STATE OF NEW JERSEY
BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2018

----------*

ENERGY MASTER PLAN
STAKEHOLDER MEETING

SUPPLEMENTAL MEETING

----------*

HELD AT:
SETON HALL LAW SCHOOL
LARSON AUDITORIUM
1109 RAYMOND BOULEVARD
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY
4:00 P.M.

BEFORE:

GRACE STROM-POWER
KENNETH SHEEHAN
MICHAEL HORNSBY
CHRISTINE SADOVY

J.H. BUEHRER & ASSOCIATES
884 Breezy Oaks Drive
Toms River, New Jersey 08753
(732) 295-1975

MS. POWER: My name is Grace Power. I'm the Chief of Staff at the BPU. And, I also serve as Chair of the Energy Master Plan Committee. Really excited to welcome you here to Newark. As you may know, we originally scheduled five public hearings, most of which went all day, in five separate areas. But, due to so much demand and interest in continuing to comment on the plan and have some more diverse locations, we have added tonight's hearing and also next week's hearing in Camden.

Also tonight, we do have one of our staff members who have graciously joined us, who can serve as a translator for anyone of our Spanish-speakers.

MS. SURREY: Hi. My name is Maria Surrey, and I'm with the Board of Public Utilities customer assistance. I speak Spanish, and if you need assistance please ask.

MS. POWER: As many of you know, in May of this year Governor Murphy signed Executive Order 28. And, that directed the Board of Public Utilities to spearhead a new Energy Master Plan, which will be delivered to the Governor by June of next year. The ultimate goal is to develop a

blueprint of the total conversion of the state's energy production profile to a hundred percent clean energy by 2050. We're also looking to implement specific proposals that we can implement over the next ten years. This is a rough timeline of the Energy Master Plan. As I said, we kicked off in May, and this has been an inter-agency effort. We had our kick-off meeting in June, and like I mentioned we held five stakeholder meetings in September, and we're having two more this month. We are soon going to be getting to work reading all of your comments, and starting to put together a draft over the winter. Some point this spring -- late winter/early spring we're going to be putting out a draft for public comment. We're going to continue the stakeholder process holding meetings around state and welcome folks to give us their input. Finally, in June we're going to deliver the final plan to the Governor.

I just want to highlight that this truly has been an inter-agency effort. We have a number of departments that are involved in the EMP. In addition to the Board of Public Utilities, we have the Department of Community Affairs, EDA, DEP, Department of Health, Department of Human Services,

Department of Transportation, Department of Labor And workforce Development, Department of the Treasury, and New Jersey Transit.

Our next meeting will be next week, October 10th, and it will be at Rutgers Camden, also beginning at 4:00 p.m.

I wanted to add that we do have an open comment period. If you go to the EMP website you will see that for each of our five working groups -- which are Clean and Renewable Power, Sustainable and Resilient Infrastructure, Reducing Energy Consumption, Clean and Reliable Transportation, and Building a Modern Grid -- we have put out combined over 100 questions where we're asking for very specific feedback. And, you can comment on that here tonight. You can also submit comments to EMP.comments@bpu.nj.com. The public comment period will remain open until Friday, October 12th at five p.m. So, again, we ask you to comment. We really are looking for input from anyone who is interested in clean energy and the state's energy future. So, thank you for joining us.

Just a few quick matters of housekeeping. We do have a list, we're going to

be going in order of folks who have pre-registered, and then we're going to be looking at folks who joined us tonight. We are asking that you please limit your remarks to ten minutes. I do have signs here to give you a little reminder. We want to be respectful of everyone's time. And, of course, if you can summarize your comments instead of reading your full comment, that would be great. We will certainly be reading all your comments carefully, and will eventually be posted on line for everybody to review.

So, without further adieu, we'll get started. We are going to start with Lyle Rawlings from MSEIA. Lyle, are you here? Okay.

Now we're going to go to Harriet Shugarman from Climate Mama. And then Ted Glick, Roseland Against the Compressor Station & 350NJ.

MS. SHUGARMAN: Thank you. Thank you very much for holding this additional hearing so that those of us in the northern half of the state can more easily and directly share our input with you at this stage in the process.

As a lead agency tasked with developing a strategic vision for the production, distribution, consumption, and conservation of

energy in the State of New Jersey, you have a critical role to play in our future now, and that of all of our children. So it's important that you hear from as many and varied individuals and organizations as you can.

As the Executive Director of Climate Mama, an organization with members in all fifty states and over a hundred countries, I'm speaking today on behalf of our members here in New Jersey and in our region. As parents and grandparents we are deeply concerned about the slow and backward response on climate policy and action that our federal administration is taking; and, also the limited leadership role that New Jersey has played. We look to you, under the direction of Governor Murphy, to lead and not to follow. This means we must do more than talk-the-talk, we must really walk-the-walk, because our planet is showing us in so many ways that we're out of time.

I live in Bergen County, where I raise my two children. One of them suffers from seasonal allergies and breathing difficulties brought upon, and exacerbated in large part by our climate crisis, and the energy policies and the pollution legacy that they've created together. From the

outset I want to recognize and acknowledge the legacy issues that you deal with from the previous administration that choose to ignore, in large part, the directives in the Global Warming Response Act of 2007, which were revolutionary to the state, ambitious in its goals, and set as far and above as leaders on the climate action in our country.

Governor Murphy has called for a blueprint for New Jersey to be a leader in the 21st Century energy economy. Well, we've had a blueprint before, and we didn't follow it. You have a direct role to play in ensuring that we don't get stuck, that we move forward, and that we think outside of the current box that we may find ourselves in. Sadly, in this state, we move too slowly and allowed ourselves to slide backwards, not learning what we she have from events like Superstorm Sandy, the flooding and drought conditions that happen on a more regular basis. And, you have before you a passed energy plan that was built on pipelines and gas. We must not allow ourselves to be stuck here. We can and we must lead with our unlimited off-shore wind opportunities, and the commercial and residential roof tops, brown fields, and other areas we have to

move farther and faster on solar energy.

As a regulatory body, your mission statement includes the following: To develop and regulate a competitive economically cost-effective energy policy that promotes responsible growth and clean renewable energy sources, while maintaining a high quality of life here in New Jersey. Well, our high quality of life in New Jersey is already directly threatened by the challenges we face from our climate crisis. With each passing extreme weather event, our future and now, and the energy infrastructure we currently have in place, is threatened. The system we have isn't working. Cost-effective means not ignoring costs like health care, food security, and damages. We must internalize these costs when pricing fossil fuel as a source of energy. Gas and its infrastructure is not a short-term fix. Not a way for it and not a transition. It's a gang plank to a future that will wreak havoc with our health, our quality of life, and our existence.

I'm joining others who have asked you for a full moratorium at all fossil fuel infrastructures and -- we look to you and this 2019 Energy Master Plan to lead on climate solutions,

policies and actions. You need to be bold, to think outside the proverbial box, to push the envelope of a regulatory body, and to really oversee the tightening of our renewable energy portfolio standards, making sure we develop real renewable ways to build out and secure our energy through wind and solar. You must also work hard to include rewards for energy conservation measures, too.

When we as ratepayers are asked to set aside fees for renewable energy support, this must be clear and transparent. And, it must support renewable energy options, programs, and projects. New Jersey must not be allowed to divert these fees for other measures, as our previous administration has allowed. When private infrastructure development, like the proposed Meadowlands gas fired power plant reared their ugly head with no energy benefits for New Jersey residents, only with health and environmental degradation, you must boldly say "no". When interstate pipelines that carry fracked gas from Pennsylvania and beyond are proposed to pass through our state, we must stand up and say we are not a pass through state. We live here. We are raising our children here. And

we want New Jersey to be a shining example of what can be done to fight against our climate crisis, and give our children a chance at a livable future. We must not be party to perpetuating past policies and actions that are literally going to kill us, and force an impossible future on our children.

As a representative stakeholder for many others who can't be here today in person, I pledge to stay involved, active, and committed to our children and their future. What about you? Our future and that of our children, and mine, is in your hands. It really is. And that's not an over statement. And you have the power, and I ask that you please use it wisely. Thank you.

MS. POWER: Next we have Ted Glick. And on deck is Kim Gaddy with Clean Water Action.

MR. GLICK: Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you. It is actually a very good thing to be able to speak to you representing a legislature, a governor, who have made a commitment to shifting to one hundred percent renewable energy in the State of New Jersey. So, I definitely am glad that I'm able to speak to that.

I will say, however, that we don't have until 2050 to make this shift. We just really

don't. Any objective assessment of the state of the climate crisis in the world as it impacts New Jersey and the United States, shows that we are in very serious trouble. So, I think the key thing in terms of what needs to happen is to get moving now on a whole series of things that involve both making it easier for solar energy to be put on roofs and in driveways and back yards. And, for other renewable energy sources to move forward. Definitely off-shore wind. It's good that the Governor is taking some aggressive steps, it looks like, on off-shore wind. There's tremendous electrical capacity off of the coast. Not just in New Jersey, but up and down from Massachusetts down to North Carolina. Tremendous amount of electricity that can be created if there's a serious initiative to produce that. So, I do commend that.

Just a word about myself. I've been active primarily in Essex County for about fifteen years working on this issue. Right now the two primary groups I work with are Roseland Against the Compressor Station. We're just trying to prevent the expansion of something that shouldn't even be there now, but it is. A compressor station in

Roseland. There's a plan to -- a proposal to more than double the size of that gas compressor station. That's one group I'm part of. Have been for five years. And I'm also on the steering committee of the group 350 New Jersey, which is part of international organization, 350.org. That is in, I believe, something like seventy to eighty countries. There's international work going on all over on this issue.

I do want to second what Harriet Shugarman said, that the Governor absolutely needs -- and the legislature and entities like yourselves who are about making this transition -- you have to be serious about a moratorium on any new fossil fuel infrastructure in the state. To me, that's the number one thing that needs to happen yesterday. Because we're not going to get to a hundred percent renewable energy probably by 2050, much less earlier than that -- which is what we have to do -- unless we stop digging the hole that we're already in. When you approve new gas pipelines, when you approve new compressor stations, when you approve the expansion of compressor stations, when you approve all of this type of infrastructure you're making things worse,

not better. So, to us, that's a key first step. And, we strongly urge you to support that, to do everything you can to bring that about.

How much time do I have left, by the way?

MS. POWER: Six and a half minutes.

MR. GLICK: Okay. Thank you. I want to talk just a little bit about the Roseland compressor project, which comes under the rubric of the gateway expansion project. The gateway expansion project is one of three fossil fuel gas, natural gas, expansion projects that Williams -- the company Williams, one of the major pipeline companies in the country, they just happened to put these proposals forward about six months after Donald Trump was elected president. One of them is this gateway expansion project. Another one is the northeast supply enhancement. And the third one Riverdale South to Market. They've got three of them. And, they're pushing very hard to dramatically increase their capacity, to again, essentially pass through -- as Ms. Shugarman said -- pass through gas through the State of New Jersey, because these projects are not primarily for New Jersey. You can see that in particular

with the Meadowlands gas plant, which is explicitly all for New York City. It's not for New Jersey. And, of course, we need to get off gas and fossil fuels any way. But, it is ironic that that's what Williams is doing, that's what Mitsubishi is doing in terms of the Meadowlands plant. They want to use New Jersey as -- it's like basically all risk and no reward for New Jersey, by and large. Because with the pipelines, the compressor stations, the power plants, we get the dirty polluted air. We get the risks of explosions and fires. And then the gas, the profits or course, go to the companies that build the pipelines and the gas companies, and the product goes elsewhere, by and large. That doesn't seem to us to be sound public policy for New Jersey. Definitely it's not sound public policy when it comes to shifting away from fossil fuels to renewables.

