U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

RE: HAWAII CLEAN ENERGY PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Wednesday, September 12, 2012

Public Comments 7:08 - 8:13 p.m.

Kauai War Memorial Convention Hall

4191 Hardy Street

Lihue, Hawaii 96766

REPORTED BY:

TERRI R. HANSON, CSR 482

Registered Professional Reporter

APPEARANCES

FACILITATOR: DAWN N. CHANG

PANEL: JANE SUMMERSON
U.S. Department of Energy

JAMES J. SPAETH
U.S. Department of Energy

MARK GLICK
Energy Administrator
Hawaii State Energy Office

MARK ECKENRODE
Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

I N D E X

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. CHANG: I've got a list of 10 people who have signed up to provide their comments. Because I know you're going to want someone to listen to you speak, so if you don't mind, can we provide attention to the speakers who are going to come up. If you recall, this is not where this is going to be a question and answer. So I'm going to call the name, I'll call the first name, and that will be the person who's going to come up and provide their comments. The court reporter -- and I'm sorry your name is?

THE COURT REPORTER: Terri.

MS. CHANG: Terri. So Terri needs to see you as well as I know you probably want to face both Jane as well as the audience. But if you could state your name for the record and then state your comment, and Terri will take it all down.

Now, I really want to make also something really clear, too, because we're going to do public scoping meetings on all of the islands. Last night we were on Oahu. Tonight we're on Kauai, tomorrow Kona, and then Friday Hilo. Next week Monday we'll be on

Maui, Tuesday Lanai, Wednesday Molokai, and then Thursday we'll be back on Oahu.

So all of those comments are going to be part of the record. So if you you've made a comment on Oahu, it will be part of the record. It will be part of the record. So I just want you to know that because I really have appreciated -- Donna, right? Donna, you were on -- last night you were on Oahu. Thank you so much for doing that.

DONNA STOKES: And it's really good to share between islands so we know the concerns that everybody has on different islands. So, you know, thank you for that.

MS. CHANG: And I do appreciate. I mean, obviously this was a really important issue, and thank you for making the time to be here and traveling.

But I just wanted to make sure everybody knew that you have a comment, and if you stated it, it's on the record.

So with that, tonight we've only got 10, but in some areas I know we're probably going to have a lot more. So I'm hoping -- and tonight Donna you signed up, and we're going to let you speak. But if you don't mind -- and that's going to be up to you.

DONNA STOKES: Yeah, I'll go last. That's

fine.

MS. CHANG: Okay. If you don't mind, because what we wanted to make sure is we give everybody an opportunity to speak. So I really appreciate that, Donna. Thank you so much. So Donna who spoke on Oahu, you know, obviously she's got really something important to say. But she's willing to let all those of you who have signed up to speak first.

So with that being said, you have to speak loudly because everybody wants to hear. I've got, first one is Michael Shaw, second is going to be Maka'ala, and third Diana. Okay. So, Michael, you come up first. And then after that, Maka'ala and Diana. And I'm sorry, the microphone doesn't work, but this is a small enough room you can talk loud.

MICHAEL SHAW: Okay. Mahalo for the opportunity to speak tonight. I've come here in defense of the island of Lanai, and to say that we are not against renewable energy. We want to produce renewable energy in a form that makes sense to Lanai, will power Lanai, and will avoid the scarring of Lanai.

Lanai is a five- to six-megawatt island and a minimal water supply will limit their growth. That's the size of Kauai's Port Allen installation alone. Creating sustainable islands generating electricity on

an island-by-island basis is new thinking for a state administration which would propose a $3 billion one-way system of taking from others and feeding energy to only one island, the most out-of-control island.

The governor's "New Day in Hawaii" needs new ways.

On Lanai three turbines, per advertised output, would be enough except based on output realities seen around the country, that is wishful thinking. So we can double that. Still an off-again/on-again power source.

Much less damaging would be to expand Lanai's existing 1.5 megawatt solar farm for more intermittent power, and we have space to do that.

Of course, every home that does not now, needs to have solar hot water to start. Photovoltaic is the next step for more of our homes. MECO has raised rates for the stated purpose of handling renewable energy, so we might as well get what we are paying for.

