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MR. CAMPANIANO: So now is the opportunity for you to come forth and offer your testimony, should you desire. The rules are fairly straight forward. We ask that you treat each other with the aloha and respect that we have been experiencing throughout the state.

I'll call your names, and please come forward. And, if you can, speak pretty succinctly so that our court reporter can pick up your testimony and transcribe it. I would also ask you to please spell your name so that she can get your name spelled correctly.

So we are going to start with Janeel. We are going to follow with Greg and then followed by David.

I am going to ask you to come and, again, to respect the rights of others; if you could keep your initial comments to about three minutes. And then if there's time, we can circle back if you've got anything else to say.

MS. HEW: Thank you, Robin.

Again, I want to thank everybody for coming; both the crew, Mark, and everybody here on Molokai. I would like to ask anyone that is here from Molokai to help spread this information, give people the e-mail address to comment the web site information and so on.

I did scan the draft. Again, thank you for getting that information out to people. My concern was that although I appreciated all the work that everybody put into this -- I know it was a long process -- I know that I personally submitted over 200 questions, questions and comments, concerns.

And what I saw was that your teams reviewed, took into consideration and categorized. Where is the answers? Am I overlooking them in the so many thousand pages? Are there answers that we can turn to? I did not see any of the questions and comments that I submitted even on the web site.

The only ones that I did find were the ones that I stated verbally at the meeting that we had at Mitchell Pauole. So apparently, I'm missing a link or the questions that I submitted weren't received. But I would like to know where I could find the answers to these things.

A lot of the information that I was looking
at -- and there was a lot of information to go
through -- a lot of the information was very generic
for me. I was hoping when it came down to the
impacts, there would be more information in regards
to, say, the undersea cable. What happens when it
deteriorates, because it's not going to be removed
from the ocean. You know, what is it made of and
what do those things -- how do those things affect
our ocean life.

So I'm hoping -- and I will submit more
questions in writing -- but I'm hoping to find
answers to the questions and comments. So I think
that would help us feel more informed.

Thank you.

MR. KAHN: Aloha, everyone. My name is
Several weeks ago, the PUC reprimanded HECO
for not developing an energy action plan that would
reduce cost reductions to the consumer, and then they
ordered them to do so. As a regulated utility, HECO
is mandated to provide a reliable service at a
reasonable cost.

But the utility's impractical and misguided
pursuit of undersea cables that connect the islands
is a plan that does exactly what the PUC has
instructed them not to do. The implementation of
deep water cables as electric grid ties and electric
generation ties not only hinders reliability by
adopting an all-your-eggs-in-one basket philosophy,
but it also ignores the order to provide electricity
at a reasonable cost because the rate payer and the
tax payer foot the bill.

Now, according to HECO's own figures, the
cost of these gen-tie and grid-tie cables will be in
the ballpark of about $5.2 billion. That's not one
million, that's not 10 million, that's not a hundred
million, that's a thousand million dollars times
five. And those are in 2009 dollars. So how does
anyone here interpret this as being a reasonable
cost.

So, HECO takes no financial risk in the
construction and maintenance of the cable, but is
able to use that asset that we pay for to generate a
profit. Now, the utility claims that the cost per
kilowatt hours is going to be reduced. But what they
don't say is that with the consumer paying for the
cable, our monthly bills will likely increase because
we'll see adjustments, surcharges, assessments and
fees.

At the Integrated Resource Planning Meeting
last spring in Honolulu, HECO's manager in charge of
overseeing the undersea cable presented the utility's
plan for inter-island connectivity. Afterwards,
during the Q and A we asked him, "What are the life
spans of these cables?" And his response was -- and
I quote, "I don't know, 15 to 20 years."

So, firstly, how can the utility proclaim
that the cable will reduce our bills when they are
not certain about the data needed to make that very
claim. In other words, if you are unsure of the life
span of the cable, how do you figure with any
accuracy its financial impact on the consumer?

Secondly, 15 to 20 years? Does that mean
that every generation of rate payers in Hawaii will
have to pony up billions of dollars when the cables
go down? Our children, our children's children and
their children will have to keep giving HECO billions
and billions of dollars to replace broken cables so
they can have electricity?

What we see in reading the PEIS is that
conspicuously absent from this discussion on the
utility's myopic radar are the obvious and plausible
alternative to the multi-billion dollar undersea
cable model. And that is, around the globe you find
countless nations, countless communities, who are
implementing micro-grids, implementing energy co-ops,
decentralized generation, etc. to achieve energy
independence without fossil fuels.

