Exhibit 3

Burke, Dan

From: Smythe, Collin
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 1:21 PM
To: McNamara, Ed
Subject: RE: Data question

No problem at all Ed, glad I could be of assistance!

Collin

From: McNamara, Ed <Ed.McNamara@vermont.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 12:14 PM
To: Smythe, Collin <Collin.Smythe@vermont.gov>
Subject: RE: Data question

Thanks Collin! Appreciate you looking at this so quickly, and the catch on the language.
Ed

From: Smythe, Collin <Collin.Smythe@vermont.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 10:48 AM
To: McNamara, Ed <Ed.McNamara@vermont.gov>
Subject: RE: Data question

Hi Ed,

Thanks for reaching out! I'm taking a look at the workbook you sent me, and not knowing much yet about the thermal or electric use of GF specifically (they would be captured in the RCI sector of the inventory). I get the similar value for semiconductor manufacturing as a percentage of the total of the inventory (2.3% for 2019). I will dig into the thermal and electricity usage, but for electricity that has got to be pretty small, because our total GHG emissions from the electricity sector are pretty small (and I don't believe they have to report that data to EPA – at least I don't see it in there). It looks like the fuel usage you are using for the thermal piece is what they reported to EPA, and when I convert the scf of NG to metric tons of CO2 it is about the same as what they list, so I don't think there is anything wrong with the calculations. Bottom line, I think the 3% value you come up with seems pretty accurate to me, unless there is an issue with what they are actually reporting, but I don't have any reason to think that.

In terms of the language below, I would probably need to defer to Peter for our official ANR answer. I think it sounds good to me, but would just flag that my understanding of the GWSA is that it is really only mandating ANR to come up with a plan to reduce GHG emissions and those reductions are required to be by sector and are based on the relative percent contributions (at least currently), so I'm not sure if it's technically accurate to say that GWSA requires reductions from VT sources. I think it will end up being true in going forward with the Climate Council and GWSA process, so it's probably just me being too detailed/concerned with language, but just wanted to flag in case you felt it was important. I think the rest of it is good, and like the last sentence.

I hope that's helpful, but if you would like to discuss more, or want me to dig deeper into anything specific, please just let me know.

Thanks!

Collin

From: McNamara, Ed <Ed.McNamara@vermont.gov>
Sent: Sunday, June 20, 2021 9:17 AM
To: Smythe, Collin <Collin.Smythe@vermont.gov>
Subject: Data question

Hi Collin,

I'm working on Global Foundries and I'm not confident on what I'm coming up with for GF as a percent of VT GHG emissions (3%).
Can you please take a look at the attached spreadsheet and also the draft language below? The 2016-2020 numbers in the spreadsheet are from GF.

Thanks,
Ed

The 2020 Global Warming Solutions Act ("GWSA") mandates GHG reductions from Vermont sources. GF is the largest private employer and one of the largest energy users in Vermont. In addition, its chip manufacturing process is a significant GHG emitter for Vermont. According to the most recent GHG Inventory, semiconductor manufacturing emitted 0.193 MMTCO2e, which represents 34.1% of GHG emissions from the Industrial Processes sector. In terms of a five-year average of its facility's emissions, GF emits 295,011 MTCO2e with 79% coming from semiconductor manufacturing, 13% from thermal usage, and 8% from electric usage. Collectively, this represents approximately 3% of Vermont's GHG emissions. To the extent that GF does not have a clear, mandatory path for GHG reductions, all other Vermonters will need to do proportionately more to reduce GHG emissions from other businesses and individual actions.