

From: [Landis-Marinello, Kyle](#)
To: paul.brouha@gmail.com
Cc: danderson@denise-anderson.law; PUC - Clerk
Subject: RE: Rule 2 workshop
Date: Monday, January 4, 2021 8:50:14 AM

Mr. Brouha,

Thank you for this email. I'll bring these helpful suggestions to the staff team for discussion. I can also reassure you that we're not going to confine the January 21, 2021 workshop in any way—we'll make sure there is time to discuss anything that arises, and I anticipate there will be additional workshops going forward. As you suggest, I'll work with our staff team to see whether we can provide additional information about where the next draft is headed.

Also, so you know, I want to make sure that other participants are aware of your suggestions, so I'm cc'ing the Clerk on this email so she can put your comment and my response into the ePUC docket for this rulemaking.

Thank you again, and I look forward to seeing you at the January 21, 2021 workshop.

Best,
Kyle

Kyle Landis-Marinello
General Counsel
Vermont Public Utility Commission
(802) 828-1158
Kyle.Landis-Marinello@vermont.gov

From: paul.brouha@gmail.com <paul.brouha@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 02, 2021 2:31 PM
To: Landis-Marinello, Kyle <Kyle.Landis-Marinello@vermont.gov>
Cc: danderson@denise-anderson.law
Subject: Rule 2 workshop

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Mr. Landis-Marinello, After reading the procedural order setting up the January 21st workshop I feel compelled to contact you for assurance that, as you stated in the 12/17 procedural order, the agenda will not be confined to the single listed topic or, if it is, that you will outline next steps.

In the initial order you stated: "The selection of these topics [on the 12/18 workshop agenda] does not in any way indicate that the Commission is uninterested in, or has rejected in any way, the other matters raised by those who have filed comments." You went on to say the Commission felt prepared to evaluate "straightforward suggestions" without further discussion and that you were "actively reviewing all comments."

I would suggest an alternative to putting the onus on participants or staff “to raise other issues during this workshop, and if there is time to do so, that will also be allowed.” I invite you to clarify where you are leading us by summarizing which “straightforward suggestions” are being evaluated, how the Commission is “actively reviewing all comments” and then encouraging discussion and the raising of additional concerns.

Thank you for your consideration.

Paul Brouha