Also, converting our power plant to biofuels for a still required firm power source. We have thousands of acres of unused pineapple fields waiting to be productive again.

With some forward thinking, increased efficiency and conservation, Lanai could be the pilot project, the first island to sustain itself for a

cleaner energy future.

The governor says we're all in the same canoe. On Lanai we see that canoe only heading for Oahu and taking all energy produced from the destruction of our cultural and archeological sites, our hunting and fishing grounds which feed many of our families, and one of the last unspoiled areas in the state. No amount of compensation can repair that damage.

The big wind fiasco is a one-way street which will not remove one drop of oil from Lanai and will not make Lanai greener by one molecule of greenhouse gas. This is a power company and developers going after guaranteed money at the expense of the tax and ratepayers, assured by the recent cable bill and a massive production tax credit.

And a closing note to the people of Kauai. When I lived here in The Separate Kingdom, I didn't think too much about KIUC. But when you get your capital refund, go to your membership meeting or cast a vote, remember you have a democratic process to guide your energy future. Also, your policy of no wind turbines for environmental reasons is to be applauded. We would love that consideration shown to Lanai as we have four federal and state endangered species, two flying through the indicated primary wind resource area.

On Lanai our future is in the hands of the governor, his corporate friends, developers, and politicians, some who don't seem to know the true value of Lanai. Lanai is a unique and varied cultural landscape, not just a pile of rocks to be bulldozed for monetary gain.

Please respect Lanai and malama Lanai. Mahalo for your time. (Applause.)

MS. CHANG: If any of you have a written comment and if you want to leave it, that's fine, too. But I trust Terri is taking every word down. But sometimes there's some Hawaiian words that she may have some difficulty with. So if you have a written comment, feel free to leave that.

Next is Maka'ala, and then Diana, and then Neal.

MAKA'ALA KA'AUMOANA: I will give you written comments. I am Maka'ala Ka'aumoana. I want to introduce myself first by saying that I hold the conservation seat on the Advisory Council for the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary, and I am the executive director of the Hanalei Watershed Hui. Tonight I wear neither of those hats.

Tonight I speak on behalf of Hui Ho'omalu i ka

'Aina of which I am vice-chair. Yes, I'll give it to you in writing. Hui Ho'omalu i ka 'Aina is a taro root organization founded in the early 1980s by traditional practitioners of moku Halele'a to address threats and impacts to the natural and cultural resources of Kauai. Founded by farmers and fisherman, weavers and hunters, we seek to provide context for issues related to the ecology of our ahupuaa. The organization is an active advocate for those native things and ways that are disappearing. We are not a non-profit. We are an activist organization. We do not whine and wait; we act.

We present comment today on a subject that affects all Hawaiians. In order to protect and preserve our cultural traditions and futures, this and any other process like it must identify lands to exclude from industrial/utility-scale wind proposals due to the disproportionate impact of scale on limited land mass, rural lifestyles and cultural resources. Before this process can go any further, the DOE must identify lands to exclude from industrial/utility-scale proposals that contain Native Hawaiian cultural sites, historic value, significant scenic view planes, or threatened and endangered species.

We are losing our places and lifestyle every

day, and no department of the federal or state government should be considering using any of these lands without first identifying the places we must protect. That is what scoping is. It's a first look, a checking in with the public to take a first cut at the content of an EIS. To begin this process in a pono way, you must first cut out those places we treasure and need.

We believe the correct approach to the need for energy should be to support locally based efforts for energy independence. To force one community or another to suffer the impacts of energy production to supply others is not correct nor does it align with real independence or resilience. Each island has sufficient renewable resources to eliminate the need for an undersea cable.

Hui Ho'omalu i ka 'Aina stands with our neighbors on Kauai and other islands for the protection of our cultural and traditional practices and places. We oppose the use and destruction of any resources in Hawaii nei for the purpose of supplying energy to another place. We all have the capacity to produce our own. Leave Lanai alone. (Applause.)

MS. CHANG: Next is Diana, and then Neal. And is it Tor? Tor. Okay. Thank you.