    Now, Molokai's peak load is never above a
meager seven megawatts. So it would be financially
beneficial to the rate payer to establish a renewable
portfolio here, which would only require an amalgam
of, say, a two to three megawatt solar park (which
other islands have), some pumped hydrostorage (which
other islands have), and a waste-to-energy landfill
(which other islands have.)

    Maybe we should ask ourselves the question,
do we want to wean ourselves off of fossil fuels by
constantly paying for the undersea cable folly, or do
we want to wean ourselves off of HECO by creating our
own renewal strategy that will generate and
distribute energy on Molokai for Molokai. Thank you.

    (Applause)

    MR. KANGAS: Janeel and Greg, that was
beautiful. This is like a postscript to that.

    My name is David Kangas, K-A-N-G-A-S, with
"I Aloha Molokai." Again, thank you very much for
coming here and letting us all speak tonight.

    I believe I'm correct in saying "I Aloha
Molokai", most people here and in Hawaii are
cautiously optimistic that we are of course stopping
the wind mills here and any cables.

Often our government has ignored the
communities here and on the mainland in making
"progress" to improve making energy and that proved
disastrous, especially for those environments and
people. Please do not ignore us here or in Hawaii.

We Aloha Molokai, our raw nature here and
our population here and in Hawaii. We don't ever
want any cables or wind mills of any kind touching
this island. That technology is not feasible and it
simply does not work to preserve Hawaii. We won't
tolerate that. Thank you.

(Appplause)

MR. CAMPANIANO: Mahalo, Dave. Mike Bond
followed by Peggy and then Rita.

MR. BOND: Thank you. Just a couple of
brief things.

My name is Mike Bond, B-O-N-D, I live on the
west end. My family has been in Hawaii for nearly
200 years and we're extensive on all the islands.
I wanted to briefly touch on my own personal
background in the energy business. I was project
manager of a Department of the Interior Electric
Power Research Institute Study, a national study of
the impacts of underground and high tension wires for
the Navy.

I was project manager of several sanguine
Studies of hundreds of thousands of square miles for
potential cable laying, as well as many other
energy-related projects. I was the chair of the
28-Nation group that integrated or spoke the working
documents for integrating the Soviet Union's grid
with the west, etc.

I was the CEO of an energy company and
worked very long and hard for Al Gore in the energy
part of the 2000 presidential campaign. I'm very
pro -- totally pro renewable energy -- which is why
I'm very concerned and upset by this document.

There isn't time to go into it -- I have
read a good part of it -- there isn't time to go into
it, I am going to give an extensive response written.
But I would just like to say the one thing that
concerns me the most is the tacit acceptance of the
underground cable and the tacit acceptance of DBEDT's
arguments in favor of the cable. And in fact,
Mr. Glick being here tonight, Mr. Glick has long been
a very strong proponent of the cable.

And I personally, with more than 30 years of
experience in the energy business, I have to say I
think the cable is a disaster. It's hyper-costly and
it's basically in my view a political corporate scam.
And I would like to just give a very short
description. For instance, you start out with 200
megawatts of main plate capacity on a wind project in
Maui that you're trying to get to Oahu.

First off, your actual capacity factor is
about 24 percent in Hawaii. That takes you down to
48 megawatts. I just scribbled this right now on the
back of my pad here -- by the time you're done -- by
the time you take in the transmission loss, the
curtailment by HECO of power coming from this wind
project on Maui or wherever that they can't use for
curtailment, by the time you consider the cost of the
fuel for the spinning reserve that you have to run
constantly because wind is so erratic and going up
and down, you need to have a constant back-up of
fossil fuel generation.

Then, when you add in the purchases by wind
projects when they are forced to keep their rotors
turning, you have to buy electricity to do so when
the wind is uncooperative. That's just a few of the
many disasters associated with a wind project.
And I'll give you an example. In
California, hundreds of thousands of acres of
California are covered by wind projects. They
slaughter birds and bats by the millions. There's
13,000 wind turbines in California. They can be
replaced by one single gas-fired combined-cycle power
plant on about 45 acres; 555 megawatts would replace
hundreds of thousands of acres of bird cuisinarts,
which is what the renewable energy people call wind
mills.

So, just briefly, because I know our time is
short, these are not just fanciful projects. The
cable has been proposed, there is a law that was
passed, thanks to Mr. Gatto, that forces the
consumers to -- in actuality -- pay for it. So this
is not just a theoretical project, this is a real
project.