Williams -- getting back to the gateway expansion project -- has put forward a proposal that is very dishonest. I would urge you, all those in legislature, all those dealing with these projects, to look at them very closely. This, I think, is an example of what we're facing oftentimes with fossil fuel industry proposals and

behavior. There's right now a 27,500 horsepower compressor station that was built five years ago in Roseland. By the way, the mayor of Roseland and the council of Roseland, are all against this plan to expand this existing compressor station, as is county executive Joe DiRizzeno. It's a very unpopular proposal among a lot of people. So, right now there's 27,500 horsepower compressor. About two years ago, Williams put in and got approval to add an additional 2,500 horsepower to what was then a 25,000 horsepower compressor. And they said that they needed this additional 2,500 horsepower to bring through 115,000 decatherms of natural gas. Okay. 2,500 horsepower for 115,000 decatherms of gas. Well, the proposal that a lot of us are fighting right now, proposes an additional 33,000 horsepower to push through 65,000 decatherms. So, 2,500 additional horsepower for 115,000 decatherms, and they're now saying they need additional 33,000 horsepower for 65,000 decatherms. It makes no sense. It's clear that the purpose of the expansion of this compressor station is to dramatically increase the amount of natural gas, primarily fracked gas coming from Pennsylvania, that Williams will be able to pass

through the State of New Jersey. It's also no coincidence that the pipeline coming out of the compressor station, coming out of Roseland, goes up a ways, it goes through North Bergen very close to the location where that Meadowlands proposed power plant would be built. So, it's very clear what is the plan of Williams. They want to set themselves up to have this very powerful 60,500 horsepower compressor station that will be able to bring a great deal of gas through central New Jersey, going up further into the northern part of New Jersey, for power plants, possibly for export overseas by hooking up with other pipelines, other companies. That's what we are certain is the plan. We don't think they're telling the truth in their proposal. And, we're hopping -- I mean, this has been called to the attention of the federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which has a history of basically rubber stamping any gas pipeline proposals. It's also been called to the attention of the New Jersey DEP. It should be rejected on these grounds. This proposal is a sham proposal.

And, there's a great deal more I can say, but I see you're holding up the one-minute sign. Just let me go back to what I said at the

beginning. The most important thing you can do in terms of steps is this moratorium on any new approvals of fossil fuel infrastructure. And, in fact, there's a decision coming up soon on the gateway expansion project. That be a really good place to start. Anything you can do to help encourage that, I think would be very much a good way to start off this whole process that you're under. Thank you.

MS. POWER: Kim Gaddy. And then Jonathan Cloud. Nancy Griffeth. Bernadette Maher.

MS. GRIFFETH: I'm Nancy Griffeth from Unitarian Universal Faith Action, the environmental justice task force. And, I've spoken at three of these hearings already, so I'm going to keep it very brief.

Our main concern is that environmental justice communities who suffer from environmental damage, and from the effects of climate change first, should also be the first to get the benefits of the programs that we put together in New Jersey. And, that hasn't always been the case in the past. I think it can be -- while we have the best of intentions, we can do things that don't work well.

And, I'd just like to add, that I support the public comments of our friends in the environmental justice community. Thank you.

MS. POWER: Thank you. Bernadette Maher here? Lyle Rawlings, I see you have arrived.

MR. RAWLINGS: Thank you. Hi, my name is Lyle Rawlings, president of the Mid-Atlantic Solar Industries Association. I have some slides to hand out. And since there are only four people up here, I'll have some extras for folks in the audience later if you want them.

Hello. And, again, for all of you up here up front, God bless you for sitting through all of these interminable hearings. You have the patience of Job.

I'm going to be continuing testimony that I gave on Friday about infrastructure for a renewable energy future. Of course there was limited time then, so I wanted to get in a little more into the detail of what it takes to get to a hundred percent renewables.

It is an incredible goal, fantastic goal, and one that we have to get to. But, a goal has to be matched with a plan, and a plan requires some detail. And, as I said, the important thing

is that renewable energy costs more than fossil fueled energy. That's the way the market values it, of course, because the market does not value the cost of climate change or regional pollution, or other costs that are imposed by fossil fuels. So, that cost is going to be substantial on the ratepayers of New Jersey. And, so, it's very important to minimize it. To create a plan that provides an optimum cost to get from here to there. And, at the same time, ensure reliability and safety of the electric system. This is not an easy task.

Of course, as we know, New Jersey doesn't have a lot of hydro. It doesn't have a lot of biomass. Those are renewable resources that are steady in the case of hydro, or can be controlled in the case of biomass. What do we have? We have solar and wind. Those are intermittent renewables. And, those pose some interesting technical challenges.

The first slide in that deck that I handed out, shows one that we're already dealing with now. And, that is the fact that solar energy is all over New Jersey. One particular utility territory, Atlantic City Electric, is already

packed with solar energy to the point where they're already closing a lot of circuits. And, this map that shows the map of all Atlantic City territory, it's roughly the bottom third of New Jersey. So many circuits are closed that whole towns are completely closed to any further solar development already today. My own company, which is a solar energy developer for large commercial projects, has experienced over half of the proposed projects that we have developed over the last year, has been denied interconnection. Now, this is partly as a result of antiquated standards that Mid-Atlantic SEIA helped to write all the way back in 2000 when solar was brand new, and utilities had never experienced solar on their grid. Now we're way past that. We are in a whole new paradigm. One in which those standards really need no longer apply.

For instance, it's forbidden that any substation should have reverse flow of power in New Jersey. Now, you can't get anywhere near fifty percent renewables as the Clean Energy Act requires, and have that restriction. In California, where they're a little bit further than us in terms of penetration of renewables, substations experience reverse flow all the time.

And Germany, which is even further ahead, this is commonplace. In fact, in Germany whole states within Germany, that are bigger than New Jersey, whole states will export solar power during sunny afternoons. So, we have to get beyond antiquated standards.

It's also not possible, for instance, in the Atlantic grid, or other places, to utilize the advanced technology that's already built into inverters that create the AC power from solar power systems. This is a capability that's free, because it's already built into these inverters. And we cannot open up circuits by leveraging that kind of asset that we have at our disposal. So, this is an immediate possible way to help integrate solar into the grid more cheaply, and get more of it.

But, that's the immediate needs. I want to talk more about the long-term measures that we need to have. So, the next two slides list nine areas where infrastructure is needed, or where controls or other measures are needed, to get us from where we are now to one hundred percent renewables. The first thing is the generation mix needs to be designed intelligently. You want

ninety percent solar and ten percent wind, or ninety percent wind and ten percent solar. It's not just a matter of which is cheaper. And, they're both getting cheaper, by the way. The latest news out of Massachusetts is that they have just run an auction for off-shore wind, and the auction winner with a 800 megawatt project came in at six and a half cents above the cost of wholesale power. That's a fantastic result. And, as technology progresses, we can expect that our results will be even better with the margin of technology. But, that doesn't mean that it should be all wind and very little solar. And, it doesn't mean it should be all solar and very little wind. You also have to look at how do those two sources combined to create reliable base load power. Now, it just happens that solar power puts out most of the power right in the middle of the day. Wind power, on the other hand, puts out most of it in the morning and the afternoon. This is a great match. But, you've got to study how much of each will produce the lowest cost and the most reliable power.

The number two issue is geographic mixes. This is because it's an intermittent

resource, the further you go to mix together the different resources the more reliable the resource becomes. So, if you just have the solar from one town, you're going to have a lot of ups and downs as clouds come across. But if you go with a forty-mile radius when it's cloudy in one area, it will be sunny in another, and the average will even things out. So, eventually this country will understand that on a much broader scale, and we're going to have an electronic super highway going from Denver to New York. So, that when it's ten o'clock in the morning here, it's eight o'clock in the morning in Denver, so we'll be shipping solar power west. But when it's six o'clock in the evening here and it's five o'clock in Denver, so we're getting dark but they still have plenty of sun, they're going to be shooting that same power back east. So, long distance transmission using the new high voltage VC technology, that's important.

The third item is load shaping or demand management. If we're stuck with when the solar and wind gets produced, we can deal with that by shaping the load around the wind we have the generation. So we can incent people through

pricing and other methods, to use it when we have the most of it. That's an important way to very cheaply get us to a renewable grid. Two minutes left. I should have gone a little faster.

Well, the fourth one is very key. And, that is curtailment of generators. It turns out that everybody knows by now that we need batteries to overcome this intermittency. But, it turns out that's not the cheapest way to get over the problem of intermittency. Recent studies, particularly the Minnesota pathway study -- two slides in advance of the official study are included as the last two pages there -- it's showing that it's actually cheaper to over build the amount of solar we have, and then curtail it in the middle of the day. So, you deliberately over built solar, and then in the middle of the day you chop off the head, the part where it's making the most. And, over building -- because solar is getting cheaper and cheaper -- over building and then curtailing in the middle of the day, turns out to be cheaper than batteries.

Now, there's several others, and you can look through this list of nine measures. But, vehicle to grid storage is another very important

issue, because no matter how much stationary battery power we build, the rolling battery power that we have in the form of vehicles will engulf the amount of stationary we have. Our studies show that if we convert a third of our vehicles to battery power, we'll have about 183,000 megawatt hours of capacity rolling around on the roads. When that connects to the charger, we want to build the infrastructure so that we can use that battery power to stabilize the grid. I'm almost done.

Several other items can get you to the optimum point. The point of all of this is this requires comprehensive study that incorporates technical challenges, the economic challenges, and how to keep the grid stable and safe, altogether in a detailed comprehensive study. That's what Minnesota did, was a study by Clean Power Research. Friends of MSEIA were prime authors of that study. And, they found a particular mix of wind and solar, but a hundred percent wind and solar all told, with enough of this curtailment by over building, would produce about five and a half cent premium over ordinary fossil fuel power to get to a hundred percent. They had a surprising finding that if you just mix in five percent natural gas, that cost

comes down from five and a half cents to three and a half cents. But, again, with exactly the right mix of all these nine measures.

So, if we're serious about getting to a hundred percent, I believe that New Jersey has to take a similar comprehensive study keeping all of those parameters in mind. And, we can get to a cheap hundred percent renewable future, too. Thank you very much.

MS. POWER: Thank you. Matthew Smith. And then we have Kevin Corcoran, followed by Paula Rogavin.

MR. SMITH: Good evening. My name is Matthew Smith. I'm a Senior Organizer with Food and Water Watch, here representing our more than 40,000 members and supporters here in New Jersey.

And, I want to start just by saying, I think there's a bit of frustration on my part in the way that this meeting was scheduled. We did ask for additional opportunities for public comments. But, to give a week's notice for community members to schedule the time to take off work, arrange for baby-sitters, do all the necessary things that it takes to come to a hearing, in my opinion isn't sufficient. I'm also

interested to find out how this meeting was noticed publicly. I think it's imperative if we truly want an energy plan that's representative of the full spectrum of interests and needs from New Jersey, that we have more participation. So, I would like to find out more about the process. And maybe there can be some follow up about how this meeting was noticed, and what outreach was done. And then maybe there can be some input into that process from community members so that we can ensure better participation for future hearings.

But, I will say that the substance -- on to the substance of my comments. It's an exciting time. I mean, those of us who have been environmental advocacy, have been dealing with an administration that, quite frankly, has been hostile to the idea of improving our energy system by transitioning to a 21st century energy grid that's powered by clean renewable energy sources. The myriad of benefits are, at this point, I think evident, from public health to environment, to addressing climate change, to the economics and energy independence -- true energy independence that can only be achieved through renewable energy. So, it's an exciting time to be talking about an

energy plan that is already working under the supposition to achieve one hundred percent clean energy by 2050.