DIANA SHAW: My name is Diana Shaw. It's my understanding that the purpose of the PEIS is develop a guidance that will be used in making decisions about future funding and other actions to support Hawaii in achieving the goal established by the HCEI to meet the state's energy efficiency and renewable energy goal of 70 percent. I have traveled from Lanai to provide my testimony and comments for the guidance.

I ask that the following policy issues form the foundation of any guidance. All islands must be energy self-sufficient, not tied together in one grid. With energy efficient measures each island has sufficient renewable resources to eliminate the need for an unnecessary incredibly expensive undersea cable. All islands must focus on distributed generation of energy (for example, PV on rooftops, residential water heating and solar panels and even small personal wind energy systems).

All policy must be made upon the needs of those living in the state, not monopolistic shareholder-owned utilities or mainland energy developers. All policy must be developed to fit the lifestyle, history and culture of each individual island. And most importantly each island must be allowed to determine how its resources are developed including identification of

lands to exclude from industrial scale wind and other proposals which would jeopardize rural lifestyles, cultural sites, significant scenic view planes and threatens an endangered species.

Basing the guidance upon the items articulated above will ensure a fair and affordable outcome, one that looks to the future guaranteeing our keiki and future generations access to resources similar to what their ancestors had. It will also guarantee a today and a tomorrow based upon living responsibly and in a suitable manner.

Many years ago a great misdeed was done, allowing Lanai to be owned mostly by one private owner. That continues today and it results in the residents of the island living in a feudal system worried about voicing their concerns or desires when they differ from that of the owner.

If the guidance were to have the foundations noted above, it would protect even those on Lanai. We would all be in the same canoe, paddling in the same direction, respecting each other and not profiting or plundering the very resources that we are supposed to be guarding and replacing and reuse them. Mahalo.

(Applause.)

MS. CHANG: Neal, and then Tor, and then

Shosanah.

NEAL CHANTARA: Smart meters do not save energy. Every environmental organization that has supported smart meters has conflict of interest ties to the wireless and smart meter industry. Their energy saving claims can easily be debunked with a little research. Dig deeper and the extent of the deception is far reaching.

It takes more energy to make a handful of computer chips than it does to make an automobile. The electronics manufacturing is among the dirtiest industries on earth. It uses and pollutes unimaginable volumes of water, it involves many toxic chemicals that inevitably find their way into the environment and people and necessitates the dirty extraction of various rare metals.

Given all this, how can smart meter proponents claim a better carbon footprint? Simply by saying it. No proof. Then add to this major problem the frequent replacement that will be required with these electronic devices. More energy. How do we dispose of these toxic devices?

The usage data from smart meters will do nothing to help homeowners and businesses actually lower their utilities bills. If you really want to save

energy, change from smart meters and digital meters to analog meters. Smart meters contribute to dirty electricity causing appliances and devices to consume more power. When we and our neighbors changed from digital meters to analog meters for health reasons, we saved five to six and a half percent factoring in daylight hours, et cetera, and 14 to 15 percent over the same period last year.

Smart meters have been measured to use one to five watts continuously and are rated to use three watts. Do the math. They will consume the total energy output of a big PV system.

Power stations react in the moment to fluctuations in the 60 hertz sine wave in the supply and demand. Smart meters won't have anything to do with production adjustments. Think of it logically. They can't predict what the moment is actually doing; i.e., usage, sun, clouds, wind, et cetera. Power plants are truly in the moment.

I've been installing wind and photovoltaic systems since the late 1970s, even grid-tied systems, long before digital and smart meters. We don't need smart meters. We don't need the smart meter grid. They won't save us energy.

Now, they want to add an underwater cable to

the smart meter disaster? Madness is not progress. Let's save energy. Let's use analog meters.

Open your eyes, put on your thinking caps, and stop the madness. (Applause.)

MS. CHANG: Thank you. Tor and then Shosanah, and then Chanterelle.

TOR CHANTARA: My name is Tor Chantara. After seeing suggestions that smart meters were not doing what the printed and online promotional material said, I purchased meters to find out for myself what the real truth was.

We have been told that smart meters emit radiation six to eight times per day to send data back to KIUC and are quiescent the rest of the day. From my measurements, I can walk up to a random smart meter for a random minute and find that radiation levels from the smart meter are fully 40 percent of the published values.