For instance, one of the proposed developers
just bought the land for the cable to land on in
Oahua. So they obviously think it's a real project
and not just a fanciful one.

The only way we can move forward
intelligently on Hawaii is rooftop solar. HECO has
tried to stop -- slow down rooftop solar everywhere
they can -- the 15 percent limit, all the other
balderdash associated with that one.

Kauai itself, by next year, is going to be
over 50 percent rooftop solar in terms of total
generation because it's not part of HECO and they can
do what's right.

I just have to say that the DBEDT'S analysis
of the cable and of the related wind projects is
fanciful, it's made up. It makes no sense to anybody
who has spent years in the energy business. Anybody
who's used to looking at it, it's a fraud. And it's
driven by corporate contributions to politicians who
then go ahead and push the kinds of legislation that
the corporations wish.

So, we're not so much dependent on foreign
oil as we could be. We could be free in many ways.
That's an old -- that's an old -- I don't know want
you want to call it -- scaredy cat -- to get
everybody to push for wind.

We need distributed generation, which you
did talk about briefly. I would just like to say
that rooftop solar has very few impacts. We're
coming to the point where batteries can be utilized,
we don't need to even be on the grid anymore. We
certainly don't need to build a catastrophic cable
through the humpback whale's sanctuary and saddle all
Hawaii rate payers with the cost.

Thank you.
(Applause)

MS. BOND: My name is Peggy Lucas Bond.

L-U-C-A-S  B-O-N-D.

When this PEIS project started way back in December 2010, like many Hawaiians, I was unclear as to what a PEIS was and why it was being done. Our learning curve was sharp. And, as you noted earlier, our public comments were instrumental in forcing the original 2010 PEIS to be morphed into the current Draft PEIS.

This new Draft PEIS now encompasses a wider scope of options for Hawaii to use to reduce C02 emissions rather than focusing on the ill-conceived Big Wind alternative, which penalized Molokai and Lanai as well as Hawaiian rate payers.

Hawaiians, particularly those on the less-populated islands, have become more energy aware and are looking to become energy independent. The concept of developing industrial scale energy projects to ship power to more populated islands is not widely accepted or popular. The Draft PEIS highlights many low impact options that would help Hawaii on an island-by-island basis to achieve the energy independence economically without large-scale projects that would qualify for government subsidies
that will raise our taxes and electricity rates.

The Draft PEIS is lengthy and I have not been able to review all of its representative alternatives which, as is stated in the document, are "NOT" recommendations. Hopefully, developers will use this document and remember that they are not recommendations if they are planning to pursue the representative transmission and distribution project -- the Oahu-Maui grid tie.

The selection of the Oahu-Maui grid tie project seems to imply that the State's desire to move forward with this project is valid. Although the Draft states that this "representative project is not intended to reflect any known or planned project", the reality is that this project is before the Hawaii PUC and is a real project.

The Draft goes so far as to agree that the grid tie is "in the public interest". How can a project whose cost will certainly raise all ratepayers' electricity bills and have massive environmental impacts be in the public interest? Additionally, can we claim that it is in the public interest when it would be built if it were connecting industrial-scale "renewable projects" which are subsidized by Federal grants that add to our Federal
deficit?

This is especially egregious here in Hawaii where there are other alternatives described in the Draft that are more economically and more environmentally safe.

In classifying the characteristics of the potential environmental impacts of electrical and transmission distribution, the Draft suggests that the socioeconomic impacts of an undersea cable are those "common among most construction and operational activities."

At the same time, the Draft acknowledges that the impacts of electro-magnetic fields from the operation of undersea cables on marine species are unknown and that researchers are working to determine the extent and the magnitude of the impacts.

Shouldn't the Draft recommend that no cables be laid until these impacts are known and validated? Or, in the very least, the Draft should recommend that the Uncertainty Principle as outlined by the Rio Convention be applied.

We have come a long way worldwide towards protecting our marine resources since I worked with Dr. Ken Norris at Oceanic Institute in the early 1970's. Dr. Norris was doing groundbreaking research
on humpback whales that led to the creation of the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale sanctuary. The sanctuary needs to be respected, and particularly its annual six-month moratorium on activities such as cable construction.

I may have missed the mention of this in the Draft. And if it's not there, it should be. It's very easy to be cavalier about daily life underwater. I am one of few individuals who has had an opportunity to live and work underwater. After ten days living in an underwater habitat and spending many hours in the water, I came to realize that the undersea world is complex and fragile, and that the Hawaiian concept that the ocean is a mirror image of the land is correct. Let's not go backwards on marine resource protection as this document can be interpreted to suggest.