I do want to echo a colleagues' comments and say that what the global, scientific, academic, public policy community is telling us, primarily the international panel on climate change which is due to release a report on Monday, which is talking about this global challenge of how do we keep temperature increases below two degrees, and in fact strive for temperature increases no more than 1.5 degrees Celsius to avoid runaway catastrophic climate change. And, then the conclusions that we're deriving from that science suggests that we need to reduce our emissions from fossil fuel combustion to zero by the year 2035, to have a better than two-thirds chance of avoiding those critical tipping points where there is no turning back from.

So, it's an exciting time. And, we think there's also opportunity to do more and approach the brevity of this crisis with more certainty. There are some direct ways to strengthen the existing energy plan that would allow us to prevent construction of unneeded fossil

fuel infrastructure, like the seven natural gas pipeline projects that are currently proposed in the state. These projects saddle ratepayers with unnecessary costs, both direct and indirect. And, stand in the way of achieving one hundred percent clean energy.

So, I will also echo my colleagues in calling for -- we need a moratorium on new fossil fuel projects. That has to be the starting point of any plan to achieve one hundred percent renewable energy. By continuing to rely on natural gas that is now majority produced through the process of hydraulic fracturing, we know that the lifecycle greenhouse gas impact from that system is very concerning. Methane, which is the primary component of fracked gas, in its raw state is up to 85 times more potent than carbon dioxide as a greenhouse gas, when it's in its raw state and in a twenty-year timeframe. What we see and what we've seen is that the original estimates of methane leakage throughout our energy system, including at the production site, at the well heads, at the processing stations through the pipeline networks at the compressor stations, are up to two to three times higher than what was

originally estimated. So, at a time when we must critically draw down our emissions, we've been investing in natural gas, which is actually pushing us in the wrong direction because of this massive leakage of methane that occurs throughout the system.

We also need to, in this transition to clean renewable energy, we cannot rely on false solutions like cap and trade, carbon capture and sequestration, or gas plants. Not only do these solutions not deliver the outcomes that we need, but they also perpetuate pollution in communities who have already dealt with a disproportionate impact from our current energy system.

So, when we look at achieving one hundred percent clean energy, it is less important when we get to one hundred percent and more important what we do in the next ten years. If we don't start to begin a dramatic draw down of greenhouse gas emissions in the next ten years, we will have missed the window of opportunity. So, we call upon the Board of Public Utilities to implement benchmarks that would get us to eighty percent clean renewable energy by the year 2028, and one hundred percent clean renewable energy by

the year 2035. In addition, we should have bi-annual monitoring and reporting on these benchmark targets.

The other issue is that clean energy should actually be clean. In the current class of renewable energy, Class I renewable energy included dirty energy sources like methane from landfills, biomass facilities, Class II includes trash incineration. Many of the folks in this room are intimately familiar with the devastation that these dirty forms of energy have on our public health and our environment. So, we must actually define clean renewable energy sources as solar and wind, as other colleagues have brought today.

Distributed solar policies should focus on maximizing development and access to community solar. We applaud the admission for the new pilot program, but we also believe it should be stronger by actually using the pilot to make community solar available to more communities at a faster rate. We also need to remove caps on net metering. Those are archaic, outdated, and do not represent the goals and intentions of an Energy Master Plan to get to a hundred percent renewable energy. We need to change building codes to

require that new construction is fitted with on-site and/or roof top solar panels. The Governor's off-shore wind plan is the right step for New Jersey's energy future, so we need more bold policy action like that.

As I mentioned, we definitely need to reject market-based schemes. Allowing utilities to purchase unbundled renewable energy credits creates a system of offsets, whereby utilities sender the energy into the grid and offset that by purchasing meaningless credits. Again, they create pollution hot spots in environmental justice communities. The state must only allow utilities to purchase RECs from clean energy sources. And, the state must ensure that RECs are bundled with the electricity they actually represent. And, the Energy Master Plan should not continue our reliance on market-based schemes like cap and trade, which quite simply do not work.

Energy efficiency is a bridge fuel that we should be scaling up immediately. It can reduce peak demand, and it can create good jobs in local communities. New Jersey should implement an energy efficiency portfolio standard that requires utilities to scale up energy efficiency annually,

as well as institute polices that significantly increase energy efficiency in the state, energy efficiency programs. And I want to also echo and close with saying -- echo another colleague and close with saying that for too long communities of color, low-income communities, have been disproportionately burdened by the public health, economic, social, and environmental impacts from our polluting energy infrastructure in Jersey. I want to uplift and amplify the community members who live in Newark and organized with the community, because for too long their voices and their needs have been neglected within our state energy policy. And, so, environmental justice must be prioritized within the new Energy Master Plan.

Thank you very much.

MS. POWER: Kevin Corcoran. And then Paula Rogavin, and then Ana Baptista.

MR. CORCORAN: Good afternoon. My name is Kevin Corcoran. And, I'd like to speak to you about the MPSE project. I'm a retired consumer products company executive. I'm presently a Board member of a community that is close to the compressor station that the NESE, or northeast supply enhancement project, is planning to put it.

I'm also a member of the South Brunswick task force on the compressor station. Now, for those who are not aware of it, the northeast supply enhancement project has two major aspects. One is a compressor station, a very large one, of 32,000 horsepower, that would be located next to the Trap Rock Quarry. The other major part of it is 23 miles of pipeline that will be trenched in Raritan Bay to take gas to the Rockaways. Okay. Obviously, Raritan Bay in the past has been something of a dead zone because of all the pollution in the area. When you trench you're going to be pulling all of that back up.

Now, my concerns are basically of two natures in terms of this particular compressor station. One in terms of safety, and the pipelines that are downstream from the compressor station -- and again, it's a very powerful one -- are approximately fifty years old. Okay. And, there is concern about whether they could potentially explode. There also are residential communities quite close by. There's a 55 plus community that's 800 yards away, the entrance of it is 800 yards away from the compressor station. And, I've gone so far as to proceed to get the

hazardous materials, pipeline hazardous materials. And, they have a specific formula for the calculation, what's known as a potential impact radius. Okay. Now, there are two pipes in that pipeline; one is 42-inch in diameter, and one is 30. The 42-inch in diameter one have potential impact in terms of an explosion. Potential impact of almost 300 yards in all directions. So, You're speaking 300 yards towards that 800 yard away entrance to a 55 plus community. Which is quite concerning.

Now, the second thing that got me involved -- again, I'm not an environmental -- excuse me, environmentalist by background, but I built factories. But, what got me basically significantly involved is Franklin Township in that particular area does not have the ability to fight a major forest fire. Williams TransCo would basically shut off the gas from their control center in Houston, Texas, and then basically ask the local volunteer fire departments to proceed to put out the fire. But again, Franklin Township does not have the water pressure to fight a major forest fire in that particular area. So, understandably, very concern. It's also right

next to a quarry that will continue blasting until approximately 2040. And, there also is a Superfund site right next store, which is the Higgins Farms Superfund site. So, altogether, a bit of a recipe for disaster.

I also understand, I found out today, that the DEP, the NJDEP, has cited them for deficiencies in a recent letter stating that the storm water run off from that site could potentially cause flooding downstream. And, downstream is a number of residential communities. Okay. So, quite a concerning situation from a safety point of view.

In terms of an infrastructure point of view. As I mentioned, pipeline downstream is approximately fifty years old. Some of it is not, but most of it is fifty years old. My experience in building factories, you don't build a factory -- this is a one billion dollar project, by the way -- you do not build a factory unless you're looking for an extended life, let's say forty years. If it does have a life of forty years, it's bumping up against Governor Murphy's hundred percent renewable by 2050 goal, because it would go in approximately 2020, that's only a thirty-year use of life. And

my understanding also is that they have a minimum guaranteed rate of return when they put in the pipeline.

Now, the gas and so forth going through here is mainly for New York City. What we're told by some of the engineers when we first had a discussion with them on the project -- don't worry, for the first couple of years we're only going to use thirty percent of the capacity. The question is beyond the first couple of years, where is the gas going? What is the use of the initial capacity associated with it? Now, there was a New York Times article approximately two months back in which they cited the high cost of power in New England. And, what they also spoke of was the fact there was cheap hydro-electric power available in Canada that could be brought down to, let's say, the Boston area. However, Vermont and New Hampshire opposed the transmission lines to bring the electricity down. Couple that with what you got in New York State with New York State blocking the constitution pipeline, for example. And, that makes New Jersey the pipeline state, to basically get gas from Pennsylvania up into New England.

What I would encourage you to do is

not allow it, basically, New Jersey to become a pipeline state. I guarantee you the pipeline companies have a master plan. I've actually gone on the internet and seen that Williams TransCo was contemplating a particular project that they filed for two years ago, back in 2010. I actually have a copy of a presentation on that. So, what I would encourage you to do -- I think it's commendable that you're proceeding to try and develop a Master Plan for energy for New Jersey -- I would use your Master Plan to challenge their infrastructure projects. Do you or did you not want to go the way that they want us to go. They're feeding us projects a little at a time. Roseland, as Ted Glick spoke about, the compressor station 206, which is now in South Brunswick and Franklin. They're giving projects one at a time to get easy approval. But, they have a master plan. Please oppose it and challenge it. Thank you.

MS. POWER: Paula Rogavin. Ana Baptista. And, Nicky Sheats.

MS. ROGAVIN: Thank you very much for holding this hearing. I'm with a group called The Coalition to Band Unsafe Oil Trains. And, I live a couple of blocks from the trains that carry bakken

crude oil, and now tar sands crude oil through New Jersey, through Bergen County, through Hudson, through Jersey City, though Newark, and down to the refineries. I'm also a mother, a grandmother, and I'm a retired elementary school teacher. And, I just retired after 44 years. And the reason I'm saying that is that this hearing should be at night. This is the first time I could ever go to a hearing, because I'm usually teaching. And, so many other people are working during the day. So there should be some daytime hearings, and there should be some in the evening.

I'm going to speak of what I'm going to say is the relationship to children, because they are the future. One; the New Jersey Master Plan should address the current dangers of fossil fuel, besides the impact on climate change. We're concerned about the current transport of bakken crude oil and tar sands crude oil by trains or pipelines on rail. They run through the heart of New Jersey and they put us in serious danger. This crude oil explodes at a very, very low temperature. And when it explodes, it's likes a bomb. They're called bomb trains. And a train carrying bakken crude oil derailed and exploded in

Lamarca Quebec, and 47 people were vaporized, leaving 16 children orphans.

These trains are currently passing schools and homes and playgrounds, downtown areas. They spew their diesel engines spew the diesel exhaust, which is really, really, really dangerous for children and anyone with any kind of a lung problem. They use sub-standard tank cars. And our federal government unfortunately is not giving them a longer time to transition to the safer -- if there's anything safe -- the safer DOT 117 tank cars. There are a lot of federal issues that we're facing, and in our Master Plan for New Jersey we have to deal with the reality that the federal government is rolling back safety standards, rail safety standards. And, probably standards from the pipelines and so on. So we have to, in New Jersey, find ways through our Oil Tank Safety Act -- which we're trying to get passed, which Christie vetoed and is now working its way through the legislature. Again, we need safety regulations, an increased number of safety regulations to combat with what the federal government is doing with the rollbacks.

