

Public Comment Forms
Submitted for January 14, 2010
NH Energy & Climate Collaborative Meeting

The opinions expressed in the public comment forms and on documents submitted, or oral statements made during the public comment period are solely those of the submitting parties, and do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the NH Energy and Climate Collaborative, its individual members or the organizations that they represent, the staff of the Collaborative, or the financial supporters of the Collaborative.

NH Energy & Climate Collaborative
Public Speaking Request Form

Whereas the NH Energy & Climate Collaborative meetings are an opportunity for the public to listen to implementation efforts happening around the state toward the Climate Action Plan goals, and whereas the meeting agenda is usually set well in advance of the meeting to cover a large variety of topics, it is required that all members of the public who wish to comment at the end of the Collaborative meeting, during the Public Comment portion of the agenda, do so by completing this Public Speaking Request Form and submitting this request form to the Collaborative Coordinator a *minimum of three days prior to the Collaborative meeting*. This allows the Collaborative members to plan for enough time to address public comment while still allowing enough time to review the rest of the agenda. Please note that the Collaborative can only allow for a two – three minute comment per person but by submitting this public speaking form, your comments on this form will be submitted to all Collaborative members.

Thank You. NH Energy & Climate Collaborative

Submit this complete form to Stacey Doll, Collaborative Coordinator, a minimum of three days prior to the Collaborative meeting at stacey.doll@des.nh.gov. Please put “Collaborative Public Speaking Request” in the subject line of your email

Name: Farrell S. Seiler

Organization/Affiliation: Carbon Action Alliance

Contact Information: 603-568-4916; chair@carbonactionalliance.org

Comment: Request that the NH Energy & Climate Collaborative adopt the following Resolution:

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING FEDERAL CLIMATE CHANGE LEGISLATION

WHEREAS, we already recognize that climate change poses serious risks to the health of our citizens, to our quality of life and to our economic future.

WHEREAS, delays in achieving reductions would result in increased implementation costs, thus reducing their economic benefit and making it more difficult to reach the long-term goal.

WHEREAS, New Hampshire must strive to achieve a long-term reduction in greenhouse gas emissions of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

WHEREAS, the sooner New Hampshire takes action to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions, the less costly it will be for the state, and the less CO₂ that will be emitted into the atmosphere.

WHEREAS, the Climate Action Plan is aimed at achieving the greatest feasible reductions in greenhouse gas emissions while also providing the greatest possible long-term economic benefits to the citizens of New Hampshire.

BE IT HEREBY resolved that New Hampshire continues to endorse strong national climate legislation to complement state efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and prepare for the projected impacts of climate change.

14 January 2010

Name: Jim Rubens

Organization/Affiliation: Union of Concerned Scientists

Contact Information: 603-359-3300, JimRubens@aol.com

Comment:

Could you (Climate Collaborative) update us on scheduling for the potential climate action plan sessions with each of our 2 senators? Could these sessions be structured so that discussion flows both ways as to the extent to which pending senate energy/climate legislation and the NH climate action plan are in sync? Will the public be invited to these sessions? Will brief public comment be permitted?

Name: David Anderson

Organization/Affiliation: Repower America/The Alliance for Climate Protection

Contact Information:

48 Airport Rd.
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 617-0679
David.anderson@climateprotect.org

Comment:

Hello, my name is David Anderson. I am here today on behalf of Repower America, a campaign of the Alliance for Climate Protection.

I'd like to thank the members of the Collaborative for this opportunity to speak. I'd also like to express Repower America's support for your work.

Repower America was launched in 2008 by Al Gore in a pioneering speech that hit the reset button on America's clean energy goals with a bold plan to "repower" our country and revitalize our national energy infrastructure. At its core, Repower America advocates investment in energy efficiency, clean renewable energy sources, a unified smart energy national grid and clean car technology. We currently have more than 12,000 members in the Granite State.

