September 26, 2024

Dear members of the Vermont Public Utility Commission, Edward McNamara, Margaret Cheney, and Riley Allen,

We write to ask you to extend the permitting for issuing a certificate of public good for the Vermont Renewable Gas, LLC project, case number 24-2797-PET from the expedited 248j 30 day process to a full 248 permit process.

We do not believe that the public interest is satisfied by the procedures established for a 248j permit process. There are too many questions around the criteria for this to qualify for a 248j process that still need to be answered to the public's satisfaction.

The technology of this plant is unproven and untested. Developers have shared that if built, they plan to build many others in Vermont. Our questions about the plant's impact on public safety and health, economic impacts, cost effectiveness, system stability and reliability, environmental impacts, and greenhouse gas and climate impacts **have not been adequately addressed** by the information submitted under this process so far. Below are some of the questions we would like you to address.

Cost and safety of the technology

Given the uncertain economic, health, safety, and environmental impacts of this plant, how can we know what the impact of this plant as part of a larger buildout would be on the orderly development of the region?

What are the public health and safety risks given this is an untested technology and the release of air pollutants?

What is High Temperature Ablative Pyrolysis (HTAP) and what are its impacts? HTAP is a kind of pyrolysis that has never been used in the United States. VRG - Lyndon would be the first project in the USA. Will this facility be prone to gumming up and fouling of equipment, and corrosion from the compounds in the gasses? Will it have a tendency to explode and burn? What threats does it pose to the Lyndon community?

Health and Environmental Impacts

Will we know how much pollution is associated with the production of electricity, other fuels and biochar at this site?

What would specific air quality impacts be from trucks bringing materials to the plant and emissions in the valley in which the plant would be situated? Do the developers expect the need to vent the system often (and if so, how will that impact air quality)?

System Reliability

Why have these plants failed elsewhere? How can we be sure that this plant will not cause a serious public safety risk and fail? How then, can we establish this plant's system stability and reliability?

Cost to Ratepayers and Economic Impacts

How would this addition of 8 jobs measure up against the economic losses resulting from building this plant? Will the climate, social, and ecological impact resulting from the use of biomass to fuel this facility and the associated pollution negatively impact the economy through economic loss to local businesses, from increased public health costs and costs resulting from storm and other climate change disaster infrastructure damage and crop failure?

What would the economic benefit be of lower cost solutions, instead of this plant, such as weatherization, air and ground source heat pump and solar installation?

The power generated by this plant would be equally distributed across all Vermont electric utilities. According to a conversation with Lyndon Electric Department, there is no current demand in Lyndon's ratepayer base for a new electricity source. Will this plant result in increasing rates for their ratepayers across Vermont?

Are there more cost effective ways to produce electrical power than burning biomass in this planned facility?

Greenhouse gas impacts could worsen the climate crisis

What would be the greenhouse gas pollution of this plant?

Would the production and transportation of "renewable" natural gas leak methane, one of the most potent greenhouse gasses, into the atmosphere?

Is this facility likely to generate biochar without producing proportionally high amounts of greenhouse gas emissions?

Given the untested nature of this plant, how can we know what the actual greenhouse gas emissions of this plant will be?

Given the fact that greenhouse gas emissions models considered do not incorporate biogenic emissions and those who have developed greenhouse gas lifecycle emissions model admit that these models do not effectively reflect the biogenic and full life-cycle emissions from the burning of biomass, how can we be sure that this plant will not adversely impact our environment, our climate, our economy, and society?

How would we know how well it is performing relative to fuels it is consuming?

Regional Impacts

What precedent would it set for this plant to be approved in Vermont?

In conclusion:

There is much that is unknown and uncertain about this plant given the new and untested nature of this technology. A longer Certificate of Public Good determination process would provide the time for needed fact-finding and understanding the full implications of building such a plant in the Northeast Kingdom.

The public and members of the NEK have a right to learn more and engage in a public robust process around whether or not this plant should be built in their region. The expedited process doesn't allow for the public to engage in the process and voice concerns.

Sincerely,

	First Name	Last Name	Town	Zip	Comments
1	Donna	Smyers	Adamant (Calais)	05640	This should not be considered clean energy. Renewable does not mean clean.
2	Hannah	Dreissigacker	Albany	05827	
3	S Christopher	Jacobs	Albany	05820	
4	Matthew	LeFluer	Alburgh	05440	
5	Stephanie	Moffett Hynds	Arlington	05250	
6	Bryan	Dalton	Arlington	05250	
7	Harry	Adamek	Barnet	05821	
8	Ellie	Adamek	Barnet	05821	
9	Lisa	Adler	Barnet	05821	
10	Sheri	Colby Schenck	Barnet	05861	Please be sure to advertise EVERYWHERE all public hearings and status of this proposed plant. THIS SHOULD NOT BE KEPT SECRET!
11	Sara	Demetry	Barnet	05821	
12	Grace	Gershuny	Barnet	05819	How will the biochar resulting from the pyrolysis be used?
13	Marilyn	Magnus	Barnet	05821	the permit process must be extended to be sure all issues are thoroughly addressed