The Governor -- and we're so happy

when the Governor made the commitment to transition to a hundred percent renewable energy. But the Meadowlands power plant, which is closer to where I live in Teaneck, that power plant is the opposite of any kind of thought to transition to renewable energy. You don't put in a power plant that uses gas, and it also will be using oil. And there will be truck loads of oil brought into that power plant. Why would we build, why would we commit to giving permits for a power plant -- which somebody mentioned before -- is outdated. It's not moving us toward renewable energy. It will produce energy for New York City, and pollution for New Jersey and New York City.

One of the aspects of this power plant, the proposed Meadowlands power plant, is this issue of ozone, which really has a big impact on children, on their lungs -- on everyone, on our lungs. And, when we met with the DEP a month ago in Trenton they said, well, they're a little over in the allowed amount of ozone to be produced by this Meadowlands power plant. But, they can get credit. They can buy credit from any power plant, old power plants that shut down. And, I had trouble understanding this. And I taught first

grade, kindergarten, and I don't get this thing about credits. I really don't. We can buy credit for the power plants that shut down, the coal power plants that shut down, but we get the pollution anyway. We get the ozone in our lungs.

So, our Master Plan should not allow the purchase, the sail of credits. It's fake. It's phony. And, it doesn't address the issue of pollution. It's for the money-makers, perhaps. This power plant would use natural gas, but that's not natural gas. It's not natural. Be brought in by pipelines susceptible to leaking. It's fracked. It's the oil that they would bring in is fracked. If we brought it by diesel trucks 24/7, diesel trucks, and diesel -- I'm sure you know -- has particulate matter that's very, very, very dangerous. It makes no sense financially or for the future, for our children, our grandchildren, our earth, to allow even one, even one fossil fuel investment approval, for even one.

An interesting thing is that Mitsubishi Diamond Generating Corporation, that wants to build the Meadowlands project, you know they have a whole solar component to their portfolio. Why they're proposing this one is

something we have to find out, as we're fighting against the proposal. It's an insult to the people of New Jersey that there were already permits from the state DEP for the Meadowlands project. It's an insult to us. And, it's counter to any kind of plan to transition us to renewable energy.

So, we must transition to renewable energy sources. There's that expression, beat swords into plow shares and turning, allocate resources for peace, for peace instead of war. Well, in our situation we want to reallocate funds for supporting the fossil fuel industry, to the production research and production of renewable sources. We need to, and part of the plan should involve community colleges, four -year colleges and universities in this effort in the research to find more ways for use -- more ways we can use and bring about renewable energy.

You know, New Jersey is the garden state. And we should really make it the garden state. We should remove the eyesores. So, we have to transition rapidly to renewable energy, but this plan, there should be a moratorium on the use of any kind of fossil fuel projects; but,

legislation to remove the remnants of the old fossil fuel generation. The refineries, the large tanks along Route 95, the compressor stations and pipelines. We've got to get rid of them. That has to be written into the plan. And we can perhaps some of those eyesores which will never, because they're so polluted, maybe we can turn them into solar farms and into wind farms, and turn something that's really hideous and horrible and out of date, into something to make our state clean and green.

The Master Plan should have an outline of all the sites that were fossil fuel, and how it can transition them to renewable energy. Also, I would like to see that we decentralize the power grid so that communities can work -- and many are working very hard to transition themselves to renewable energy. And, so, I think we need the state and the federal government to help towns and cities to take those initiatives to transition.

MS. POWER: I was remiss in thanking and welcoming my colleagues of the BPU. Just want to introduce yourselves briefly? Who are all, also, working actively on the Master Plan.

MR. HORNSBY: Mike Hornsby at the

Office of Policy and planning.

MR. SHEEHAN: Good evening. My name is Ken Sheehan, I am the Director of the Division of Clean Energy.

MS. SADOVY: Hello. I'm Christine Sadovy, Director of Operations.

MS. POWER: Ana Baptista. Nicky Sheats, and then Maria Lopez.

MS. BAPTISTA: Good evening. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the EMT, the Energy Master Plan. My name is Ana Baptista. I'm a professor at the New School, and also a member of the New Jersey Alliance, Justice Alliance, as well as on the Board of the Ironbound Community Corporation, which is a local organization here in Newark.

I want to echo the concerns of all my colleagues in the room here who echoed concerns about the meetings. There were several meetings, four meetings in Mercer County in the middle of the day. And my colleague and I, Nicky Sheats, are part of this Executive Order 23 regarding environmental justice steering committee, and I thought isn't it ironic that the Governor has signed an Executive Order on environmental justice,

and yet one of the most important pieces of policy being constructed are hosting meetings in the middle of the day without little input from the environmental justice communities. I'm glad you're having this meeting, but I also want to encourage you to think about how much more you can do to really reach out to the folks that couldn't be here tonight because of the short notice, and also for the timing of the event, the accessibility of the event.

And, I do want to remind all of you about the commitment that Governor Murphy has made under the Executive Order 23 to environmental justice and integrating that into all of the state's plans and priorities.

I want to start by making a few comments and recommendations on the EMP effort. First and foremost, we are here in Newark, which is the home to an extensive amount of energy infrastructure, fossil fuel energy infrastructure. And that energy infrastructure disproportionately impacts communities of color and low-income communities, which we refer to often as environmental justice communities. So, I want to ensure that the next EMP really takes into

consideration an effort to mitigate disproportionate emissions that already exist in those places where fossil fuel energy infrastructures are already located, and overburdening EJ communities. Things like a moratorium on future fossil fuel infrastructure should be considered and should be put into place, because Newark is a testimony to the harmful effects of the fossil fuel industry, particularly when they're concentrated in densely populated areas of the state.

We are home to the Newark Energy Center, a 655 megawatt power plant. The Newark Bay CoGen. The PSE&G Peaker Station. So, we're already overburdened by multiple accumulative disproportionate emissions in this community. And the cruel irony of this burden is that the residents of Newark, and the surrounding areas, represent relatively the least consumptive parts of our society. They're the most energy insecure members of our society, and yet they bear the brunt of our energy infrastructure. So, you should ensure that the EMP, in its next iteration, makes significant investments in environmental justice communities to reduce existing emissions from these

industries, and also to reduce energy burdens in these communities. You should be looking at how you can both build the wealth of LMI communities through your investments.

Currently, efforts like the SBC, the societal Benefit charge, nuclear subsidies, these are regressive taxes on the most impacted communities. They pay disproportionately into these funds relative to their incomes, and relative to the benefits that they reap from these incentives. Most of the funding that they pay into the system goes to higher income individuals who are accessing high capital cost investments, like solar PV on their homes. Very few of our residents ever see the benefits of renewable energy and solar projects in this community. So, I want to encourage you to think about what are the real incentives that you can build into the EMP that will ensure that our communities reap those benefits.

And, we have some suggestions about the exact investments. I know in the past there have been efforts to reach LMI communities through specific programs. But, we believe that you need to make a mandate to devote at least 33 percent of

clean energy funds to EJ communities, and to set aside up to forty percent for things like community solar for low and moderate-income customers. We should think about using factors or multipliers that would incentivize projects that serve low-income customers, particularly those in public housing or low-income service organizations.

The EMP should include opportunities for community based energy planning. A lot of the reasons why the existing programs don't reach LMI communities is because they don't really understand the need and the correct incentive levels that will reach those communities. We need bottom up assessments of the energy needs in communities. Is solar the only thing our communities need? No. A lot of our energy needs in LMI communities come from heating. You know, old appliances, poor insulation. These are things that are misunderstood or not well understood in our communities. There has not been a significant assessment of energy needs. Other communities and other parts of the country have undertaken community based energy assessment planning. And we recommend that that be part of your plan, so we can better understand the needs of these households.

I want to encourage that we try to reduce energy consumption and make these incentives available to low-income households, because programs like LIHE don't really get at the energy consumption of these homes. They don't really build the wealth and bring savings into the household. They play an important role and subsidize energy bills, but they don't really help address the energy insecurity of these homes. I want to really emphasis that the EMP should eliminate the inclusion in the state's energy portfolio or further incentives to Class II renewables like garbage incineration, biomass, nuclear. And, garbage incineration is of particular concern to us because we understand that this industry continues to try to be included in new and different ways, and not just as Class II renewables, but find other ways to be subsidized as ways to energy. What they are is a waste of energy. Garbage incinerators, like the facility that Covanta runs here in Newark, New Jersey emits hundreds of pounds annually of criteria air pollutants as well as HAPs, hazardous air pollutants, in an already overburdened community. When they receive Class II renewable energy

credits, what you're essentially doing is incentivizing the burning of garbage. And, you're taking away incentives to divert waste from the system. They want to burn more to make more money. And if we can stop subsidizing them as a renewable energy, which they're not, that would help us also meet our waste management goals. I'll just mention that per unit of energy produced, both in terms of greenhouse gases and air toxins like mercury and carbon monoxide, garbage incinerators produce more per kilowatt hour in terms of emissions than coal plants. So they're not clean.

EMP should reinsure that renewable energy and energy efficiency investments like solar installations include opportunities for local employment, community ownership, distributed generation and storage, and energy independence. We don't want to just see solars on sticks. We don't just want to see solar on individual middle-income households. We want to see energy and solar installations and wind installations go into the hands of residents who are tenants, who are renters, who pool their resources and can own a piece of that solar future. So, we really want to

encourage community ownership of renewable energy.

Finally, I just want to say a little bit about the transparency of this process, and of your future goals for the EMP. As a researcher and looking at different state's investments in renewable energy and urban energy efficiency, it's very difficult to track where these investments are going. So, I want to encourage increased transparency of this next EMP so that we know where the funding is going, and in what communities are benefiting from your investments.

And, lastly, we know that you're meeting individually and with different sector-specific stakeholders. I really, really want to encourage you to reach out to organizations that are here in this room tonight, and others around the state, who represent environmental justice communities, to have individual meetings with those sectors. They have important insight and input into this plan. And, I encourage you to engage with them early and often throughout this process, and not just in this venue. So, I hope you take that opportunity to meet with us and all of these folks here, to learn more about this important work that we're doing here in Newark and

other places in the state on energy efficiency and renewable energy. So, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

MS. POWER: Next, Nicky Sheats. And then we have Maria Lopez-Nunez. And, Reverend Tuff.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Maria Lopez-Nunez is not here.

MS. POWER: Okay.

MR. SHEATS: Hi. Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to comment again. So, I work at Thomas Edison State University where I run a small policy center called -- my name is Nicky Sheats, by the way -- I run a small policy center called the Center for Urban Environment, it's a part of the policy institute called the Watson Institute of Public Policy, it's at Thomas Edison State University in Trenton. And, I'm also a member of -- that Professor Baptista testified before me -- a member of the New Jersey EJ Alliance.

And, I'll say a little bit about the Alliance. We're the only statewide organization in New Jersey that focuses on EJ issues. And we're the only -- and although we are well-integrated, we

are also the only statewide organization in Jersey that focuses on, that addresses environmental issues, which is a majority of color in both membership and leadership. We're a small organization, but we've been become national leaders in developing public policy from an EJ perspective.

And, we fear that when it comes to energy policy and climate change policy, that if they're developed in a business-as-usual manner, they're going to perpetuate or exacerbate the current inequalities that exist in our country based on race and income. And, in order to avoid that, we have to integrate environmental justice equity into energy policy up front. So, what that means is that don't figure out how you're going to produce the energy and implement that, if you put the infrastructure in and produce the energy and make sure it's reliable, and then say we're going to get to environmental justice and equity later. No. It should be done at the same time.

We filed comments in 2008, we filed comments in 2011. We reiterated in the short letter, we reiterated those comments in 2016 and '17, and in all of those comments we called for a

coherent, so, one way to implement equity or integrate equity into the policy. We've been calling for years for a coherent urban energy strategy that addresses environmental justice issues. So, we're going to call for that again tonight. And, I'll talk about some of the components. And, I'm going to echo Professor Baptista in several of the things she said -- doesn't hurt to hear it twice -- and, we'll submit them in our written comments, also.