New Hampshire is one of more than thirty states that have developed a Climate Action Plan. Repower America supports the efforts of state governments because they are well positioned to take action on building a clean energy economy and reducing pollutants that cause climate change. Adopting a climate action plan helps a state understand not just how much greenhouse gas emissions they produce, but also what causes those emissions and how they can be reduced. Ultimately, Climate Action Plans proactively guide states toward a clean energy future.

As you know, the New Hampshire Climate Action Plan recognizes the need to support strong climate action at the federal level (GLA 1.6). As such, Repower America encourages the

Collaborative to continue to publicly support passage of comprehensive federal clean energy and climate legislation as part of its mission to oversee and guide the implementation of the New Hampshire Climate Action Plan.

New Hampshire's economy will benefit from comprehensive federal clean energy and climate legislation that will spur unprecedented investment in the U.S. economy and create millions of jobs. An investment of \$650 million in clean energy infrastructure will create nearly 7,700 new jobs in New Hampshire within two years, according to the Center for America Progress. The New Hampshire Action Climate Plan recognizes the job-creating benefits of federal investment in clean energy.

Indeed, we can't afford to wait. Rising temperatures will significantly impact New Hampshire's ski-dependent economy. Over the past decade, 18 of the state's ski areas increased snowmaking to ensure good snow conditions, at a cost of \$24.2 million. If warming trends continue, the length of the winter season may be cut in half by the end of the century, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Again, I'd like to thank the members of the Collaborative for your all of your hard work in support of clean energy solutions to the climate crisis. Thank you for your time.

Name: Charles Daloz

Organization/Affiliation: Daloz Mill and Farm BioCultural Center

Contact Information: cdaloz@myfairpoint.net

Comment:

I am unclear whether the Thursday meeting is technical or legislative, but I urge you not to ignore micro-hydro-power from non-hazard or low hazard dams--18 sites previously used in the town of Hancock alone !! thousands statewide !!!

Also about carbon sequestration: consider funding "increased organic matter" in state farmlands. 1% increase in OM = 2,000 lbs CO2 or some such. Increased organic matter (ie. bound carbon in soil) is good for productivity of soil, farmers, community and earth's atmosphere. Increased organic matter in farmers' fields and our forests is also relatively easy to monitor, administer, and evaluate. Every town has a Grange or Ag Commission or Soil Conservation group.

For the Greening, Charles Daloz

Daloz Mill and Farm BioCultural Center

Name: Jill Longval

Organization/Affiliation: Nashua Regional Planning Commission

Contact Information: jill@nashuarpc.org, 603-424-2240 x27

Comment:

The Nashua Regional Planning Commission (NRPC) would like to thank the Collaborative for the opportunity to provide input and would like to share some of the success we have had in integrating land use and transportation planning. Through our iTRaC program, NRPC helps communities to deal with the challenges of growth in a manner that sustains community character and fosters a sense of place. This is accomplished by integrating transportation, land use, and environmental planning in accordance with the NH Office of Energy and Planning's Smart Growth Principles. iTRaC is a comprehensive program with services that support the diverse needs of our local communities. These include community specific special projects designed to implement integrated planning principles; resource cards, fact sheets, and short guidebooks on current planning topics; individualized trainings; and a lending library. One of our guidebooks that might be of particular interest to the Collaborative is "Making the Connection: a guide to achieving comprehensive land use and transportation planning." NRPC's iTRaC program was established in 2006 and has very strong support from our member communities. We have recently begun exploring ways to incorporate energy issues into the program and look forward to deepening this connection through initiatives such as Smart Commute Week and Transportation Demand Management. In short, we believe that we and the other Regional Planning Commissions can play a significant role in helping to implement the NH Climate Action Plan's recommendations.

