

STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Case No. 24-2797-PET

Petition of Vermont Renewable Gas, LLC for a Certificate of Public Good pursuant to 30 V.S.A. § 248 for a Farm Methane Facility in Lyndon, Vermont	
---	--

MOTION FOR SCHEDULE

Intervenors Steve Dolgin, Ernest and Madeline Hastings, John Ling, and Mark Simakaski move to request that a schedule be set for this Vermont Renewable Gas (VRG) case.

On January 23, 2026, VRG filed a Motion to Alter Schedule “to allow VRG to respond to requests from the Agency of Natural Resources, Agency of Agriculture Farm and Markets, and Public Service Department for additional information relating to the proposed project and to engage in good faith discussions regarding the development of memoranda of understandings if the agencies desire”... after having “conferred with Counsel for the Vermont Public Service Department, Agency of Agriculture Food and Markets, and Agency of Natural Resources in the development of this proposed enlargement of time and all three support this motion.”

The schedule for this case, as established in the Hearing Officer’s “Order Establishing Schedule” of October 30, 2025, set the date for non-petitioner pre-filed testimony as January 30, 2026. VRG requested a two month delay and suggested the new deadline for non-petitioning parties’ prefiled testimony to be March 31, 2026.

Although VRG’s Motion to Alter Schedule was timely filed and in accordance with the PUC’s rule requiring such requests to be made at least three days in advance of the deadline, the PUC Hearing Officer did not respond by January 31, 2026, and to date has not responded.

On January 30, 2026, intervenors filed notice in the case that because of VRG's Motion to Alter Schedule and the lack of response, intervenors would not be filing prefiled testimony by January 31, 2026. Intervenors supported VRG's requested schedule change.

Intervenors now withdraw support for VRG's proposed schedule. This case currently has no schedule. The previous deadline for submitting prefiled testimony as established in the Hearing Officer's scheduling order has passed. No new deadline has been set because the Hearing Officer has not responded to VRG's requested schedule change.

At no time prior to VRG's filing of the Motion to Alter Schedule, or subsequently, have the intervenors been contacted by anyone, including VRG, PSD, AAFM, or ANR.

Intervenors renew the request for a Site Visit and Public Hearing prior to filing pre-filed testimony. If PSD, AAFM and ANR are entering into MOUs or stipulated agreements, Intervenors need to see the substance of those agreements prior to submitting prefiled testimony.

Intervenors also request that the Hearing Officer review the process this case has gone through, with its initial filing as a Section 248(j) case, and later conversion to Section 248. Petitioner has effectively subverted the Section 248 public process because the PUC proceeded with the Section 248(j) 30-day deadline for motions to intervene, instead of the normal Section 248 process which first has a scheduling conference, then a site visit and public hearing, after which there is a deadline for motions to intervene. Intervenors request that the full Section 248 process be held in this case.

Intervenors request that a schedule be set for this case going forward, including a site visit, public hearing and new deadline for motions to intervene, followed by disclosure of and

discovery on VRG's negotiations with DPS, AAFM and ANR, after which non-petitioner prefiled testimony is due.

Intervenors will not be submitting pre-filed testimony on the date suggested by VRG, March 31, 2026, which has not been ruled on by the PUC Hearing Officer and because there is no schedule in this case.

Respectfully submitted this 16th day of March, 2026 in St. Johnsbury on behalf of Intervenors Steve Dolgin, Ernest and Madeline Hastings, John Ling, and Mark Simakaski,

/s/ Steve Dolgin
Steve Dolgin
54 Cliff St.
St. Johnsbury, Vermont
(518) 645-6830
dolgins@westelcom.com