So, here are some of the components that should be in a coherent urban energy strategy for New Jersey. Professor Baptista mentioned this, but let me mention this first. Siting issues. There is evidence that comes from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection -- and we'll cite that in our comments -- that shows that in New Jersey there's a disproportionate amount of pollution in EJ neighborhoods. And they actually have graphs, and they did a report and they have the graphs. And, you see that as the number of people of color live in a community in New Jersey goes up, so does the pollution, or the estimate of the pollution. And it's same thing for people living in poverty. But remember, the poor

people who live in the neighborhood in New Jersey increases, so does the amount of pollution. I think we all agree that this is unacceptable. And we need to use the Energy Master Plan to break up what we call this unholy relationship between race, class, and collusion. But again, we don't want the Energy Master Plan to perpetuate or exacerbated it, we want it to be used to reduce this.

So, siting issues. There should be no polluting energy infrastructure sited -- no more new energy infrastructure sited, polluting energy infrastructure sited in communities of color and low-income communities and over burdened communities. And, where possible, energy efficiency renewable energy should be used to reduce the disproportionate amount of pollution in these neighborhoods. Now, we know that energy efficiency usually reduces energy coming from the grid, so it's not place specific. But, we need to come up with new ideas and any way the energy efficiency or renewable energy can be used to make place-specific emission reductions. That's what we should do. And, the pollution we want to reduce -- I mean, everybody talks about climate change, reducing greenhouse gas emissions -- but, we also

really want to use climate change policy to reduce the local pollution along with the greenhouse gases. Because that's what's killing people in our communities now. So, we want to get that pollution as well as greenhouse gas pollution. And, we do actually have a recommendation. We oppose RGGI, but we're not able -- it doesn't look like we're going to be able to stop the state from going in. But, we made a proposal that would mandate a reduction in plants located in EJ communities under RGGI. So, the Energy Master Plan could be a compliment to that, and also help reduce emissions in EJ communities.

So, I talked some about renewable energy and energy efficiency. Let's talk a little bit more about that. I'm going to echo what Professor Baptista said, and say that we should put aside at least 33 percent of the funds in the clean energy fund to address the energy needs, or make sure -- address the energy needs of EJ communities, and make sure that energy efficiency and renewable energy are accessible in EJ communities. When I say EJ communities, I mean communities of color and low-income communities. And solar, in our community solar comments, I think we suggested that

at least 24 percent of customers that should set aside, at least 24 percent of customers in community solar should be low and middle-income, and at least 10.4 percent of those should be low-income. That's the rate of poverty in New Jersey. And, we think that that is also true for energy efficiency programs, and all new renewable energy programs, and that should be before. So, I haven't read the community solar regulations yet, but if it's higher than that we're happy about that.

Community energy planning. Let me say a few more words about that. Professor Baptista talked some about that. We want to make sure that renewable energy projects and energy efficiency is planned on the community level and have community folks involved in the plan. Now that usually doesn't happen. But we want to make sure community residents, EJ groups, and community groups are involved in energy planning, so that local residents in EJ communities are not just consumers of energy, but they also make decisions that affect how the energy is produced in their community. Along with that idea, we want to introduce the idea of community energy utility that

would gather capital and then use that capital to invest in energy efficiency, renewable energy, specifically in environmental justice communities. I want to say both of these ideas originated from the Center of Urban Democracy in Minneapolis who in their staff of energy experts on -- well, they're experts on environmental justice and energy.

So, let me close by saying, echoing again something Professor Baptista said. One thing that we think community energy planning would yield or help in, is maximizing the co-benefits to EJ communities of energy production. So, again, we don't want EJ communities just to be consumers of energy, we want them to make decisions about the energy production in their neighborhoods. We want to make sure that they have opportunity to own, we want to promote ownership of renewable energy in EJ communities. That's one way of using energy production to improve the economic condition of EJ neighborhoods. But not only ownership, but we want to make sure that residents in EJ communities have access to jobs produced by energy production. Entrepreneurship opportunities. And, basically, we want to make urban areas center of energy innovation and research and education. We also

want to link the energy production system to the public schools in the inner cities. And, I don't know how many of you heard me say this in the community solar comments, but I'll say it again. One of our visions is that the urban areas in New Jersey will not only be known for producing sports stars, and we are proud of the sports starts, but we also want our urban areas to be known for producing energy experts. And, for New Jersey to be known for producing energy experts from environmental justice communities.

I'll end by saying, also, with clean energy we do want clean energy defined as wind, solar -- and, as Professor Baptista says, we oppose incineration, and we don't think nuclear should be classified as clean energy either. We think that will not only help everybody, but in particular we think that would help EJ communities. And, we really would like to meet with you, New Jersey EJ Alliance, and some other EJ groups, maybe Ironbound Community Corporation. And, we can talk about some of the ideas that we presented, because even though they're here, we want to be partners with you in implementing these ideas. Thank you.

MS. POWER: Nicky, I'll reach out to

you so we can set up something up.

MR. SHEATS: Okay. Thank you. That would be great.

MS. POWER: Reverend Tuff. Kim Gaddy from Clean Water Action are you here now?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

MS. POWER: Jeff Tittel will be next. I don't see him here. Imelda Foley. Sally Gellert.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

MS. POWER: Melissa Miles.

MS. GADDY: Good evening. And apologize for being late, but I'm one of those residents that has to pick up their child from school, and then come here to this meeting.

But, my name is Kim Gaddy. I'm a fourth generation Newarker. I'm the environmental justice organizer for Clean Water Action. In the State of New Jersey we have 125,000 members. Nationwide we have 1.5 million.

And, so, as I proceed, I just want you all to have a paradigm shift in the way you think about energy for a few moments. So, as you look at this Energy Master Plan, I think you need to look at -- well, I know you need to look at it

through a lens of environmental justice and energy democracy. Energy democracy enables a community to have ownership and control of the resources, with shared responsibilities and decision-making authority that involves all stakeholders. And resilience of our nation's communities, as well. Energy democracy must be issued and talked about from a critical framework. Addressing the economic and racial inequalities that exist in the State of New Jersey. Energy democracy seeks to refrain energy from being a commodity that is commercially exploited, and instead appreciated and respected in our ecosystem. Energy democracy sees renewable energy resources as enabling a new alternative economy. A regenerative rather than an extracted economy, one that builds our economic strengths and resilience.

The new economy model is characterized by community-based development. Not exploitative forms of production, socialized capital. Ecological use of natural resources and sustainable economic relationships. By contrast when you look at our current economy, it's built on the fossil fuel energy. It has achieved vast increases in labor productivity by exploiting our natural

resources and human labor, to accumulate capital and create huge corporate empires.

Now, I want to focus on my community and where I come from. And, I'll look at it from the lens of transportation. As a south ward resident in the City of Newark, I live seven minutes from the port and the airport. On a daily basis 14,000 trucks travel through our port. 3,500 to 4,000 of those trucks stay on our local roads. These trucks that travel through our community are emitting pollution. I'm a parent of three -- that's my youngest, my fourteen year old up there. And, I have three children, all three of them are asthmatic. And that's because, unfortunately, we are disproportionately polluted upon because of the zip code we reside in and the color of our skin. And, so, when you think about that, there is an imbalance and an injustice from the transportation side. So, you have to look at the transportation from an EJ perspective.

The New Jersey ports and the logistics industry, the goods movement, must establish zero emission zones, ZEZ, both within the port and outside, in the neighborhood and within the warehouses and/or other destinations. Electric

equipment vehicles and trucks should only be allowed to operate within these ZEZ zones. Electric power hookups must be established within the port, and the these ZEZ destinations should allow for power recharging and loading bays, as well as rest areas for the truck drivers. Also, you have to look at automatic shut offs should be required within all of the trucks and the logistics industry.

When you talk about funding, we know that the Volkswagon settlements funding, CMAC, DERA, and private monies from these terminal operators, should be used to fund these ZEZ zones. The use of the Volkswagon settlement dollars should be prioritized in our EJ communities where climate and diesel vehicle emissions are the greatest and most impactful. These funds should help amplify support, and complement stronger provisions of the updated EMP.

Now, as we move towards zero-emission vehicles, that should include our public modes of transportation, our ride shares, our public fleets, as well as our personal vehicles. That's critical to addressing climate change and global warming in the State of New Jersey, more importantly in the EJ

neighborhoods first. We experience the heat allen effect, typically, it's ten degrees hotter in my neighborhood than if you go up to Livingston or South Orange. The reduction of diesel soot, the black carbon in the transportation sector will keep temperatures down much faster and cheaper than CO2 reduction efforts. The mass transportation -- well, mass transit offers options for reducing greenhouse gases, their co-pollutants, the heavy metals, the ozone precursors NOx and SOx and corresponding health arms, but not if the buses and vans are run on dirty diesel engines.

We have some -- I mean, the technology exists that we should not be having 2011 and 2000 buses riding through my neighborhood in the City of Newark and any of the other urban corridors. Drivers, riders, and walkers are all exposed to diesel particulate PM2.5 and ultra fines causing high incidents of asthma, cancer, strokes, and premature deaths and related healthcare costs.

As I mentioned earlier, transportation is an environmental justice issue that affects community of color and low-income people, both in terms of access to mass transit as in proximity mode of getting to work. And, as well as,

concentrated goods movements, activity, in and around our ports. And, so, I am hoping that as you review and hear from all of the other stakeholders coming here today, that you keep in mind that it is about changing the lens you look through to include the EJ communities, those front line communities that are hit the hardest. And, as well as energy democracy, understanding that we have to have control of what happens in our neighborhood. We have to have a voice, and we must have a seat at the table. And, as so many people have articulated, I'm on that committed with Dr. Ana Baptista and Dr. Nicky Sheats for the Executive Order 23.

And, it is problematic to call meetings at four o'clock, when you have children that get out of school at three o'clock or 3:30. Right? I couldn't even go home and cook dinner for my child. So, if you begin to have a paradigm shift in how you think and you discuss what is real community engagement, you would understand that a meeting at four o'clock is not community engagement. And, is actually excluding the voices that should be here. So, I'll leave you with that. Have a good day.

MS. POWER: Sally Gellert. Followed by Bernadette Maher.

MS. GELLERT: Good afternoon. I'm Sally Gellert, speaking first on behalf of Unitarian Universal Faith Action of New Jersey, and later on on behalf of the Lackawanna Coalition. I'd like to thank both groups for letting me speak.

The UU Faith Action of New Jersey, comment stakeholders on transportations, which is about 41 percent of the energy consumed here in New Jersey. Our comments based on Unitarian principals, including respect for the inter-dependent of all existence, and the worth and dignity of every human-being.

Today we focus primarily on two of the questions about transportation; our ports and improving the variety and reliability of various types of mass transit. Frankly, I couldn't say much better than Ms. Gaddy said about the ports situation. That's the largest piece of complex logistics industry, including a growing number of warehouses and distribution centers, light industry manufacturing, service -- industries. The widespread use of 20 to 50-foot long containers have fostered an industry based on both independent

contractors to all those containers from port to destination in the greater metropolitan area. These individuals often cannot afford the newer engines that would cut down on air pollution, yet corporations don't want to pay for the upgrades. Port Authority and/or the state government needs to ensure that these conversions to electric vehicles take place, or to even just low -- for bio-fuels and therefore without bankrupting the drivers.