Name: Alexander Lee

Organization/Affiliation: Project Laundry List

Contact Information: 603-226-3098 or alee@laundrylist.org

Comment: *Household actions can provide a behavioral wedge to rapidly reduce US carbon emissions*, a technical paper written by Thomas Dietza, Gerald T. Gardner, Jonathan Gilligan, Paul C. Stern, and Michael P. Vandenbergh and published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences is an important document for this collaborative to consider. See <http://www.pnas.org/content/106/44/18452.full#xref-ref-10-1>.

Most climate change policy attention has been addressed to long-term options, such as inducing new, low-carbon energy technologies and creating cap-and-trade regimes for emissions. These authors use a behavioral approach to examine the reasonably achievable potential for near-term reductions by altered adoption and use of available technologies in US homes and nonbusiness travel. They estimate the plasticity of 17 household action types in 5 behaviorally distinct categories by use of data on the most effective documented interventions that *do not involve new regulatory measures*. These interventions vary by type of action and typically combine several policy tools and *strong social marketing*. [my emphasis] National implementation could save an estimated 123 million metric tons of carbon per year in year 10, which is 20% of household direct emissions or 7.4% of US national emissions, with little or no reduction in household well-

being. **The potential of household action deserves increased policy attention.** Future analyses of this potential should incorporate behavioral as well as economic and engineering elements.

Individual and household behavioral change faces well-known barriers (10), but more is known about how to overcome these barriers than is commonly recognized (11–14). **Lack of familiarity with this knowledge among scholars and policy makers is a major obstacle to achieving prompt, large, low-cost emissions reductions.** These authors apply a behavioral approach that complements engineering and economic approaches to estimate the reasonably achievable potential for near-term emissions reduction from behavioral change in households. They focus on US households because households are a major emitter and because there is a significant body of knowledge about the potential to achieve near-term reductions in that sector.

Direct energy use by households accounts for approximately 38% of overall US CO₂ emissions, or 626 million metric tons of carbon (MtC) in 2005 (15, 16). This is approximately 8% of global emissions and larger than the emissions of any entire country except China.

Recent reviews of the available research suggest a large near-term potential for emissions reductions from behavioral changes involving the adoption and altered use of available in-home and personal transportation technologies, without waiting for new technologies or regulations or changing household lifestyle (15, 17). These authors develop a quantitative estimate of this potential at the national level, aggregated across behaviors.

Project Laundry List would like to call attention to a variety of commercial sector and industrial sector laundry practices that might also achieve large carbon reductions. At least one of these technologies is a New Hampshire technology that has been deployed at the Concord prison and various nursing home facilities run by the counties throughout the state. We believe that in the interest of public health, **faster adoption of the ozone injection technology washing systems needs to be implemented.**

There are, of course, a large number of items not researched in the above-referenced study that would be either W, E, M. A, or D actions available to households. Chief among these, in our opinion, is a reduction in meat and dairy for the American diet. (http://www.sd-commission.org.uk/publications/downloads/Setting_the_Table.pdf) **Until the collaborative meaningfully addresses this issue, it will be viewed as a political tool for powerful dairy interests in the state.**

Project Laundry List would like to caution that energy efficiency for its own sake is not a laudable goal. In his book *The Coal Question* published the year that the American Civil War ended, British economist W. Stanley Jevons, argued that “**it is a confusion of ideas to suppose that the economical use of fuel is equivalent to diminished consumption. The very contrary is the truth.**” While economists can argue until the methane-free cows come home about what causes an uptick in consumption when we start using energy and resources more efficiently, there is no denying that we use more and more energy and resources with each passing year, even as we decrease the energy intensity of our economy. We belch more and more carbon into an increasingly polluted atmosphere even as we become more efficient, because we buy more stuff, eat more yoghurt, and pat ourselves on the back for having LED Christmas lights. **All energy efficiency programs implemented as part of this collaborative should be put through a stringent test to make sure that they result in a reduction in use of the fuels or materials we are trying to conserve.**

Finally, we would like to caution that methane, which only persists in the atmosphere for about twelve years, is about 70 times more potent than carbon dioxide over a 20 year period. Large

amounts of methane stand to be released over a **critical** twenty to thirty year period from the creation of any new reservoirs in Northern Quebec. This collaborative should initiate research on the effect of temperate dams on climate change and on the hydrogeologic (<http://www.internationalrivers.org/en/node/1637> and <http://www.internationalrivers.org/en/node/1640>) and seismic effects of large reservoirs (<http://www.johnmartin.com/earthquakes/eqpapers/00000054.htm>) so that we can import power from our Canadian neighbors with our eyes wide open.