I also challenge the Draft's assumption that undersea cables have no environmental justice impacts. Isn't the degradation of the fisheries in areas where population who rely on fishing for subsistence a potential environmental justice impact? Similarly, wouldn't industrial projects on less-populated islands connected via an inter-island cable have the environmental justice impact of
subjecting residents to "disproportionally high and adverse impacts" by substantially changing the nature of their island? Thank you.

(Appause)

MR. CAMPANIANO: We have one more person who has signed up to testify. Kano?

I'm sorry, Rita, I jumped the gun.

MS. WOODS: Hi. My name is Rita Woods -- R-I-T-A, W-O-O-D-S -- and I am a resident of Molokai, and very, very interested in what's been going on with the PEIS.

First of all, I want to say that it's a very, very amazing chunk of paperwork here. And I learned a lot about my island just by reading through it. Spent most of the day today, in fact, which is why I'm cross-eyed tonight.

My main concern about this PEIS is the plan for the submarine cable. From the maps provided throughout the PEIS, Molokai seems to have the lion's share of endangered species and marine involvement.

From the maps, it appears that a cable from Maui to Oahu will require three stations on Molokai. It looks like it will be coming into the Pala'au area, which is a very high tourism area, beautiful beaches; and also it looks like it will be coming in
at Kakahaia National Wildlife Refuge just beyond the Kavelas.

That's where all of the nutrients flow into the ocean, and why we have some tremendous amounts of green turtles and beautiful, beautiful coral heads and fish of just every imaginable color.

Then, the last one, as it jumps off for Oahu, looks like it will be at Ilio Point, which is a very popular place for the very greatly endangered Hawaiian Monk Seal where they take in on birthing, nursing, resting, and molting.

We just did our Monk Seal count on Saturday, and we counted 17 on Molokai, 17 on Oahu, and fewer as you go south. That's not very many. And if we start to take over their nesting and birthing places, we'll probably lose more.

Their PEIS, by the way, is extremely specific about the Hawaiian Monk Seals. And apparently, it is in progress and people are abiding by it.

The area in its entirety, of course, is the whale sanctuary here. And it's just silly that we have so many different endangered species that we're going to try and interrupt with this cable that's going through.
I believe the favorable course for Molokai and for all of the islands will be to focus on projects that work specifically for them.

For us, I believe that solar power is the best thing. Raising that arbitrary 15 percent level on solar would be very good; that would be a good start; and then having some battery storage would of course be helpful.

The report talks about having converter stations at each of these three points where they hit Molokai. It says that they'll be up to 40 feet above ground level and have a footprint of six acres within a half mile of shoreline. That's an enormous chunk of land to disturb and will create a huge amount of silt, which has been smothering our pristine Fringe Reef, our 30-mile long -- second only to Australia's Great Barrier Reef -- that runs along the south part of Molokai.

For all these reasons, for the three huge converter stations that will affect the humpback whale sanctuary, the severely endangered Hawaiian Monk Seal birthing areas, the population of green sea turtles, our Fringe Reef along the south shore of Molokai, and the huge footprints taken up by all of this on our tiny island -- we don't want it, we don't
need it, and we -- at least I -- am opposed to the
undersea cable.

Thank you.

(Appause)

MR. HELM: Aloha and Mahalo, you guys, for
coming and broadening this process and looking at
other alternatives. I think Molokai has stated loud
and clear our stands on the cable and the Big Wind
project, and we oppose it.

Been saying it over and over again. I think
you guys get the message.

I represent an organization, Ikehu Molokai.
We have over 800 members. And we continue to meet
every month, continue to look for alternatives.

We have our meetings maybe every two months;
and hopefully we can get a little bit more on that,
called the Molokai Clean Energy Initiative. And we
will be more than glad to share some of that
information with you folks that we've gathered from
some of the people here on the island.

With that, I just wanted to share a
statement from Molokai Ranch, which comes from their
web site. I would like this to go on the record
because this is what they say, and this is on there
about the project, the cable project.
"Ikehu Molokai has the potential to convert the island to 100 percent renewable and to accomplish the following goals." And I will just read a few.

"Stabilize and reduce the cost of the energy to make it more affordable for Molokai residents and businesses, enable the grid to absorb more distributed renewable energy. For example, residential and commercial rooftop solar systems. Allow Molokai to be self-sufficient in energy, putting island residents more in control of their energy future and help make the island a global model of sustainability.