The readings I have taken all show levels of radiation that have been linked to sleep disorders, weakness, and fatigue, impaired motor function, reaction time, memory, and attention in children, cardiac arrhythmia and cardiac arrests in frogs, and even such things as leukemia.

As for the frequency of transmissions, we have

been told that smart meters transmit data back to KIUC six to eight times per day. We do, however, have testimony submitted to a California court about the same smart meters as are being installed here. In this document we find what we were not told about network transmissions.

In addition to the six to eight daily meter read transmissions, there are also 15 network management messages, 360 time synchronization messages, and well over 13,000 mesh network message management messages.

In typical installations, each home or business may be affected by 3, 5, 10 or more meters, meaning that with meters transmitting at the average frequency, one may be exposed to 140,000 or more pulses of microwave radiation per day. Some smart meters transmit up to 190,000 times per day.

The best analogy for pulses emitted by smart meters is that of a strobe light. In a condominium where meters have been installed in banks it is quite possible for people to be exposed to microwave pulses at a frequency strobe lights are generally kept below in order to reduce risk of inducing seizures. Thank you. (Applause.)

MS. CHANG: Next is Shosanah, then Chanterelle, and then after that will be Walt Barnes.

SHOSANAH CHANTARA: I stand in support of the testimony heard before about Lanai and island independence -- energy independence island by island, and I would like to speak to the health concerns about smart meters.

Since KIUC began its smart meter rollout last May, many people have been reporting health symptoms known to be associated with exposure to pulsed microwave radiation and dirty electricity. And no one in a position of authority is paying any attention.

What kinds of symptoms are people experiencing? Ringing, buzzing in the ears, headaches, dizziness, stress, anxiety, irritability, difficulty sleeping, muscle aches and weakness, heart arrhythmia, chest pain, concentration, memory issues, nausea, flulike symptoms, skin symptoms such as burning, prickling and rashes, eye problems, tooth pain, nose bleeds and worsening of chronic health conditions.

Tor Chantara described some of the discrepancies that he and others have found between the KIUC website material claims and the actual facts. Here's another. KIUC claims that smart meters emit a fraction of the radiation of a cell phone. Independent scientists disagree.

In January 2012 the Santa Cruz Department of

Health reported that smart meters exposed people to 50 to 450 times more radiation than a cell phone. That's a single smart meter, and that's when considering whole body exposure. No wonder people are get getting sick.

I have done extensive research, and I am unable to find any angle from which smart meters are a general benefit to the people or the environment. The embodied energy in these devices and in the working devices that will be discarded to install them dwarf possible savings.

And if energy savings were really the purpose, $11 million could have bought far more energy savings invested in solar domestic hot water systems and timers for electric hot water heaters to name just two possibilities.

Meanwhile, there are so many reasons to be concerned about smart meters including human health, animal health, the safety of our bees, the safety of our homes, our privacy, the integrity of our power system and escalating power bills.

It is your responsibility as you consider where to go with this program to prove that these devices are safe and a clear economic and environmental benefit before you inflict them on us and our precious fragile environment. Thank you. (Applause.)

MS. CHANG: Chanterelle, and then Walt Barnes, and Ken Taylor.

CHANTERELLE CHANTARA: I'm Chanterelle. I'm against the suggested implementation of smart meter grid and undersea cables. Since the smart meters began being installed by KIUC, I personally know many people who are having health problems due to exposure from the pulse microwave radiation of the smart meters.

It greatly concerns me that no one in a position of authority is addressing the problems caused by smart meters.

One place often quoted to try to claim the safety of the smart meters is the FCC standards for exposure limits to wireless transmitters. This is highly misleading and irrelevant to the true dangers of smart meter radiation.

I'd like to read a passage on the subject from a website called Just Prove It. The FCC was assigned by the Environmental Protection Act of 1969 to protect our health from microwave radiation from wireless transmitters like cell towers, WiFi and smart grid units.

U.S. safety standards for wireless exposures are now among the weakest in the world. Why? The FCC has struggled to establish standards for public

exposures because it lacks the internal biological expertise to evaluate risk to humans. The FCC staff is dominated by electrical engineers, physicists, bureaucrats and ex-telecommunications executives. No biologists.