14	Kathryn	Roosa	Barnet	05821	
15	Wendy	Stein	Barnet	05821	Please grant us time to review. Thank you.
16	Gail	Johnson	Barre	05641	It's hard to believe someone is considering such an environmentally dirty plant , it's like going backwards!
17	Ethan	Smith	Barre	05641	Developers have shared that if built, it plans to build any others in Vermont. *Many others?
18	Susan	Cooley	Barton	05822	
19	Cole	Davisson	Barton	05822	
20	Saloma	Furlong	Barton	05822	
21	Fredrica	Very	Barton	05822	
22	David	Furlong	Barton	05822	More time is needed to consider this project publicly.
23	Laurel	Green	Bellows Falls	05101	
24	Simon	Anguish	Berlin	05602	
25	Jacq	Anguish	Berlin	05602	
26	Karen	Bixler	Bethel	05032	
27	Geoffrey	Gardner	Bradford	05033	
28	Nancy Rae	Mallery	Bradford	05033	There is no need for this. Solar and wind with battery storage can meet our needs. A methane leak could really cause harm to the emissions as well as health.
29	Lauren	Campbell	Brattleboro	05301	
30	Leigh	Marthe	Brattleboro	05301	We need to have more time for education and public comment.
31	Kathy	Urffer	Brattleboro	05301	
32	George	Carvill	Brattleboro	05302	
33	Connie	Green	Brattleboro	05301	
34	Barbara	Thibeault	Brattleboro	05301	
35	John	Woodland	Brattleboro	05301	My understanding is that in the few cases where this technology was used, the projects failed. This alone calls fir a full review. We need to electrify rapidly but not using technology that releases CO2.
36	Eric	Weller	Bridgewater corners	05035	No burning wood for power
37	Diana	Bain	Bridport	05734	Your job is to help Vermont meet its climate goals!

38	William	Thompson	Brighton	05846	
39	Sally	Burrell	Bristol	05443	
40	Sally	Roth	Bristol	05443	I say NO to a biomass plant anywhere in Vermont.
41	Dawn	Taylor	Bristol	05443-4453	
42	Gary	Smith	Bristol	05443	Foolish and counter productive enterprise!
43	Amy	McClellan	Burke	05832	More research needs to be done
44	Sara	Davis	Burlington	05401	
45	Jack	Hanson	Burlington	05401	
46	Hans	Heikel	Burlington	05408	
47	Sylvia	Knight	Burlington	05408	
48	Peter	MacAusland	Burlington	05401	Please do not build this facility. Bad for forests.
49	Trisha	Melton	Burlington	05408	I have a lot of questions
50	Miles	Pahl	Burlington	05405	
51	Ali	Palmer	Burlington	05401	
52	Douglas	Phinney	Burlington	05401	
53	Linda	Quinet	Burlington	05401	
54	Lani	Ravin	Burlington	05401	
55	Leigh	Steele	Burlington	05401	
56	Martin	Wolf	Burlington	05401	1. Why not burn the wood chips directly as with the McNeil Plant in Burlington, and 2) Would safeguards be put in place to prevent other fuels (for example, waste plastics) from being used?
57	Laura	Zakaras	Burlington	05401	
58	Ashley	Adams	Burlington	05401	New combustion infrastructure has no place as we exceed climate and ecological tipping points. Furthermore, An expedited approval process would be deeply unjust to the local community.
59	Mary	Andrews	Burlington	05401	
60	Kimberly	Hunt	Burlington	05408	
61	Lisa	Lax	Burlington	05401	
62	Martha	Whitney	Burlington	05401	
63	John	Brabant	Calais	05640	
64	David	Ellenbogen	Calais	05648	
65	Chris	Gish	Cambridge	05464	