Reduce electricity for Molokai only. No connection to a cable or export to other islands."

I want to repeat that. "Reduce electricity for Molokai only, no connection to a cable or export to other islands."

This is a statement that Molokai Ranch made.

So, I just wanted that to go on record. We continue to work hard and look for alternatives.

Just again, thank you folks very much.

Mahalo.

MR. CAMPANIANO: Is there anybody else who has not signed up to testify yet that would like to come forward?
MR. ESPANIOLA: James Esptaniola. Aloha, everybody. My name is James Esptaniola.

I just have a couple of questions to the Hawaii guys -- or just questions about -- I mean, listening just tonight the conversations about the alternative energy and the issues, to me it's creating energy and meeting that goal that the state has does not look like an issue.

The issue that is bringing up all these other issues is the energy going from wherever it's been created to the consumers. And that's coming through basically the issue that they're dealing with, the electric companies.

That's where the issue is coming from, is that -- and to me -- if the state was serious about meeting their goals, to me I was wondering if the state ever took data on what was the electric company's use and consumption of fuel that they're generating. Because the thing that it looks like is that they're pursuing a lot of, you know, businesses and homeowners to help meet this objective.

But if you look at it, if you really figure out who were the biggest consumers or biggest industries that are using up the energy, and you had those people focus on the reduction of their energy
or having them switch over to alternative powers, you meet your goals a lot faster and it will have less effects.

Because the biggest energy consumer right now would be HECO because they're bringing all their fuel in. But what have they brought to the plan other than wind, because everybody is saying no to it -- and the undersea cable -- what else have they brought to the plan in order to, you know, show that they're actually making an effort to cut their costs and their reductions.

I mean, a couple of other questions is, also is if the state has any policies that help out the individual homeowners? I mean, there's a lot of different tax breaks that are going around. But I've never seen any tax break for homeowners who are off the grid on their own.

You've got to either have solar, because there's paperwork for that, or you've got to have, you know, a solar water heater or some other sources. But there is people that are using their own technology or creating their own fuel. But they're, you know, they're creating their own fuel on site. But there's -- I haven't seen any breaks for them. I mean, even for transportation to meet that
goal of 70 percent is a really interesting goal to cut the fuel cost by 70 percent. I mean, the only way to do that is to, you know, switch out people's cars.

But there is technologies and people that are doing it individually, saving fuel, becoming more fuel efficient with their vehicles which means they use -- get better mileage -- which means they're consuming less fuel. I mean, it's not -- to reach those reductions is not necessarily you have to stop all of it.

But it's just, you know, you've just got to -- you know, it's like the alternatives that you guys -- that they have on here -- there's 31 different technologies. Creating the power is not the issue. Like to me it's just -- I'd just like to say that the biggest issue that I see and I hear from other people is dealing with the electric companies. The one thing with a lot of people were against the Big Wind company over here when they were developing. And a lot of things was, you know, people were against the company and asking them like, oh, all the power is going to Oahu and none is coming back to Molokai.

The issue is the power not coming back to
Molokai was never in the hands of the company. They have to deal with HECO. It's HECO that is restricting the possibilities that could be beneficial for the island.

Now, if -- because I heard alternative plans from people that talked with the wind companies where their deal for the community -- which I'm just using the wind now, but it could go for any power source like Kano mentioned with the Molokai Ranch, that there is people that see the potential of this island because of the size of the island and the people, and the support that the people have towards alternative energies, that it could be totally self-sufficient.

But the biggest barrier is this HECO. If HECO doesn't allow like Molokai Ranch's project that could become a hundred percent renewable, they don't want that because if they're not bringing in fuel or they don't have a line that they've got to maintain, that's one less fee that they can't add on your bill in order for you to pay, which is more profits.

And it comes down basically to the profits.

How can -- as gas prices rise throughout the nation and the electric bills rise -- how is their profit margin also rising when they're saying they're doing it for the consumer, that we need to raise -- we need
to raise prices of electricity because of the cost
that is -- the increasing costs in order to produce
it.

Well, if your costs is increasing and you're
increasing the bills, your profit margin should not
be exponentially increasing. And when they report
their finances it's blindly -- everybody can see
it -- but I don't hear anybody questioning, okay, you
ask PUC to raise the gas prices because gas is going
up, everybody can see it, everybody knows importing
fuel is going up.

