar
14 in other places, and it would be nice to avoid
15 this in Vermont. For example, ISO New England
16 estimates we'll need about 4,000 miles of new
17 transmission for 20 percent wind in New England.
18 We only have 8,000 miles, so we're talking about
19 enormous infrastructure projects, and socializing
20 that is going to have some problems.

21 And the last thing is that, in your
22 report, in your final report, upfront that you
23 define renewable generation, because now in
24 Vermont that phrase means more than one thing, and
25 for any of us, anyone reading that report, we need

1 to know what you mean when you use the term
2 "renewable energy."

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

5 So we have one more?

6 THE SPEAKER: That quick?

7 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Yeah, that
8 quick.

9 THE SPEAKER: Hello. My name is Ed
10 Weslow. I'm from Lowell. That's W-e-s-o-l-o-w.
11 And I would submit that no commercial windmill
12 industrial sites be permitted at all. There is a
13 clear alternative that, for some reason, I don't
14 know why the paradigm shift in thinking hasn't
15 taken place, but we have 21st century technology
16 that would answer the problem. I spent a lot of
17 money and time and research to actually put one of
18 these systems together. It's a hybrid wind and
19 solar system, and it's absolutely 21st century,
20 it's home appliance plug-and-play technology, and
21 it's here now, and it's a clear alternative. As
22 an example, if 10,000 homes in Vermont were to do
23 the same identical system that I did on my home,
24 it would be using power point-source use, it would
25 improve the efficiency of the grid, and it would

1 meet the legislature's mandate of 500 megawatts of
2 renewable power by 2015. To give you an example
3 of how efficient this system is, when Lowell
4 project had to shut down for high winds and ice,
5 my roof mill was still going. They're rated to
6 withstand 120 meters per second. That's 130 miles
7 an hour of sustained winds without damage.
8 There's no bat kill. They're a human scale. They
9 can see them. I'll sit up there, and the bats are
10 flying around my head getting moths while my
11 little roofmill's going away, spinning away. I
12 make about 900 kilowatt hours a month. My light
13 bill has gone down by \$180 and, after very little
14 money, I could actually produce all the power I
15 consume. It's a new structure with bond-proof, a
16 user-friendly appliances. This alternative should
17 be explored to its fullest because it would meet
18 the mandate and solve a lot of the problems that
19 are in front of us.

20 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

21 So that's it for the sign-up. I'm at
22 5:58. Mr. Nelson, do you need to come back and
23 say something else?

24 THE SPEAKER: Yeah. One last thing,
25 I had was, Richard said that this is the greatest

1 thing that happened since the Eden mines. Well,
2 the Eden mines are a \$500 million mess, and we got
3 one more mountain we're making a mess out of.
4 Have we got any more mountains in Lowell? How
5 many more dead races do we go for before we don't
6 have any mountains left?

7 CHAIRWOMAN EASTMAN: Thank you.

8 Thanks very much for taking the time to
9 come. We'll take other comments on the website or
10 any other path you want to use. Thank you.

11 (The hearing adjourned at 6:69 p.m.)

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

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

I, Marilee J. Young, Court Reporter and Notary Public, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 2 through 90, inclusive, are a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes of the Public Hearing of the Energy Generation Siting Policy Commission held on February 12, 2013, in Lowell, Vermont, starting at 5:00 p.m., and transcribed by me with use of computer-aided transcription and produced under my supervision.

My commission expires February 10, 2015

February 22, 2013

mjy