In the mid 1980s the FCC finally gave up trying to establish a standard of safety and instead adopted a very weak and outdated one. The new standard was adopted from the recommendation of two non-government organizations comprised mostly of engineers and ex-telecommunications executives, the IEEE and the ANSI.

The standard which was established in the 1950s was based solely on the thermal effect, heating of the tissue. This safety standard ignores biological impacts from low-level microwave and does not protect us from at least nine additional microwave effects that can injure us.

Other countries set their standards based on science that shows biological effects at very low nonthermal exposure levels. For example, U.S. standard is 580 microwatts, in Russia 10 microwatts, China 6 microwatts, Italy 5 microwatts, Switzerland 4.2 microwatts, Salzburg, Austria 0.1 microwatts. We have 580 microwatts.

I feel strongly based on my research that this

technology is extremely dangerous to our health, environment and safety, and I am against the use of it. (Applause.)

MS. CHANG: Walt Barnes, Ken Taylor, and Elaine Dunbar.

WALT BARNES: Aloha. I would like to address the PEIS and the smart meters if I could. I'm Walt Barnes, a resident of Kapaa. I'm a former founding member of the board of directors of the KIUC, a former member of the board of directors of the Kauai Public Land Trust. I'm a current member of the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, their Computer Society and their Power and Energy Society. I'm a member of the Kauai Energy Sustainability Plan Advisory Committee. I have a master's degree in electrical engineering from Northwestern and employed by AT&T Laboratories.

All the ideas that might replace or augment our energy infrastructure have significant environmental impact. Qualifying their impact on a per-technology/ per-project basis is difficult. But hard as it is, it is insufficient to make good decisions.

When discussing environmental impacts, we focus almost exclusively on geographically local and temporally local impacts. Build a dam here, and it

impacts the local watershed. Put a wind turbine there, and it kills birds. Out of sight, out of mind is a cliche precisely because it's such a human way of thinking.

The environmental impacts of many of our energy choices, especially choosing to continue with some traditional energy sources are anything but local and anything but immediate.

What I'm asking you to include is some analysis about the non-local, non-immediate environmental impacts. Want clean solar photovoltaic energy? Seventy-four percent of last year's PV production was from China and Taiwan that resulted in multiple environmental disasters there in their countries including open ponding of chemicals that toxic doesn't even begin to describe.

Want to continue with more fossil fuels? It really only creates very minimal environmental impact here and now. Of course, it contributes to occasional disasters like the BP/Transocean Horizon spill and it contributes to the creeping disaster of climate change.

How can local policymakers possibly evaluate your environmental statements about local impact? How can they use this information to decide if the impact of building a dam or erecting a wind turbine is justified

unless you also provide at least some minimal information about the all-in environmental impacts that will occur not just here, but globally; not just today, but tomorrow?

My second request is that you prioritize your limited time and effort on what we know really works. For example, we absolutely know the very first thing we should do, the thing that has the lowest total cost per kilowatt-hours with the least environmental impact would be to get solar hot water on every roof. That ought to be the very first thing in your report, and we need to make every policymaker in the state realize figuring out how to make that happen should be their highest priority with respect to energy solutions precisely because it has the very least environmental impact of the alternatives.

My second example is an example of wasted focus. I know the underwater HVDC grid intertie is a sexy project, but precisely the thing that makes the project interesting is the thing that should put it at the bottom of the priority list for analysis, at least for now.

The cable being considered is four times deeper than any comparable projects. I'm talking about the Basslink project in Australia and the Danish grid

intertie project. That depth makes this an R&D project, not a construction project. I do R&D for a living. I've done design and architecture for projects that big. If you've got enough money, you can make it work. But R&D exceeds cost estimates like crazy. It won't cost a billion dollars. It will likely cost $2 billion or more, and that will blow out any rational energy pricing models.

My third request is that you put more effort into the analysis of energy storage in your scope, especially beyond batteries. Battery energy storage systems are necessary to provide frequency stabilization and can provide limited holdover at intermittent renewables like wind spool down, but chemical and solid state storage will never scale up to provide the high-capacity storage we need everywhere except the Big Island to actually transition to a significant penetration of alteration generation. Given our geography and resources, mechanical high-capacity storage means pumped hydro. Please size it, make clear to policymakers its essential nature, and then discuss its environmental impacts in the context of the alternatives. For example, continuing to ship in and burn fossil fuels.