66	Margaret	Stevens	Charlesto	05872	This is a harmful project threatening public and environmental health.
67	Cheryl Joy	Lipton	Chester	05143	
68	Chris	Hardee	Chesterfiel d, NH	03466	Biomass is bad for forests. That's why Burgess Biomass in Berlin filed for bankruptcy!
69	Mark	Klinedinst	Colchester	05446	solar or wind, not methane
70	Patricia	Shine	Concord	05824	
71	Savhanna	Winters	Concord	05858	
72	Rick	Cawley	Corinth	05039	It is time to get away from combustion as a source of electricity. Biomass plants add to the carbon in the atmosphere.
73	Bethany	Barry	Cornwall	05753	This is an appalling idea - methane is deadly and volatile, and Vermont does not need anything producing more emissions to heat our planet. Stop this before it starts!
74	Bethany	Barry	Cornwall	05753	Let's use technology that already works w/o adding greenhouse gases, and woodburning to the mix.
75	Greg	Dennis	Cornwall	05753	
76	Akeo	Maifeld-Carucci	Craftsbury	05827	
77	Craig	Taylor	Craftsbury	05827	
78	Henry	Coe	Danville	05828	Bio Mass burning is an euphemism for carbon-emitting polution. It is not green energy, and is responsible for destruction of much of the lowland hardwood forests in the lower Atlantic states, as pelletized wood is exported to Europe, and it is falsely labeled "renewable energy".
79	Susan	Duckett	Danville	05828	
80	Georgia	Frye	Danville	05819	
81	Cheryl	Gilbert	Danville	05828	
82	Kathrin	Lawlor	Danville	05828	THERE IS NO NEES TO RUSH THIS PROCESS.
83	Jacon	Mayer	Danville	05828	
84	Susannah	Morlock	Danville	05828	This project need to slow way down. Very few people have heard of this technology and I am interested to know how Vermont was chosen to to be the guinea pig. Is it because we are a small population state? Residents of our area need to learn about this project before it is given a green light.
85	Sylvia	Plumb	Danville	05828	

86	John	Rapoza	Danville	05828	
87	Elisabeth	Dorries	Danville	05828	
88	barbara	Huibregtse	Danville	05828	
89	Robert	Stuart	Danville	05828	
90	Walter	Medwid	Derby	05829	
91	s	warthin	Derby	05855	
92	Letitia	Scordino	Dorset	05251	It is ridiculous that burning of wood is not considered a climate hazard. Simple 8th grade biology with tell you so!
93	Gilles	Gerard	Dummer	05301	
94	Eesha	Williams	Dummerst on	05301	
95	Ames	Robb	Duxbury	05676	
96	Caroline	Porter	East Burke	05832	
97	R F	DeLorme	East Burke / Kirby	05832	
98	Elizabeth	Cope	East Charleston	05833	
99	Jim	Hand	East Dorset	05253	I cannot understand that a new, untested technology that burns trees for a fuel can possibly be given expedited status with almost no public input. The PUC has dragged more than one 500kwh solar project through months of process when the only question involved was 'visibility' through screening that PUC's chosen expert approved of.....no noise, no pollution, clean power, bonded site cleanup....and the permit was denied! and now they expedite an untested technology that burns one fuel to make another fuel to make electricity...talk about an inefficient way to make electricty for 8 jobs??? PLease stand back at look at the absurdity of what you are doing.....Jim Hand
100	Jim	Hand	East Dorset	05253	
101	Jim	Hand	East Dorset	05253	Let's see....An unproven technology, burnig carbon storage (trees), all because of incentives.....and if successful, will all future plants get the same 'expedited treatment' while solar projects have go through a daunting 1 to 2 year permitting procass??? Will they also have to post a bond for cleanup at the end of their life?

102	Susan	Riley	East Montpelier	05602	
103	Judy	Dow	Essex	05452	think of the future of our grandchildren.- they deserve a future
104	Gibson	Smith	Essex Junction	05452	This project requires rigorous research and investigation to determine if this new technology can be carried out safely, sustainably and with minimal environmental impact. Protect the pristine beauty of the NE Kingdom.
105	Stephanie	Scherr	Fitzwillam	03447	Vermont’s sister state, New Hampshire, is deeply concerned about fast tracking this plant!
106	joan	alexander	Glover	05839	
107	Ned	Andrews	Glover	05839	
108	Ann	Creaven	Glover	05875	Two wind farms and the state's only dump and now this! Enough!!
109	Clare	Dolan	Glover	05839	
110	Nicholas	Ecker-Racz	Glover	05839	
111	Margaret	George	Glover	05839	
112	Lindsey	Gillette	Glover	05839	We all deserve clean air. Our air quality in this area is hard to find any where else in the world this will harm us all.
113	Mariel	Hess	Glover	05839	
114	Arthur	Hynes	Glover	05875	Not so fast, folks.
115	Shelley	Little	Glover	05839	
116	Patricia	MacNichols	Glover	05839	
117	Sylvia	Manning	Glover	05839	See the several Seven Days articles on biomass energy over last several years.
118	kristen	murphy	Glover	05875	
119	Elizabeth	Nelson	Glover	05875	
120	cheryl	safford	Glover	05839	I agree.We need to pump the brakes.
121	Solveig	Schumann	Glover	05839	
122	Peter	Smyth	Glover	05875	What happened to the proposal for this in MA in 2021? Did it happen?
123	Barbara	Stuart	Glover	05839	The Public needs more advanced notice and inclusion in the process.
124	Joan	Vincent	Glover	05839	
125	Rebecca	Young	Glover	05875	
126	Margaret	Ziegler	Glover	05839	