As we have mentioned previously, we are aware of no studies from the IPCC or other peer-reviewed journals that tackle *temperate* dams. The findings about tropical dams are damning (<http://www.nature.com/news/2009/090929/full/news.2009.962.html#B1>, http://www.internationalrivers.org/files/EXEC%20SUMMARY%20ENGLISH_0.pdf), but the response of the scientific community in New Hampshire and elsewhere, as a way of touting their grasp of these problems, has been to assume that temperate dams are better, for a host of obvious reasons. While we agree with the high likelihood of these assumptions, this has resulted in a lack of adequate research. As this Governor and other New England governors and eastern Canadian premiers plan electricity resources for the future, it is critical that we examine the ecological issues surrounding temperate dam construction.

In closing, we do not think that it would be an improper intrusion of the state into religion or that it would create constitutional problems to more deliberately engage the religious denominations in this process. In light of the remarks of Pope John Paul II on The World Day of Peace (http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/messages/peace/documents/hf_ben-xvi_mes_20091208_xliiii-world-day-peace_en.html), we hope that Bishop John Brendan McCormack, David Lamarre-Vincent of the Council of Churches, and other logical parties will become full collaborators in this process.

Name: Janet Ward

Organization/Affiliation: Private Citizen

Contact Information: jwardnh@aol.com

Comment:

First of all, I wish to thank the members of the Climate Collaborative for their efforts to address climate change. The very existence of this commission is evidence that our state recognizes the serious threat posed by climate change to many icons of New Hampshire life. Our maple syrup industry, skiing, hunting, and many other facets of our tourism industry, are being challenged by a rapidly changing climate. New Hampshire residents will also have to confront novel threats to our health and environment, as well as a rise in sea level along our coast. None of this will happen tomorrow, but it IS happening and this commission has the scientific evidence which confirms this.

Given the critical nature of our situation, I was deeply puzzled and concerned by the Commission's decision to remove the recommendation, EGU 2.10 in the Climate Action Plan which called upon New Hampshire to "Evaluate the Potential to Replace Existing Coal-Fired Generation."

All of you are well aware of the fact that Merrimack Station in Bow emits more than 3.7 million tons of CO2 EACH YEAR; that it is the source of 40% of all man-made CO2 emissions from electricity generated annually in New Hampshire; that the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that CO2 is a pollutant governed by provisions of the federal Clean Air Act; and that federal regulation of carbon emissions and particulates responsible for health-damaging smog are going to make dirty, coal-derived power very, very expensive.

The Climate Action Plan Minority Report (“Actions for Future Consideration”) calls for further discussion at some point in the future of EGU 2.10. I believe the future is NOW, and that all of you have a fiduciary responsibility to take your charge seriously. The Merrimack plant is the elephant in the room, a point source of 3.7 million tons of CO2 every single year. To me, it is incomprehensible that this body would not clearly see the need to objectively examine whether or not this source of electrical power is absolutely necessary. Can the energy produced by the Merrimack plant be replaced by other, cleaner energy? This is a question worth answering AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. This commission should act NOW upon EGU 2.10 or all of you all should be prepared to explain to the citizens of the State of New Hampshire why this reasonable action cannot be taken NOW.

Janet Ward
82 Watchtower Road
Contoocook, NH 03229
603/746-4991
jwardnh@aol.com