Thermal storage also deserves discussion.

Although more efficient than mechanical storage, its use is inextricably linked to solar thermal generation and, therefore, it's a less flexible storage mechanism.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you tonight. (Applause.)

MS. CHANG: Ken Taylor, Elaine Dunbar, and Nataan. And then if anybody else wants to speak, then I ask them.

KEN TAYLOR: Thank you. My comments will be addressed to the five categories that are listed in the Federal Register dated August 10, 2012, notice. I think it's referred to as the Amended Notice of Intent.

First of all, under Category 5, smart grid, to be successful, would require smart meters. They make people sick.

How will these issues be addressed in this document? Even if I opt out of a smart meter program, I can get radiation exposure from my neighbors' smart meters. Radiation frequency, microwave easily travels through the walls.

How will the radio frequency radiation be contained? That's the question.

I think in reference to all five categories that a cost benefit analysis island by island for each of the five categories should be dealt with.

Also, I think the DOE should identify lands to exclude, exclude from industrial utility-scale wind proposals due to the disproportionate impact of scale on limited land mass and rural lifestyle. The DOE should identify land to exclude from industrial utility-scale proposals that contain Native Hawaiian culture sites, historical value, significant scenic view planes or threatened and endangered species.

The DOE's focus should be on making each island energy independent. Coupled with the energy efficiency measures, each island has sufficient renewable resources to eliminate the need for unnecessary undersea cables.

Because of time constraints this evening, I will be submitting written comment which will be more extensive. Thank you. (Applause.)

MS. CHANG: I've got Elaine, and then Nataan, and then Donna.

ELAINE DUNBAR: Aloha. My name is Elaine Dunbar. I agree with all the testimony before me regarding the wind farms. I object to those, the hydro proposals that have been recently discussed, and the grids and the meters. I object to all those. And it seems to be that solar is advancing in so many areas, it's the most feasible.

But there's another area that needs to be

addressed that nobody's touched on, so if I could I'll just run through that right now. I hadn't prepared to come here tonight.

My concern is to your jurisdiction in Hawaii, that you have an array of vast and very general proposals and business ventures that encompass the use of lands not under U.S. jurisdiction. I cite as an example, FERC came back with a decision to deny KIUC hydropower proposals on Kauai stating they have no authority/jurisdiction as the lands involved are not part of the United States. And I'm sure that a lot of the people at Kauai Island Utility Cooperative probably don't remember that little section in their denial, but it's there.

I also bring to your attention two public notices submitted to all Hawaii newspapers for 30-day uncontested running proclaiming lawful authority over the Hawaiian Islands, including Chattel properties. The first notice was in 2001, the second in 2003. I'm not exactly sure on that one.

Please note also I would like your response as to how you intend to proceed when the claims to these lands through Public Law 103-150, as stated by Congress, have not been addressed or resolved? Will you be consulting with the sovereign government, specifically

the lawful Hawaiian government?

As to any proposals from this dysfunctional entity on Kauai called KIUC or Kauai Island Utility Cooperative, they are one of many attempting to fleece taxpayers. You guys should really know what's going on behind the scenes that you're probably not aware of all the way over there in Washington.

Exploit Kauai's fragile environment and run a green scam, and I mean green in the color of money. Before accepting any input from KIUC, I would like to ask that their business practices and proposals be investigated as well as their board members be investigated as to their qualifications to be making autonomous decisions that have grave impacts on the residents and environment before entering into any agreements. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

MS. CHANG: Nataan, and then we have Donna, and then Alice.

NATAAN KAUAKAHI: I'll speak from here. My concern is basically with the smart meters and the effects that it has on not only my health, but all in this room because sooner or later the smart grid program will take effect.

And my thing is because some of us are on a fixed income, I use HUD subsidy. Okay. I am in a

federally HUD funded apartment as well as with some of my neighbors here. The owner of the property welcomed KIUC to install smart meters on the property without proper notification in advance to my neighbors and myself. I found this out through a neighbor.