127	Darlene	Young	Glover	05839	
128	c	armstrong	Greensboro	05842	
129	David	Bamford	Greensboro	05841	
130	Michael	Barnett	Greensboro	05841	Let's not rush into a quick idea on how to generate energy, while not understanding the community and environmental and health impacts
131	iola	Benedict	Greensboro	05841	
132	Andy	Carpenter	Greensboro	05841	
133	Elizabeth	Donlon	Greensboro	05842	
134	harry	hoblin	greensboro	05841	I wonder if there is any offset after considering the logging, chipping, and transportation required and the negative impact on traffic and our wear and tear on our highways.
135	Diane	Irish	Greensboro	05841	Need more info on project. Never heard of it before today.
136	Anna	Kehler	Greensboro	05841	
137	Heather	Lumsden	Greensboro	05842	
138	Lucy	Mitchell	Greensboro	05841	
139	Miriam	Rogers	Greensboro	05841	
140	Elizabeth	Steel	Greensboro	05841	The Vermont Climate Council adopted a set of recommendations regarding the use of biomass for electrical generation in December 2023, which called on the State to conduct an evidence-based study, which includes inputs from Traditional Ecological Knowledge before making policy decisions on the inclusion of biomass as a clean energy source.
141	Anne	Stevens	Greensboro	05841	The local people need more information, please.
142	susan	Cammer	Greensboro	05841	Awful idea
143	Nancy	Riege	Greensboro	05841	

144	Elizabeth	Stabler	Greensboro	05841	The public and members of the NEK have a right to learn more and engage in a public robust informational process. The expedited process doesn't allow for public engagement. Any project of this magnitude requires thorough understanding and the public and citizens in the affected areas must be involved. Questions must bee answered, the governance must be completely transparent and forthcoming. Hopefully, all those pushing for the expedited process are not anticipating financial kickbacks. There is no room for regrets.
145	Mary	Riordan	Greensboro and Norwich	05055	
146	Natasha	Bali	Greensboro bend	05842	
147	Judy	Carpenter	Greensboro Bend	05842	I grew up not far from where this plant would be built and it took years to clean up the river from previous uses--better to take the time to prevent errors and unanticipated effects than to rush through. Why the rush???
148	Mark	Gleicher	Groton	05046	A full hearing on the merits is required here.
149	Barb	Zander	Groton	05046	I have lived in the Northeast Kingdom of Vt for more than 30 years. I am so very very worried about our state becoming the first in the US for this unproven technology. We do not need what appears to be a hazardous/dangerous business situated next to the area's largest daycare. Please make sure that this project is fully and rigorously vetted before it is approved or denied. Thank you.
150	Dennis	Casey	Groton	05046	
151	F	Corr	Guilford	05301	
152	Nancy	Detra	Guilford	05301	I don't want this plant rammed through on an expedited track when its neighbors haven't had a chance to learn about it.
153	Bert	Picard	Guilford	05301	
154	Carol	Schnabel	Guilford	05301	
155	John	Donovan	Hanover	03755	
156	Andrea	Brightenback	Hardwick	05843	
157	Harold	McCoy	Hardwick	05843	Good idea to take a closer look
158	susan	johnson	Hartford	05001	

159	Andrew	McLaughlin	Hartland	05091	
160	Janis	Murcic	Hartland	05048	
161	Peter	Erb	Hinesburg	05461	
162	Suzie	McCoy	Hinesburg	05461	
163	William	Scott	Hinesburg	05461	I thinks that this is one more part of VGS's strategy to protect its fracked gas business by adding new dirty fuel sources branded as clean energy - see in particular the Clean Heat Standard in which VGS is included with fossil importers as an Obligated Party that positions it to become the dominant player in VT thermal energy. I suggest that you very carefully watch for this when the PUC proposal on the is released. This expedited approval is indicative of their influence over VT energy policy. What is the role of the legislature in this project?
164	Rachel	Smolker	Hinesburg	05461	As codirector of Biofuelwatch for 18 years I have seen MANY such proposals approved and then fail. Mark my words - this one is bound to fail! Dont waste time and money on it. Beware greenwash
165	Lynn	Furno	Hinesburg	05461	
166	Lynn	Furno	Hinesburg	05461	
167	Anne	Dannenberg	Huntington	05462	Agree - the proper procedure must be followed.
168	David	Feurzeig	Huntington	05462	
169	Jeanne	Desrochers	Irasburg	05845	
170	Vicki	Gentler	Irasburg	05822	
171	Howard	Gentler	Irasburg	05822	
172	Anne	Lynch	Irasburg	05845	
173	Elaina	Buursma	Jacksonville	05342	
174	Judy	Wade	Jericho	05465	
175	Michael	Kane	Kirby	05832	
176	Cynthia	Keith	Lancaster	03584	I live just across the border from Lunenburg VT, 25 miles from Lyndonville, and I share the concerns in this petition.
177	Elizabeth	Nestler	Lebanon, NH and Sutton, VT	03766 and 05867	
178	Mark	Benton	Lincoln	05443	Absolutely not to anymore methane production!!!!!

