

November 10, 2021

Please note that my comments are not with regards to this particular project at Richville Road. My questions and concerns are for PUC in general and how VT will meet the greenhouse gas reduction standards if the commission is denying solar projects based on subjective aesthetics criteria. Solar projects don't diminish property values nor have negative impact on environment, wetlands, stormwater runoffs, etc. So, if the PUC authority will continue to make its decisions based on aesthetics vs. the expert opinions of the State Agencies, what is the commission's plan for Vermont to meet its commitments for the renewable energy goals as addressed by the Climate Action Plan to reduce the GHG-emissions by year 2050 by no less than 80% below the 1990 emissions? Vermont needs to replace 700 million gallons PER YEAR of fossil fuels currently used for vehicles, heating, and industry. In order to meet the basic standards of the Climate Action Plan there is going to be some serious electrification around the town of Manchester. To put this into perspective; it's estimated that town of Manchester will need at least 20MW of renewable energy. The Richville project was planned as a 500kW project, therefore Manchester will need at least 40 projects of that size and clearly no one is going to be able to develop roughly 120 acres of solar panels in Manchester without some public visibility. So, I'd like to ask the PUC and the Town of Manchester to sort this out quickly without creating this unnecessary friction between the property owners and the solar projects. The Town of Manchester has an energy plan. Richville Road was not specifically identified in the plan either as a solar site or as a site that should not have solar, however it was granted a "preferred site" status from the Town's SB and PC supporting the project at Richville.

Thank you!

Marek Kovac

Manchester Center, VT  
[mjkovac@gmail.com](mailto:mjkovac@gmail.com)