From an energy conservation perspective, when these truck drivers are forced to idle their engines while waiting for directions they're wasting fuel, creating air pollution, and not getting -- when these engines are idling for more than three minutes, they're actually breaking the law, and into the dangers of asthma and respiratory illness the EJ communities surrounding the port areas. UUFA today supports efforts to improve the air quality, safety, and security, as well as the working conditions pro-workers could support before commerce. These goals can be reached concurrently if the Port Authority controlled with the operation issues, rather than simply delegating operations to a for-profit corporation.

Regarding potential strategies for NJ Transit from energy commitment to clean transportation, we suggest encouraging use of public transportation by better marketing and focus on reliability, which of course is a major issue right now. It's particularly important to work on first and last mile solutions. People are rarely willing to walk more than a quarter of a mile or a half mile post to get to a bus or a train. Create subscription-based shuttles and on-demand call or ride services electric to train stations to local pick-up points.

I'll transition here to my role as communications director for the Lackawanna Coalition. Both groups will be submitting slightly longer written testimony. The Lackawanna Coalition advocates on behalf of New Jersey Transit riders and their communities, and has done so since 1979. We got our start in Millburn on the Morris and Essex rail line, which was originally electrified by Thomas Edison himself. More Transit use is an essential part of the solution to the current environmental problems. We need to have much more than we have today, with everybody encouraged to use it. We'd like to see zero car

and one care households encouraged so that multi-car households are seen as wasteful. This requires an extensive rail network with previously abandoned lines of rights of way to rail passenger service and trains running frequently on every line. So the passenger is accommodated, with space for freight movements, as well. This would require a significantly expanded rail network with as many lines electrified as possible, which are -- during this previous century, and with more frequent services offered now. If you look at a map and compare rail lines of 1901 to today, we've lost a lot. We also need light rail and bus networks that would provide connectivity for shorter trips, including the first and last mile of lengthy trips.

Until 2010, New Jersey Transit offered rail fares outside peak commuting hours that were discounted enough to encourage price sense to riders to take the train when there is sufficient capacity. Such discounts are still offered on New York's Long Island Railroad and Metro North. We have consistently called for these off-peak fares to be restored, and there should be enough off-peak service to be convenient for riders. Ideally every thirty minutes or so. The availability of these

trains helps make the system work even for commuters called home unexpectedly, need to stay late. Running these trains as full as possible for the fewer full fare riders is ultimately more profitable overall. It should go without saying that in the short term we need full restoration in January of what's being cut next week.

We call for a moratorium on new highway construction with only sufficient expenditures to keep them in good repair. And for most capitals funding to be redirected into projects that would expand the existing Transit network. It would produce a moderate expansion while using billions of dollars of capital funds. We are currently seeing gateway following the arc path, and figured as a huge expensive project, way more than needed. We don't need Penn South, even if developers -- in a full block of -- real estate. We need useful tunnels now. Let's cut gateway down to an affordable size and get it done quickly. Transit is inherently more efficient for carrying passengers than highways. A double track rail line can carry as many people as 24 highway lanes. Large scale automobile use, even if electric, requires large scale automobile storage which paves

over land and precludes other uses of that land, with strongly negative environmental impacts. Instead, let's look at the transit systems of the four New Jersey cities with the highest number of car-free households. Newark is number two in the country, after New York City. Jersey City is number three, Paterson number 12, and Elizabeth number 15. Rather than replicating these systems exactly, we would like to see connecting transit among those cities, suburban and rural areas, offering a variety of environments connected by transit helping us as a state break our auto addiction, and substantially cutting the transportation percentage of the state's energy use. Although electrically powered motor vehicles are expected to constitute some improvement over gasoline and diesel engines, particularly eliminating particulates that cause asthmas and other respiratory diseases, the overall goal must be less energy use and less use of fuel per person, which requires the efficiency of an extensive transit network that provides frequent service and connectivity. In addition, creating a vastly electric vehicles that would require a great deal of cobalt and other minerals that may well not be

available, particularly at affordable cost. And obtaining it will in itself create a great deal of environmental disruption and damage.

Considering Governor Murphy's proposal of the 3.5 megawatts of off-shore wind, we see a great opportunity for this energy to be used to power electric rail as the ducts already do. In summary, all transit is greener than the greenest automobiles. And, it has been neglected for too long. The best thing we can do regarding clean and reliable transportation in an updated Master Plan is to emphasize more transit, encourage more people to use it, and provide enough of it so they will. Thank you.

MS. POWER: Just a quick reminder, we do have a court reporter here, and I am a fast talker as well, but please remember to slow down just a little bit.

Melissa Miles. We'll then have Drew Curtis and Joseph Fave.

MS. MILES: Good evening. And thank you for the opportunity to speak on the Energy Master Plan for 2019. My name is Melissa Miles, and I'm the environmental justice manager for Ironbound Community Corporation.

Ironbound Community Corporation, or ICC, is a local community-based organization, grass roots base building. So, we really are working with Newark residents to build the future and vision of the kind of community we want to have. And, basically, for the last 49 years have been alongside the community responding to environmental threats as they arise or as we are made aware of them.

If you're not familiar with the environmental justice history of Newark and the ironbound, you can go to our website, it's ironboundcc.org. But, it's something that, you know, based on the fact that we're an environmental justice, environment justice community of concern, and Governor Murphy's Executive Order 23 which mandates state agencies to take these things into account when building new infrastructure, making plans and decisions. It's really a relevant point that Newark is an environmental justice community of concern, that deals with the burden of energy infrastructure, as well as economic issues that my colleagues have spoken about that also make our energy burden grossly unfair.

So, the thing that I mainly want to

speak about is this process. So, you know, there are lots of community members in the room, lots of folks who we are in coalition with who basically get paid to do things like this. They get paid to come at four o'clock on a Thursday to speak with you all. But, you know, in terms of regular people, this process was really completely inaccessible. And, you know, before I started this work I might not have even thought twice about that, you know, energy, Energy Master Plan. It's something I might have assumed, did not concern me. But now that I understand that not only the rates that our folks pay, the fact that we have the Newark Energy Center which was a gift of Chris Christie until our community fought that, but we have it any way, was called for in the 2011 Master Plan. Now that I understand that the energy infrastructure, our rates, whether we have access to energy efficiency, renewable energy, are really determined by processes like this. I had to get paid first before I realized that. And I really feel like it's the responsibility of the BPU to make this process more accessible to regular people whose lives are directly impacted by the decisions that you make. And, so, the fact that there were

many meetings, there were four meetings, it wasn't until there were complaints made that a meeting was planned for Newark and Camden. And, I find that to be really incredulous, especially considering folks like Nicky Sheats, Dr. Baptista, I read their comments from 2011, from 2015, and they've already talked about these processes. We talked about them also in the comments for the community solar, what these kind of hearings should actually look like if you want community participation. I feel like it's really pretty clear. And, so for this to happen in this way again it reiterates that the system and the process is actually designed to exclude people of low income, designed to exclude working-class people, designed to exclude people from communities that are most impacted by energy, by dirty energy infrastructure. And that's a problem.

So, we really want, you know, from the very start to be included in these processes. Also, you know, issues of capacity. So, you know, how are regular people supposed to even access the information, the tools that they need to be able to understand these processes. I'm really impressed when folks who are able to get up here and just

talk about all the facts and all the -- but, really, again, for people who this is not their job, you know, how are they supposed to really access the information and the tools that they need to be able to participate in this, which should be a democratic process.

So, it really has to start from the place of, like, what are you all doing to get into communities before you're asked, actually, or you're mandated, get in to communities and share resource in a way that allows people to participate in the process. And, so, that starts before the hearing, actually. By the time we get to the hearing, people are kind of expected to get up here with something to say. But how could you have something to say if you don't really know what this process is about.

And then also the outreach for the process. I didn't see any real outreach. There are people from our community that are here, we invited them. And, you know, so, again, we're taking communities that are already burdened, and organizations that are small and grass roots, and we're putting the burden on them to figure this out and navigate this process. And, again, it's just

unfair. And, so, like some of my colleagues are saying, I really again implore you, there needs to be a much more transparent, democratic process around the Energy Master Plan that includes regular working-class people, hearing people who are from communities, environment justice communities that already bear the brunt of the energy infrastructure in the form of pollution, air pollution, weird smells. I'm sure you smelled them yourself when you came into the neighborhood. We have the Newark Energy Center, we have Newark Bay CoGen, we're a stone's throw from Linden. And not to mention the incinerator, which again is totally false ways to energy scheme that is a waste of energy, I just really have to echo that. But, somehow is classified as renewable. So, it's sort of like insult to injury when these kind of processes, during which decisions are made about our future, come around, but we're not included in a real way in them.

So, just also to talk about a little bit about what our vision looks like for the process. Like my colleague Kim Gaddy mentioned, we believe really in energy democracy. A process by which decisions are made from the ground up, which

we trust that when people know what's happening that they can make decisions and find solutions that are best for their lives and their families' lives. Also an energy system that's decentralized, where people in communities like this can utilize energy models to bolster themselves economically, educationally, where ownership can be localized. I know things like that, even suggesting things like that might not make you popular with PSE&G, but we know that we can't continue to do things business as usual if we want to see change. Not only climatically in the sense of the climate and slowing down climate change, but also reducing and reversing some of the historical inequities that we see have been taking place as these decision-making processes are happening.

So, I really encourage you not to do things business as usual. Take a step back and really include the communities that are most impacted by the energy infrastructure. Thank you.

MS. POWER: Next up, Drew Curtis. And then Joseph Fave.

I want to take a quick minute. This is just the first step in the stakeholder process.

And, in fact, I have encouraged you all, please submit your comments, whether they're directly in response to the series of questions that we have put out, or that they are more general about how this impacts your community or your life. I mean, that's really the way that you're going to get your voice heard. At any of the meetings there's only a representative -- a small representative or small handful of folks that are actually part of this process. So, I really encourage you to send your comments in, you have the next eight days or so. So, thank you. Okay.

MR. CURTIS: Good afternoon. My name is Drew Curtis. I live a couple of blocks away from here. And, I work for a local community-based organization, Ironbound Community Corporation. Ms. Miles is my colleague.

First off, I'd rather be saying "good evening". I wish this meeting took place later, where more people from my neighborhood and neighborhoods like mine could attend. I'm able to come here because I work for a community-based organization. But when I was telling, at the last minute when I heard about this meeting a week ago, my friends and neighbors about it, they were very

excited to come here. But, they're like, oh, four p.m.? I can't make that, I'm still at work, I have to pick up my kids from school, et cetera. I do thank you, though, for having this meeting in Newark and not just down in Trenton and Mercer County. But, I wish your earlier sessions had been up here, too. You had offered alternatives to the other meetings that you had in Mercer County also up here, in multiple parts of the state. And, I wish you went to other parts of the state besides Trenton, Camden, and Newark. There's a lot of other communities that deserve easy access to meetings and their voices to be heard; Paterson and Atlantic City to name a couple. And, lastly, I wish your outreach had been a little stronger, and included language justice, so there are multiple languages used in outreach and at this meeting.

This issue is too important not to have a lot of meaningful and accessible community engagement. Climate change and greenhouse gas emissions and emissions from other co-pollutants are killing our communities. Just like here in Newark with our garbage incinerator, a waste of energy as my colleagues have said. And then two other natural gas power plants in Ironbound. We

need zero emissions now. And as we move towards real renewable energy, like solar and wind energy as well as with weatherization programs, we need to make sure residents of environmental justice communities gain the economic benefit of this transition with community ownership, worker, and locally-owned businesses, business creation, and living wage jobs.

I'm just going to close with a quote from my favorite people Jane Jacobs; cities have the capability of providing something for everybody, only because and only when they are created by everybody. As a corollary to this, our Energy Master Plan can only provide something for everybody in this state and be truly great, if everybody has a seat at the table in creating it, and not just providing verbal and written comment toward the end of the plan after it's already been created.