179	Mary	Gemignani	Lincoln	05443	
180	Nancy	Bailey	Londonderry	05148	
181	Martha	Elmes	Lyndon	05851	
182	Charles	Fergus	Lyndon	05832	
183	Madeline &Ernest	Hastings	Lyndon	05849	
184	Garet	Nelson	Lyndon	05850	
185	Jon	Prue	Lyndon	05851	
186	Tim	Sturm	Lyndon	05851	Let's ask questions as if our children's lives depend on the answers.
187	Julie	Sturm	Lyndon	05849	
188	Thomas	De Carlo	Lyndonville	05851	
189	Vera	Hawkins	Lyndonville	05851	
190	Isaac	Leafe	Lyndonville	05851	
191	Isaac	Leafe	Lyndonville	05851	
192	John	Ling	Lyndonville	05851	My business is less than 300 feed from the proposed build site and their is no way we will not have some air quality effect if this project goes through. This type of plant should be located minimum .5 miles from any residence or business already in operation.
193	David	Martin	Lyndonville	05851	
194	Walter	Morris	Lyndonville	05851-8458	Meaningful process is critical, to preserve public confidence in decision making, and facilitate community acceptance of the proposed project, if approved.
195	Penelope	Patch	Lyndonville	05851	
196	Linda	Whitcomb	Lyndonville	05851	
197	mary	durland	Manchester	05255	
198	Polly	Jones	Manchester	05250	
199	Anne	Dolivo	Manchester Center	05255	No more biomass!
200	Christine	Anderson	Manchester Center	05255	
201	Anne	Jameson	Marshfield	05658	
202	Becca	Mandigo	Marshfield	05658	

203	Amabel	Siorghlas	Marshfield	05658	
204	Jessie	Bodette	Middlebury	05753	
205	Maija	Chamberlain	Middlebury	05753	
206	John	Cook	Middlebury	05753	
207	Talia	Trigg	Middlebury	05753	
208	Roger	White	Middlebury	05753	
209	Sarah	Ashe	Middlebury	05753	
210	Wallace	Elton	Middlebury	05753	Biomass is not clean energy I'm my opinion until you prove otherwise.
211	Lily	Snow	Middlebury	05754	It makes no sense to me to expedite something that we know do little about! This is exactly why we have a permit process - to ensure safety.
212	Arthur aka Leger	Grindon	Middlebury, Vermont	05753	
213	Linda	Buckley	Middlesex	05682	common sense
214	Karen	Gennette	Middlesex	05602-8621	
215	Carol	Maloney	Middlesex	05602	
216	Melissa	Chesnut-Tangerman	Middletown Springs	05757	
217	Elizabeth	Cooper	Middletown Springs	05757	
218	Sean	Ruck	Middletown Springs	05757	
219	Mark	Boltz-Robinson	Monkton	05443	While I may not reside in the NEK, there is considerable concern for the precedent this sets for the rest of the state, given VRG's claim to build more after this one.
220	Jane	Palmer	Monkton	05473	
221	Barbara	Burnett	Montpelier	05602	The precautionary principle should be used here--don't cut corners when you aren't sure of the consequences.
222	Nolan	Carver	Montpelier	05602	
223	Marisa	Keller	Montpelier	05602	
224	Deborah	Lisman	Montpelier	05602	
225	Maeve	McCurdy	Montpelier	05602	
226	Jeff	Nitzberg	Montpelier	05602	
227	Zack	Porter	Montpelier	05602	

228	Zack	Porter	Montpelier	05601	
229	Alice	Silverman	Montpelier	05602	
230	Samuel	Silverman	Montpelier	05602	I think that the concept of public input in regard to decisions that effect the whole community is fundamental no matter what town you live in.
231	Katharine	Whiteley	Montpelier	05602	
232	Mary	Zentara	Montpelier	05602-3301	Yikes - pump the breaks, please!
233	Maryalice	Bisbee	Montpelier	05602	Methane is a NO NO!
234	Rachael	Timberlake	Montpelier	05602	
235	Sybil	Schlesinger	Moretown	05660	
236	Richard	Parey	Morgan	05853	
237	John	Meyer	Morrisville	05661	
238	Barbara	McKay	N. Ferrisburgh	05473	Biomass is a false solution! Do better, Vermont!
239	Eileen	Donohoe	Newark	05871	Strongly agree that thorough research is needed prior to any construction of such an unknown project. Many complex questions,
240	Kim	Fried	Newark	05871	Just another case of a developer putting the rural Vermont counties at risk for profit under the umbrella of climate change
241	Thomas	Kidder	Newbury	05085	
242	denise	niemira	Newport	05855	
243	Peter	Powell	Newport	O5855	
244	Sarah	Lincoln	North Ferrisburgh	05473	
245	Rebecca	Dalgin	Northfield	05663	
246	Kelly	Wantuch	Northfield	05663	
247	Liz	Blum	Norwich	05055	There is nothing good or safe about biomass.
248	Courtney	Dobyns	Norwich	05055	I agree with the well-phrased questions asked and the issues raised in this petition. Even though I don't live in Lyndonville, my grandchildren do. The potential air quality and environmental impacts of this project must be looked at closely. To my mind wood is not a renewable, green energy resource. My son built a zero energy house and heats with a heat pump. He is thinking of putting up solar panels on a new garage. I am