And KIUC says that we will be notified, everybody. And I did not -- my neighbors and I did not receive any notification. Any notification from the owner was given after the fact, after everything was already done, that's when we were notified.

And my thing is because we live in a federally funded living facility, we basically have no say because it's a federally mandated program. And the HUD program considers smart meters an energy upgrade. Okay.

I do not agree with that based on independent research by myself as well as many other educated people here. Whether I'm in a federally funded project or not, my decision should be respected and not pushed aside because it's federally mandated.

Okay. I do not agree with the smart meter program because of its future health implications as well as the financial implications that will be passed on to the consumer. And we live in a society today that humans don't matter. The bottom line is money. You know, we need money to exist, to buy what we need to

live, hopefully as comfortable as we can. But when that becomes the overall focus and the hearts and minds of people are overlooked, something is wrong.

And my thing is, what recourse do I have? See, the general population that have the ability to opt out or to defer smart meters, they have that option. I don't. And I have on my wall eight meters that includes my neighbors. You know, and as far as the facade of it transmitting eight times a day. It doesn't. You know, if you do the research, it transmits 190,000 times. Now you times that by eight or however much meters you want, that's a lot of radiation that I and my neighbors have to deal with.

Now, if the general public is allowed an option, those under HUD programs should be given an option also. You know, the basic concern I have is not only health but retaliation. And retaliation, I've been through it. Where I live it can take many forms. You know, it's basically we provide you with a home, we think it's safe, shut up.

And I feel that with everybody else's feelings on smart meters or other environmental concerns, our government needs to wake up and realize that I don't have to possess a degree or whatever to make my voice heard. If I don't agree with that technology because

based on my research that's outside of the box and that's credible to my understanding as well as to those who have voiced their concerns here, it's valid.

It should be listened to. It should not only be taken into consideration, but if you are actively for the community, you should act upon it and not just placate the community with words.

They'll say, Oh yeah, we'll do this. We'll do that. To me that's a bunch of BS. Because what I feel should be done you should act upon. Your actions will show you and show others whether you're sincere and have the community's interest at heart. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. CHANG: Donna, then after Donna, then we have Alice.

DONNA STOKES: Alice can go first.

ALICE PARKER: Basically what I have is a question. I know this is supposed to be comments. There was mention of an undersea cable. Where did he go? Max, or whoever you are.

I understand that the channel between Kauai and Oahu is so tumultuous that they couldn't do cable and they couldn't do some kind of enhanced television.

Now, have invention and science figured a way to get cable to Kauai, or everybody but Kauai could have

cable? That's my question. Where did he go?

MS. CHANG: That's a good comment, and we'll have it done. Thank you. Donna.

DONNA STOKES: Aloha, everybody. I'm really glad I came to Kauai because I got to hear the Kauai people's concerns on your environment and how this program will impact your island. So I came to share with you so that you know how it's going to impact Lanai. Even though I have to repeat myself to you, I hope you don't mind listening because you might get something else that you might have missed.

But anyhow, the undersea cable that you folks talked about that you're against, if they put it in place, it's going to connect those windmills. That's the island of Lanai. It's going it take one fourth of our island. Our island is only 18 by 13 miles wide. It's a small island.

Okay. So I'm going to share my concerns, and I'm glad you're here to listen and nobody left.

I came from Lanai to speak for my ohana and our future generations of family to come. The island of Lanai is only 13 by 18 miles small. Kaa is the largest, most significant and most abundant ahupuaa on our island. This is the area that you choose to destroy.

In this day and age, we have to protect our

areas of significance and abundance and not destroy them. This ahupuaa, right up there, also includes the only and largest one-and-a-half mile of secluded white sand beach on Lanai. Now, you have Polihale on your north shore. That is our north shore, Polihua. We will not let this area and our lifestyle be degraded, desecrated, and destroyed just to meet Oahu's increasing electricity needs.

Our Hawaiian community strives to keep this particular ahupuaa healthy and intact for future generations to practice their heritage, cultural gathering rights and spiritual beliefs. We hunt, fish and gather there in that area because it is still abundant, whereas other areas on Lanai have been used and abused, have been depleted or covered with erosion and silt from previous ranching and plantation use and is no longer abundant.