So, please, I urge you all to continue to have and have more meaningful community engagement and bring people to the table, particularly from our more marginalized communities. We need this authentic community engagement with social and economic inclusion of

all. Thank you.

MS. POWER: Joseph Fave.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: He's not here.

MS. POWER: We're just going to take at ten-minute break and then we'll get back.

(Whereupon a short recess was held.)

MS. POWER: Okay. Next speaker, Leonard Thomas. Followed by Bernadette Maher, and then Cynthia Mellon.

MR. THOMAS: Good afternoon. I'm Leonard Thomas. I'm here from Ironbound Super Neighborhood Council. Just a few points I wanted to make, because time seems sort of short right now.

First of all, I would hope that any future contact that was being made would be made wider and earlier. I didn't get the message until late last night. And I tried to contact some people to come. And, I probably would have more to say, but the fact I didn't have the time to prepare. But that's a big point, because you're looking at stakeholders, some of the people who are most impacted by these energy decisions won't even know. And it will be the same old game, a small group of people be making all the decisions and not

have most of the people in their best interest. So, I hope that in the future, outreach would be a future outreach and wider outreach.

One point I hope that would be followed is this; in any type of Energy Master Plan you have to look at energy load reduction. To only focus on having more than energy is to find only one solution. You're going to find more ways to produce energy, which is silly, because we're just getting more, we waste more, we use more, we waste more, we get more. We're not getting where we really wanted to go, where we need to go with all the issues with climate change and reduction of resources. It's silly not to look at energy load reduction.

And in that mind, I look at some of the things, the possible problems that you have to deal with. For example; where I live in Newark, and about 75 percent of the people that live in Newark are renters. So some of the energy savings that come out would not even apply to them, unless a landlord chooses to use them. And that said, you have to incentivize landlords to take advantage of some of these things that come out. It's sad in other ways, too, because many of these programs

have come out to save energy and do things like this, go so quickly, by the time you hear about them you have maybe a half a day to take advantage of them and you miss out. And if you find out about it and you speak to your landlord and ask them well, will you do this because it's an advantage to you, they don't want to do it. Because they don't see money come into their pockets. It's not worth to them. You're paying your own heat. So what. They have to spend money, they don't want to spend money, because nobody wants to spend money. So, something has to be done to make that work. Otherwise, you don't have a bulk of people wanting to save energy because it's not going to help them. They're just going to be spending more. Energy reduction, again, you have to really get that word out there, too. And that comes out through that notice, that contact with the people, the stakeholders that you want to reach.

Clean energy. Clean energy can never be equated with gas. It can never be equated to fossil fuel. I hear people talk about gas as clean energy. There's so many things coming out of gas combustible. And, if you're talking about fracked

fuel, whether you're talking about oil or gas, it's horrible to see some of the chemicals that come out of there. I guess I think about those chemicals because one of the things that comes out of any type of combustible fuel will be the fine particulate matter air pollution, 2.5 microns. And we have now connected that to so many illnesses, everything from heart disease to cancer, to asthma, to emphysema, to respiratory illness, as I mentioned, cancer. A big thing right now in autism. Autism is exploding. There should be Jerry Lewis on television saying save the kids who have autism, it's that bad. When I started teaching, I didn't know what an autistic child was, to be honest with you. And now we have schools where there are whole floors of autistic classes. Something has changed. Something is going wrong. And yet, when we find out that it's connected to this type of combustion product, this fine particulate matter air pollution, it seems no one is interested in doing anything about it. And, that's so sad. Because autism is not something where you get sick for awhile and you get better. And, I didn't even think about this. You have autistic adults. There are so many difficulties

they have in dealing with life. I don't care how much their families loves them. And, yet, a lot of this is keyed into our energy decisions.

I look at our EJ communities right now. We get hit with so much crap that it doesn't make sense. We are finding money for these big polluting entities. We fought and lost the energy center. They said you're going to have jobs, I think it was eight jobs that came in. They had an agreement to do certain things with the standards. For the first couple of years they broke the standards left and right, like 256 incidents of breaking the rule. And then what they did after that is we had another hearing like this, and we go to testify in front of people from the state, and they say don't worry about it because they're not going to get excused from these standards. That wasn't true. When they finished, they had less infractions because they lowered the standards. That makes no sense, no sense at all. So, on paper it looks good because the standards have been lowered.

So you have more pollution, save money on the processing, and we get damaged more. More children have asthma, emphysema, autism, heart

disease, respiratory illnesses, all those things. And, yet, there's no compensation for that. And, in fact, instead of compensation, what happens is the people who live in that community actually pay more for their energy because the government at the time wanted to keep the energy cost down to ten cents. So, we paid to keep the price of the gas down to ten cents. And then we have to still pay for the energy. But they say look, it's cheap. Well, that's because you paid for it twice. That's not really cheap. What kind of bargain is that?

But, there are so many things like that financial burden you have. How do you find money to put these energy centers into a community, and can't find money for solar farm or wind, or anything like that. That's a puzzle. Right now one of their solutions is take the carbon dioxide get this energy center, and put it into ocean. Their going to make the ocean water into soda. We've had fish kills in the last couple of years. Maybe no one remembers those. But you take the oxygen out of the water, fish die. You put the carbon dioxide in water, you're taking oxygen out, fish die. And then we're going to be hungry, and then the people -- why don't we have so many fish?

What happened to them?

We're not thinking ahead. We're not making those connections. The placement of these new energy plants have to be started in EJ communities because they have been the communities where they had these newer fossil fuel plants. Now, according to the pecking order, these fossil fuel plants would not be scheduled to removed or changed because they were the last ones in. But these are the ones that should fixed first, because these are the neighborhoods that have been the most damaged by this. People are paying more financially for their energy, they're getting less out of it, and the benefits go to somebody else, but they still pay. They pay in money, they pay in health, they pay in life. It's not right.

The last part, I just hope that you will have more people involved. There are so many solutions to this that are possible. A lot is just matter of will and finances. We find the finances through the fossil fuels, why can't we find the finances through the other alternative methods? Why? It makes no sense. It's a question that needs to be answered.

So, I hope that in your planning you

take these suggestions -- I heard several suggestions, wind to water to solar. There are a lot of them out there. In other countries they do it. Countries we feel that are not doing as well as we are, they're doing great with this. Plus, they have a smaller load on their energy, which we should be thinking about, and we're not doing that right now. We have to. It has to be part of that plan, otherwise the plan will fail.

So, I hope that you'll be considering these. And, I hope that with the future hearings that we will have better outreach so that more people -- so, you can really get a feeling of what people want and what they need. There are a lot of suggestions out there. There are things that will make this work, but we have to do the work to get it together. And, I hope we will. Thank you for your time.

MS. POWER: Bernadette Maher.

MS. MAHER: Good afternoon. My name is Bernadette Maher. I'm a volunteer with the Franklin Township task force against compressor station 206 and the northeast supply enhancement project.

And, what I would like to see -- one of

the items I'd like to see in the upcoming energy plan, is that you take all these fossil fuel and infrastructure projects into account overall, and not project by project. There's a Meadowlands project, there's a Roseland project, there's Chesterfield project, there's our project in Franklin Township. And, I think it would be important to overall look at these projects as a whole, versus piecemeal, because I think that would make a big difference. We're becoming the pipeline state.

We're such a densely populated state, that I think we really have to look at the safety issues of all these gas pipelines running through our state. And, some of the Williams TransCo is the company that's doing the northeast supply enhancement project. And, some of the reasons that our township and South Brunswick Township opposes the project are listed below, and I'll just read them off to you. Adding natural gas facilities and pipelines does not support the missions of New Jersey and New York to decrease reliance on fossil fuels, and the transition to renewable energy sources while also increasing energy efficiency. Expansion of this infrastructure will also

exacerbate the impact of intense future weather events on New Jersey. We already know Hurricane Sandy, we have floods, hurricanes, heat waves, infectious diseases, mental health issues, and many more.

The site for the compressor station where we are located has a high water table, and run off of pollutants is a major concern. In the state's water supply plan the Trap Rock Quarry is considered a potential reservoir site after they stop mining in 2040. There is concern that the continued emission of toxins over time will pollute this water resource. And water is more and more becoming a commodity that's in short ply. At Trap Rock Quarry, mining and processing activities include blasting with dynamite.

There are no reported studies or plan from Williams TransCo about the impact of tremors on the stability of the compressor over time for many decades. The concerns are that the ongoing blasting could destabilize the gas powered compressors and turbine units and cause a fire or explosion, with resulting added emissions of toxins. Many of the residents who live down near the quarry and in South Brunswick who live across

from where the quarry is, their homes shake when they do the dynamite blasting. I mean, they are notified like there's going to be blasting today. But, that's one of the major concerns.

Williams also has a long history of safety violations that have led to fires and explosions and leaks, with loss of lives, illnesses, injuries, and damaged land and buildings. There is a potential danger from increased capacity and velocity of gas to the aging Class I and Class II pipelines in densely populated residential neighborhoods, with many elementary schools, daycares, and places of worship and adult communities nearby. The pipeline includes some segments that are over fifty years old, and corrosion or cracks then can lead to gas escapes, adding increased gas along these lines may add stress. And this combination has led to dangerous explosions and fires elsewhere.

I think we all seen what's happened just recently in Massachusetts. Gas powered compressors emit many airborne toxins as part of routine operations. And these include known carcinogens, as well as respiratory irritants. Particulate emissions are mostly at the point where

natural gas is burned at the compressor unit. Particulate matter can get deep into the lung and carries other toxic chemicals. Modeling has shown that it can travel 2.5 to six miles away. Studies have shown that the levels per PM2's are not protective of human health.

Also, there is a New Jersey Buddhist Vihara which would share a property boundary with the compressor station. Walking meditation is a common practice, and there are frequent outdoor religious observances, as well as the weekend dhamma school where children engage in activities outdoors. Noise, toxic emissions, and the fear of risk of an explosion or fire would interfere with the rights of the monks and the congregants to practice their religion. The New Jersey Buddhist Vihara serves as both a place of worship and a cultural center for those of Sri Lankan heritage and the community at large. Their Samadhi Buddhist statue is the largest and tallest in the western hemisphere, and it was designated as a cultural landmark by Franklin Township. As it is, as a result of the blasting, some of the foundation there has already cracked; so, we're not quite sure what's going to happen when there's additional

vibration from the compressor station.

Construction and operations would interfere with communications, breeding, food sources, and navigation of wildlife. The pipeline would also then go over to Raritan Bay under the Raritan Bay over to the Rockaways, and then the pipeline would turn and go to Brooklyn. Construction in the Raritan Bay would resuspend and spread toxic contaminants that would adversely impact habitat and marine mammals. The feeding habitats and nesting grounds of birds on the state and federal endangered and threatened species list by the Raritan Bay would be affected by construction, noise, and pollution. There would be negative impacts on recreational boating, fishing, and commercial fishing to communities along the Raritan Bay, that include but are not limited to a potential to cripple business dependent on seasonal visitor access to the bay.

Also, greenhouse gas from the NSSI project would contribute to more significant health problems, ozone, and damaging weather climate-related events that harm and cost all of us here in New Jersey.

So, I think as part of the overall

Master Plan, taking all these projects into consideration as an aggregate would be helpful. Again, we want to try and have a Master Plan that gives us a rapid transition to renewable energies. And, clean energy should be our goal. And some of these fossil fuel projects are not clean energy. We should reject these market-based schemes where you can buy credits from one place and give it to another. These effect, I guess, disproportionately I believe environmental justice communities. And most important, these projects, the plan, should address environmental justice issues. I think that's very important here in the State of New Jersey. Thanks very much.