					concerned that permitting this project will set a precedent for other similar projects.
249	Stephen	Foltz	Norwich	05055	
250	Eli	Hecht	norwich	05055	
251	Suzanne	Leiter	Norwich	05055	
252	Ulrike	von Moltke	Norwich	05055	
253	James	Antal	Norwich	05055	
254	Nancy	Philips	Norwich	05055	
255	Andy	Snyder	Orwell	05760	
256	Stephanie	Sloman	Pascoag	02859	I do not live in VT, but I visit there every year. VT is a beautiful and clean state. Let's please keep it clean!
257	Anita	Pomerance	Pawlet	05761	
258	Jane	Alper	Peacham	05862-0252	
259	Jane	Alper	Peacham	05862-0252	
260	Jill	Hurst	Peacham	05268	
261	Bess	O'Brien	Peacham	05821	
262	Andrea	Otto	Peacham	05819	Public comment is so important, especially when impactful development is being considered. Thank you.
263	Becky	Atchinson	Plainfield	05667	
264	Marcy	Baer	Plainfield	05667	
265	Seth	Mullendore	Plainfield	05667	This is not the path forward.
266	J.M.	Waterman	Plainfield	05667	
267	Bob	Atchinson	Plainfield	05667	Please take the time to get this right, for our children, grandchildren, and yours... Bob
268	Donna	Thomas	Plainfield	05668	
269	Benjamin	Martin	Plattsburgh	12903	
270	Margaret	Coady	Pownal	05261	
271	Richard	Bissell	Putney	05346	
272	Brian	Cali	Reading	05062	
273	Mary	Oberly	Readsboro	05350	
274	Megan	Worthington	Ripton	05766	

275	Stephen	Crofter	Rockingham	05101	
276	William	Murphy	Royalton	05068	No
277	Candy	Jones	Rutland	05701	
278	Tracey	Forest	Shaftsbury	05257	
279	Dee	Gish	Sharon	05065	
280	Jeff	Phillips	Shelburne	05482-7783	Do we have other preferred options to this proposal to obviate the climate impacts?
281	Gunnar	Sievert	Shelburne	05482	
282	Mary	Van Vleck	Shelburne,	05482	I gather that there is dissatisfaction with the electric plant in Burlington, and this proposed plant is very similar, also starting with wood chips.
283	Mary	Worthington	Shoreham	05770	
284	Stephen	Crowley	South Burlington	05403	
285	Samuel	Smith	South Burlington	05403	
286	Clifford	Bennett	South Duxbury	05660	I support Solar Power. We Humans need trees and other plants to help clean the air which is being polluted, provides food and helps water/rain.
287	Danette	Harris	South Strafford	05070	Thanks for considering putting the brakes on this until we know much more!
288	Susan	Hodges	South Strafford	05070	Please do the right thing: delay approval until a full process has been completed not just a quick turnaround. There is too much at stake.
289	Vanessa	Rule	South Strafford	05070	
290	Michael Scot	Zens	South Strafford	5070	
291	Steven	Clark	South Wheekick	05851	
292	June	Goodband	Springfield	05156	
293	L.Beebe	Potter	St Albans City	05477	I have many questions about this plant and process, including those stated above. Given plans to expand the number of plants within Vermont and the Region, it seems that a cautious approach is needed. Please begin a regular review process and stopping current expedited one.The citizens of Vermont deserve better.

294	pete	blose	St Johnsbury	05819	
295	Philip	Brown	ST JOHNSBURY	05819	
296	Catherine	Grant	St Johnsbury	05819	
297	Kathy	Gray	St Johnsbury	05819	Very very strongly oppose expedited approval
298	Kathy	Gray	St Johnsbury	05819	
299	Kathleen	Haines	St Johnsbury	05819	
300	David	Horton	St Johnsbury	05819	
301	Stephen	Kline	St Johnsbury	05819	
302	Roger	Mier	ST JOHNSBURY	05819	Thanks for looking out for the little guy.
303	Pam	Parker	St Johnsbury	05838	
304	Neil	Raphel	St Johnsbury	05819	
305	Michelle	Rutman	St Johnsbury	05819	Please complete a full review and give community the opportunity to respond!
306	Richard	Smith	St Johnsbury	05819	
307	lia	byrnes	St Johnsbury	05819	
308	Catherine	Cost	St johnsbury	05819	
309	PATRICK	Kennedy	St Johnsbury	05819	HOW ABOUT A BIOMASS PELLET PLANT? THAT WE COULD USE, INSTEAD OF PEOPLE BURNING WOOD WASTE.
310	Denise	Perry	St Johnsbury	05819	
311	Michelle	Rutman	St Johnsbury	05819	This proposed plant requires full evaluation with community participation
312	Katherine	Skahan	St Johnsbury	05819	