But how does you raising it by five cents,
and all of a sudden your profit margin is increasing?
To me it's like if you're really doing it -- the
business of energy, the problem with HECO the way it
is -- that it's such a monopoly within the islands
that it's on, that they're just focused on -- they've
become too much of a corporation and wants their
focus on their bottom line, on their profits, and not
on their services to the people. And then that's why
they're having -- that's why they're having issues
with everybody.

But I just don't -- I just don't -- I just
disagree -- I mean, I agree that alternative energy,
there is potential. I see no problem with Hawaii
reaching those goals.

But to me, the biggest barrier is -- right now is HECO -- because a perfect example is somebody else mentioned on Kauai where they have another energy source that is not with HECO, they're making progress. And to me, it's like the direction that we're focusing, maybe the people, but also the state, some of that should be directed to HECO.

I mean, the issue is with HECO, they're trying to cover their costs. Something I heard from somebody who used to work there, the reason they didn't want the Big Wind Energies coming in is because they have some of their contracts for fuel that they haven't a set price that is set for "X" amount of years out there. And that's why they don't want alternatives yet because they already bought the fuel and they need to use it.

A good example of that is the reason why the electric plant in Maalaea on Maui is switching over to biodiesel, and HECO supported the wind farm, was their contract for their fuel is running out. So that's why they are pursuing alternative energies, because they don't want to use fuel anymore because it's going to cost them too much.

But yeah, thank you, everyone. And
everybody else have a good night.

MR. CAMPANIANO: Would there be anybody else
who would like to testify for the first time?

Then, Janeel, come on back up.

MS. HEW: Just me again.

I would like to emphasize, I think, what
most of the group here is feeling. We received this
draft of the final EIS.

My feeling is it's not ready. I know you
guys have put a lot of work into it. But I think we
need more details, we need more responses to our
concerns.

And we need issues such as what's going to
happen, how smart is it really to put anything in the
ocean, whether it's wind power or the cable in the
ocean, when we're dealing with issues such as
radiation from the Japan incident. Nobody is
thinking about those things. How is it going to
affect that cable or any wind mill stations out in
the ocean.

We still have to look at the larger picture,
not just site specific. And that's what I'm seeing
in the PEIS. A lot of it is site specific.

I also noticed that -- and I have to admit
I got a little offended by it, okay -- which was the
area of the impact on social, economics, and how the
impact wasn't that big because it was a minority or
it impacted -- there was the minority of individuals
in low-income situations.

That was offensive because Molokai, that's
the majority of the people that live here, that will
be impacted.

When we look at the issue of long term,
again, it needs to be broadened in the effect of more
than site specific.

When we're talking about our area, when
we're talking about our animals, I would like to see
the Draft -- the PEIS -- I would like to see it
include more information from NOAA. I would like to
know how they plan on protecting the whales when it
comes down to the guidelines for submarine cables
saying that the Hawaii humpback sanctuary is exempt
from the guidelines that they have in place.

Why are they exempt, and how much damage
will really take place. On the PEIS I see during
construction -- well -- I'm sorry, there is going to
be more than that. It's going to be a lot more than
that.

We need to -- when we're looking out of the
box for these energy ideas, we need to be looking out
of our area too -- we cannot be selfish on this. What we do to our ocean and our land is going to affect the world. Just like we want to affect the greenhouse effect, we want it to be a positive impact in every aspect.

So, my personal opinion -- and yes, I'll go back and reread and reread until I go cross-eyed too like Aunty Rita.

So my bottom line is, yes, you guys did a lot of work, but there's still a lot of work to be done.

Also, I'd like to know, these are guidelines for the state -- what about people that are doing their own personal energy projects at home? And what are the repercussions if the state chooses to just totally ignore all this research and suggestions that you've done, what are the repercussions from that?

Will the government still be funding the state for the projects that they know are the worst projects when it comes to environmental impact?

How much support are they going to receive Federally?

So, anyway, thank you.

(Applause)

MR. CAMPANIANO: Would there be anybody else
who would like to offer comments?

MR. BOND: I don't need that, I just want to add one more comment.

Please don't be confused by the small number of people that are here tonight. Any time anything important comes down and we think we're at risk, you're going to find the entire population of Molokai is going to be out to stop you. And that goes for the cable and that goes for anything touching Molokai. Thank you.

MR. CAMPANIANO: Further comments?

You have until -- what was it -- July 17 to offer your comments. And again, on one of those charts back there it shows you how to log on, where to send your snail mails and the like.

So, on behalf of the Department of Energy, again, and DBEDT, we are going to really thank you for taking the time to come out and offer your manao to us. Thank you very much. Mahalo!

(The public comments period was concluded.)

* * *
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