MS. POWER: Cynthia Mellon. Emily Turonis.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: She left.

MS. POWER: Subquidah Carter.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: She left.

MS. POWER: And then Alexa Sanchez. Christopher Latonnel. Jeanett Mitchell.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Here I am.

MS. POWER: Okay. You'll be next.

MS. MELLON: Hi. Good evening. My name is Cynthia Mellon. And, I am the policy

coordinator for the National Climate Justice Alliance, which links 68 organizations across the country, also which are based in low-income environmental justice communities. Ironbound Community Corporation, ICC -- I'm also co-chair of the City of Newark Environmental Commission. A member of the Board of New Jersey Environmental Justice Alliance. And, the chair of the Environmental Justice Committee of the Latino Action Network of New Jersey.

Working with the membership of the Climate Justice Alliance, we've developed an energy democracy platform that has ten principals of energy democracy, which include the human right to a clean and healthy environment rooted in a commitment to a just transition for workers and communities who will experience displacement as we move into a clean energy future.

We call for an end of fossil fuel use by 2035. We believe this is possible. We want to see community solar, owned and coordinated and governed by the communities, as other people here have spoken about. And, this means community-based planning and assessment, and the type of inclusive action that others have talked about this

afternoon. And, we favor a smaller more local solar grid. It can be close to communities so that they can actually reap the benefit of those jobs. And, it's smaller equipment they will be able to achieve the same thing.

We define clean energy as solar, wind, and small hydro projects. And we completely reject nuclear, waste incineration, and biomass. These are not clean energy, and should not be included in that category. We reject market-based programs such as carbon trading and cap and trade. These are false solutions. And we reject all of the more recently proposed geo-engineering schemes, which also includes carbon capture and storage. These are false solutions that some are promoting in order to profit from the current climate crisis. We saw this heavily promoted at Governor Jerry Brown's climate action summit a couple of weeks ago.

Finally, we want to see an end to siting dirty energy facilities in already overburdened communities, like those that we have been speaking of tonight, and the environmental justice communities like Newark. We need mitigation for the facilities that are already

here. And, I just want to say that here in Newark as a city of concern, a community of concern, working very closely with the previous EDA and the one we have now to put an end to vehicle idling, and other types of things that creating more problems around pollution here. So, I'll end with that. Thank you.

MS. MITCHELL: Hi everyone. My name is Jeanett Mitchell. I am a climate organizer with Clean Water Action. You heard from my colleague, Kim Gaddy, earlier. And of course everyone here is really our colleagues because we all work together.

My organization is funded a hundred percent grass roots. And, a lot of the work we do is in the State of New Jersey, but we also do a lot of work in Newark, New Jersey, as well. Particularly I do a lot of work in the south ward, which is directly linked to the Ironbound, so we share a lot of the same issues.

Governor Murphy's commitment to a hundred percent clean energy economy by 2050 is visionary. Achieving the goal it will take key interim benchmark to restore New Jersey as a national leader, not just in terms of addressing the climate crisis, but also advancing public

health, protecting private property, growing the economy, and creating the jobs. Hurricane Sandy was catastrophic in many ways. I was in my bed very cold for a lot of time. But I know that there were a lot of residents who faced a lot of flooding. And when there is flooding in certain types of areas that have a lot of pollution and truck activity, of course the water is mixed in with a lot of elements that you would never want anyone to drink much less touch your skin. This also resulted in a loss of power, and residents in both, of course, the Ironbound and south ward were exposed to many toxins from chemicals in sewerage plants overwhelmed by surge water that ended up in our neighborhoods and our communities.

One of the areas that I work in is in the Dayton Street neighborhood. That area alone has about eleven public housing high-rises, as well as town homes. And those high-rises are home to senior citizens and people with disabilities. A lot of them during that time were trapped on their particular floors, and were not able to come down. One of the things that we talk about a lot when we talk about community work is at each one/teach one, which is pretty much your neighbor being your

keeper. And we call that a buddy system. That is something that we are looking to constantly create when we talk with tenant associations, as well as community groups. But it is also something that needs to happen, I would think, on a national level, as well. And definitely on a city level so that residents can have more diversity in terms of emergency contact and not just the usual 9-1-1.

If we are able to create a more sustainable energy infrastructure, we need to plan for the extremely hazardous situations mentioned earlier. And, here are seven to start with. One; getting power back quickly in all neighborhoods regardless of color, income, geography, precedence, or restore power in some cases much longer than in the Jersey shore. Having independent microgrids that allow complex institutions and neighborhoods to stay on line with power, regardless of the largest system being damaged. Three; getting back on line faster with the emergency power systems prioritizing the most vulnerable people, the elderly, sick, and disabled. Definitely in some cases there needs to be a lot of work with the Housing Authority, as well, too, to be able to address some of these concerns in times of

disaster. Which is when we really think about energy and resources when something bad happens, and not necessarily when we go in and can turn on the lights. Number five; having neighbor-to-neighbor check-in systems, which is our buddy system. Ensuring that we have the ability to take renewable energy systems off the grid, and put them to on-site use and back up when larger systems shut down. Number six; taking steps to minimize use of gas and diesel power generators, which are unsafe, contribute greenhouse gases and other co-pollutants, as well as are being difficult to access during power outages when our pumping stations do not work. And, number seven, of course, emphasizing a more decentralized renewable energy, and reduce demand. Energy efficiency demand response and conservation are policies, not building more fossil fuel infrastructure. And, of course, finally, you know, we are happy that these two new hearings are happening. We wish more residents can come. And, we know that, as you said earlier, that this is just initial conversations and hearings and that there are more to look forward to working with you guys. In the future you can definitely call on us, I or Mr. Pringle who

works with us here, as well. Thank you.

MS. POWER: We have Heather McFalls and Olga Morales. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak who didn't sign up?

MS. McFALLS: Hi. My name is Heather McFalls. I'm with the New Habor. I live in Newark for about eight years.

One of the things that this is very important to me as a half-blood native American because sustainable energy can help protect a little bit of the earth we still have left. A lot of things that are going on now with the pipelines and the power plant, which is very important to not let go through because it's just going to make the problem much worse, and we want to switch to sustainable and a hundred percent energy, that's just going to make the process even more complicated because having more pollution, which we don't need at all. One of the things I wanted to say is that it will help create jobs, as well as create a job market where, you know, we will be able to give more jobs to local people, as well as people from, you know, that have studied and have a new job working with green energy jobs. I'm sorry.

We'll leave a lighter carbon footprint on the earth now, which is more important because if you think about it he is projecting 'til 2050. And I very agree with everyone else that it needs to be earlier than 2050. 2035 would be the best projection, because the way that we are now with the pollution that we have now, it's getting worse. And we're not going to have that time later. If we put this off to a later time, we're not going to have that time. And, it's going to be too late to do this because the pollution and the damage is going to be done already. And, without our earth mother, which to me is very important, we wouldn't be able to live. Her oxygen is what helps us breathe, what helps us have lives. So, not just the animals and plants will be dying, but so will we. If it is harmful to her and if it's harmful to the environment, then it's harmful to us, as well. Because it's going to cause a lot more problems not just with her, but problems for us, as well.

And, I know that as a native American I feel that this is what the great spirit and our creator father side would have wanted. Because we were put here on this earth to take care of her.

And we've done it for awhile but now with the natural gas and the pipelines we are creating more pollution than we can actually contain it and clean up after ourselves. Which is very important, because in other countries, as someone else has said, there is sustainable energy, there's wind energy, there's water and powered energy, and it's doing very well for them. And, we look at them as third-world countries, but I feel that they're doing much better off then we are, especially in the energy department.

In closing, I definitely want to say that there is a parable that rings true to this. And one of our ancestors has said only when the last tree has died, when the last river has been poisoned, and the last fish has been caught, we will realize we cannot eat our money. Money comes and goes, but our earth where we live where we have to survive, that is what really needs to be protected. Not the money in our pockets, but the environment, the trees and the grass which we need to live. The oxygen, the water. Because we are polluting our water supplies, and that is definitely something we need live off of. And the oxygen that we need to breathe. If we draw out

all this carbon dioxide and we have not oxygen to take in, we're going to die, as well as the planet. Thank you.

MS. POWER: Olga Morales.

(Through an interpreter)

MS. MORALES: Only Spanish. Good evening. (In Spanish)

MS. SURREY: So, you are New Labor. It's a non-profit organization called New Labor. More than 3,500 members. They represent immigrant workers. They believe that it's worth participating in this. It's a very ambitious project. It sets New Jersey for a better future. But, the way that the project is presented it only seems like the money is the important part of it. It doesn't seem like it protects the environment. So, she believes that they're using the -- they're using wind, but they're not really making.

I don't understand. I can't understand. I'm sorry.

MS. McFALL: (As Interpreter) We believe that -- she says that we are not giving back to the environment what we are taking from her.

She says that in the project we should

have a place where we grow trees so that they can process the carbon dioxide and give us back something.

She says that they're only thinking about the money to have the green energy for the people who already have money in their pockets and they are not paying for the energy to produce their business.

The people that are producing and have money and that have power, they are the ones that are winning at this.

Basically, the government is just putting in their money and their time and their effort for the people who have money, and for them so that they can do and produce their business without paying for it energy-wise.

But where is the community benefiting? You don't see the investment in the community or the people that are benefiting from the community from this.

The project should also have components to where they are using the garbage to reduce, reuse, and recycle, so the community can benefit from it. Having a job. Educational. Forming green-wise, energy-wise, knowing about the

environment. And at the same time receiving incentives that better their quality of life. Because you don't see this in the project. They only talk about implementing wind energy. Minimizing the impact by changing the transportation from buses to electric buses. But the environment involves many things. And where the community is a very important part.

The small part the community will receive with this change. The change, the minimal change that would come is that in their, when they pay their electric bill there would be a small reduction in the price that they pay. That would be the only thing.

What does the big companies receive? They sell their buses to other countries that are not as forward in the energy as we are. Take a new technology of buses, they get rich, pay less. And the government, the only thing that they did was take all their resources and put it into this. That they are from the taxes, even the ones that poor people pay. Only to benefit for the big companies. The factories, for example, what are they giving? They don't give nothing. They treat bad their employees. There's no security and

health and safety for them. They don't pay them very well, and to produce their product. And to produce their project in the future would cost much less. But they will sell it for more. And, so, where did the community win from that?

It's important that we reflect on how a project that's very good and very promising, and really for the environment, where it should benefit the community -- for the environment, but starting with the community. Where will the big companies be investing that money, and what they got from it into the community or into the future? They shouldn't pay less for their energy. They should pay the same amount, so that that money is invested in the future and in the community. Investing in New Jersey.

In the project there's different components that are missing. Components that are missing that would make this a very promising and future project. The investment that the government will put into it is so big. That really is important. And, it is something that will be shown in the future. Not only used for the companies that are big.

She says she doesn't want to say

anymore, but thank you very much.

MS. POWER: Last call for speakers. Anybody? Well, thank you so much for coming tonight. Again, please, we welcome you to submit comments via e-mail. And, we hope to see you at our next meeting next week in Camden. Thank you.

(Whereupon the proceedings were concluded at 7:00 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, CHRISTINA RESTUCCIA, a Court Reporter of the State of New Jersey, authorized to administer oaths pursuant to R.S.41:2-2, do hereby CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony that was taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and on the date herein before set forth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am not financially interested in the action.

Notary Public of the State of New Jersey
My Commission expires November 14, 2021

D

E

T

U