313	Greg	MacDonald	ST JOHNSBURY CENTER	05863	Issuing a Certificate for the Public Good without allowing questions and concerns from the affected communities has the appearance of the PUC working more to protect the interests of the corporation, rather than the citizens that the PUC is appointed to serve.
314	Anne	Amos	St. Johnsbury	05819	
315	Michele	Authier	St. Johnsbury	05819	
316	Scott	Beck	St. Johnsbury	05819	Thank you for helping to ensure that caution prevails.
317	Edward	Behr	St. Johnsbury	05819	
318	Florence	Chamberlin	St. Johnsbury	05819	
319	Kathryn	Cote	St. Johnsbury	05819	I want more information on environmental and health impacts of this new technology for producing electricity and information on how and where this electricity will be used and proof that this is needed in our area?
320	Barbara	Edelman	St. Johnsbury	05819	
321	Valeria	Elliott	St. Johnsbury	05819	
322	Matthew	Elliott	St. Johnsbury	05819	Thank you for considering the merits of this petition.
323	Diane	Holmes	St. Johnsbury	05819	Please stop the fast track of this until we have more information.
324	Gwen	Kinney	St. Johnsbury	05819	This potential development needs muuch deeper consideration than the fast track approach allows.
325	Thor	Magnus	St. Johnsbury	05819	Put the brakes on please
326	Brenda	Meierdiercks	St. Johnsbury	05819	Slow down
327	Jill	Minkoff	St. Johnsbury	05819	There are too many concerns with this to expedite the review. Even with a more thorough review, it seems to be risky for humans and for our environment. Send, the amount of energy that seems to create is not worth the risk.
328	Richard	Moye	St. Johnsbury	05819	There is no hurry for a review of a first-in-the nation energy facility.

329	John	Perry	St. Johnsbury	05819	Good work getting on this!
330	Madeline	Robertson	St. Johnsbury	05819	
331	Tucker	Tirey	St. Johnsbury	05819	
332	Edward	Morgan	St. Johnsbury	05819	What’s the rush in permitting this project? Do a thorough Environmental Impact Study, and involve the citizens who will be most affected!
333	Janis	Raye	St. Johnsbury	05819	
334	Otto	Wurzburg	St. Johnsbury	05819	
335	Penny	Kimball	St. Johnsbury Center	05863	
336	Sigurd	Andersen	St. Johnsbury, VT	05819	I'm having a difficult time figuring out benefits that come close to outweighing the seeming negative consequences of what's being proposed.
337	Kelly	Kennedy	St.Johnsbury	05819	
338	Lynn	Wurzburg	St.Johnsbury	05819	I am extremely concerned about the possible negative impacts of this project and feel it has not been transparently presented to the public. I live close to the industrial park, so would be affected by it. I am also a member of the St.Johnsbury Town Energy Committee and we have severe doubts that this biogas plant would probably net benefit to the NEK. There remain many unanswered questions about it.
339	Forest	Willman	Starksboro	05443	
340	Phillip	Merrick	Starksboro	05453	
341	Katharine	Mackie	Strafford	05072	This technology needs more study. It failed in Germany.
342	Rebecca	Seibel	Strafford	05070	
343	Stephen	Maleski	Sutton	05867	Why consider such a project in a valley noted for extensive and long-lasting thermal inversions?
344	Martha	Tack	Sutton	05867	We need time at least to understand what the process of this plant is, and its impact.
345	Bill	Keegan	Thetford	05088	

346	Debra	Kraemer	Thetford Center	05075	The local people need to be informed and consulted and vote on this issue.
347	Bob	Walker	Thetford Center	05075	
348	Richard	Biddle	Thetford Center	05075	The public needs to know the full impacts of this proposed biomass plant. CO2 and emissions being foremost.
349	Henry	Swayze	Tunbridge	05077	Carbon emissions and the los of carbon captured should become a prime factor in all biomass energy projects.
350	Jarryd	Audette	Underhill	05489	
351	Rick	Peyser	Underhill	05489	
352	Wendy	Andersen	Underhill	05489	
353	Ethan	B	Vermont	05401	Enough of these ludicrous expedited massively impactful development projects w/out adequate time and opportunity for public input, review and approval. This is not what our state needs, but more likely what a few wealthy powerful interests want. Stop!
354	Joanna	Hamlin	Vershire	05079	
355	Robert	Arnell	Walden	05836	
356	Katey	Foster	Walden	05836	
357	suzanna	jones	Walden	05836	
358	DAVID	MATTE	Walden	05873	
359	Emma	Podolin	Walden	05836	
360	Jay	Stetzel	Waltham	05491	
361	Carol Lee	Rawn	Warren	05674	
362	Callie	Willis	Warren	05674	I kind of thought with the McNeil plant controversy that it was determined that biomass is not a good option and definitely not environmentally sound.
363	William	April	Waterbury Ctr	05677	
364	Shawn	Hallisey	Waterford	05819	
365	Ann	Hare	Waterford	05819	
366	Miriam	Simon	Waterford	05819	
367	Richard M	Roderick	Wells River	05081	It doesn't make swnse to close down Ryegate to build a new plant in Lyndon.
368	Kuenzi	Wiswall	WEST DANVILLE	05873	More research needs to be done before a plant of this kind is permitted and the people who live here

					need to be informed and involved in this decision making process.
369	Melissa	Freitag	West Glover	05975	The public and neighboring communities need TIME to assess this project, and provide comments! Do this project TRANSPARENTLY, please. No need to rush...~MCF
370	sarah	samsara	West glover	05875	Were trying to FIX the environment around us, let's stop asking for problems by building industrial parks we don't need
371	Lucille	Smith	West Glover	05875	
372	Earl	Hatley	West Hartford	05001	Please give this petition serious consideration, for sake of public health, environmental protection and the climate! Thank you!
373	Susan	Yost	West Windsor	05089	Please don’t permit this plant.
374	Richard	YOST	West Windsor	05089	
375	Anne	Lazor	Westfield	05874	The PUC has a responsibility to provide more information to the people of Lyndon and the surrounding area. Answers to questions presented in this petition would be a good start.
376	Diane Z.	Lehder	Westmore	05860	
377	Kim	Crady-Smith	Wheelock	05851	
378	Tune	Faulkner	Wheelock	05851	
379	Michael	Reddy	Wheelock	05851	No one even knows about this in lyndonville and Wheelock. There can be no informed consent without information. This process needs to slow down to allow the public’s understanding to catch up!
380	Matthew	Scott	Wheelock	05851	
381	Rye	Keller	White River Junction	05001	
382	Laura	Simon	White River Junction	05001	
383	Randy	Kritkausky	Whiting	05778	

384	Carolyn	Schmidt	Whiting	05778	My experience (in Northeastern Pennsylvania in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s) with new technologies being rushed into rural areas was that, without fail, these were potentially ecologically devastating efforts to enrich the developers at the expense of the residents and environment being targeted. It is deeply upsetting to see the same process happening in Vermont - I moved here in 2000 in large part because Vermont had stronger state environmental protections, so grassroots citizens did not continually play "whack a mole" with our own financial, mental and energy resources.
385	Elizabeth	Ezerman	Williston	05495	Last thing we/climate need is cutting trees (which suck up CO2) for wood chips and potentially leaking methane which is significantly worse than CO2 in the short term for the climate.
386	Brian	Forrest	Williston	05495	It's time we address head-on the issue behind why we are fighting this proposed plant: the idea that "fossil Fuels" are bad, but bio-energy sources are "good". The EPA has made it clear that this is okay at the Federal level and the state is happy to followed suit, which allows the ANR to meet their GWSA goals. We need to address this misconception at all levels of government or permits will be issued and we'll always be fighting from behind, not getting ahead of developers who start permits years before we get wind of their projects.

387	Kimberly	Hornung Marcy	Williston	05495	Biomass that burns trees or pyrolysis that uses trees is not healthy or good for the planet. When you burn trees you return all that carbon right back to the atmosphere instantly. Pyrolysis is also known to release toxic chemicals. And with pyrolysis, you are still removing the trees from the forest, stopping them from sequestering carbon. The older the tree the more it sequesters. Over 1,000 IPCC scientists have signed a letter to President Biden and other leaders saying that burning trees is not net zero—in fact the opposite and nor is burning trees renewable—we don't have time to wait for a tree to grow back to the age it was when burned or consumed by pyrolysis. See that letter here: https://www.woodwellclimate.org/letter-regarding-use-of-forests-for-bioenergy/ It is old rejected science that believes burning or using pyrolysis for trees is net-zero and renewable. Trees should be logged only for wood products that sequester carbon not for burning or pyrolysis. We have better/cleaner ways to produce electricity. Solar and Wind are much cleaner and do not create methane the most potent green house gas. This proposal is not needed, not fair, polluting and a climate wrecking way to make electricity. We do not want these kinds of false solutions. We want wind, solar, small scale hydro that does not flood land, weatherization, of buildings. These bring good green jobs to Vermont, that do not wreck the climate but help us slow down climate change. In addition biochar is best used in tropical soils not in northern New England.
388	Jack	Locker	Williston	05495	
389	Sue	Graup	Wilmington	05363	
390	Sue	Graup	Wilmington	05363	
391	Julianna	Brazill	Winooski	05404	
392	Rita	Pitkin	Wolcott	05680	
393	Patrick	Flood	Woodbury	05650	
394	Anne	Dean	Woodstock	05091	
395	Deborah	Goodman	Woodstock	05091	