This north shore area is our only abundant area left on Lanai. The rest is all brown with mud from plantation and ranching. I know a lot of people don't know about how Lanai is, and that's why I came to share and to let you folks know how this will impact us.

On Lanai we don't have fast food restaurants, major supermarkets, shopping malls or recreation centers like gyms, bowling alleys, public tennis courts,

theaters, large community swimming pools, and we don't have any large playgrounds like the one you have in Wailua side. We got one -- we got tiny little ones. Well, one.

Anyway, I wanted to say the land and ocean are our food cabinets and refrigerators, and it's also our recreation centers.

So Department of Energy, Mr. David Murdock, PUC, and Hawaiian Electric, you must not destroy our island, our resources and our Hawaiian way of life. For we are a small Hawaiian and minority community, and we all depend on this land and ocean resources to sustain ourselves physically, mentally and spiritually.

We have nothing else. Without these resources, we would perish. We need what's left on Lanai. We need the Kaa ahupuaa intact, and we will fight to preserve what is left.

Oahu needs to learn how to conserve their use of energy. Many offices on Oahu have air conditioners blasting, and the employees actually have personal electric heaters to keep themselves warm. Okay. And at the state capital it's so cold over there they all have to wear jackets and sweaters to keep warm. We know because we went to this past legislative session. Our people were freezing in there. Now, that is a

tremendous waste of energy, of electricity.

Federal government, you can start by mandating solar on every building, every public building. That would help a lot. By doing this, you won't be destroying what's left of our precious aina, and you won't be destroying what's left of the real Hawaii, you won't be destroying and degrading the lifestyle of many generations of Lanai people to come.

So I say it again, we oppose the windmills because it will create irreversible damage to Kaa, to our way of life on Lanai, to our cultural sites and gathering areas, to our food and medicinal sources, to our native birds and turtles' habitat, to our rare and endangered native plant habitat, and to our only and secluded abundant white sand beach and pristine reef.

What will you, the federal government, do to protect and preserve all of that for Native Hawaiians and Lanai's future generations?

I say one solution is simple and it's a no-brainer and it costs a lot less. Photovoltaic panels on all of Oahu's public buildings and no windmills on Lanai.

I thank you guys for listening to this. I hope I shared, and you will be more aware of our concerns on Lanai because we're all of the same ecosystem. You

know, this kind of stuff will impact all of us, and we've got to support each other.

We believe in conservation practices. That should be implemented more strongly. Conservation, Oahu has really got to conserve.

Not only that, we also believe in independent energy systems for each island. What I'm saying is what everybody else is saying. Each island needs to use their own resources and be sustainable energy-wise.

I've learned that those smart meters are not so smart. You guys have to correct that. It's ruining a lot of people's health. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. CHANG: We have one more speaker, Shanti. And then after that, if there's anybody else who hasn't spoken who would like a make a comment.

SHANTI: I didn't know what I was up against when I came here tonight, all these people. I'm really not very, very prepared. But I'll talk to you off the top of my head at least.

I'm just very, very, wow, disappointed in the way my life has turned around since we got all of these smart meters where I live in a senior's complex. There are three huge buildings, and I wish I would have counted the meters on the walls before I came. But I do

know that each wall is plastered with smart meters.

I did attend some meetings about them, and I did alert a few people and gave them the information, and a few people did protest them as I did. We put our two-cents' worth in, and they complied. They didn't put ours.

But when I do the math, there's, what? Must be close to 200 meters in the three buildings. And when I researched it to some degree on the Internet, it turns out that this microwave radiation travels one quarter of a mile. And they're all downstairs in our meter room and each of the three buildings.

And the reason I'm up here bitching is because I have had pain exponentially increased in my body to the point where most days when I wake up I don't know if it's worth trying to be enthused about life anymore because it just isn't happening.

I've spoken to a few people there where I live, and they're very happy about it. So I say, well, what happens if you get sicker? Oh, we'll just sue KIUC. They've got lots of money. Ha, good luck.

So anyway, I could go on and on, but I would like for you to know that my request might be a little unusual, but I would like to request that these smart meters be removed and be replaced with the original

meters because of so many reasons, but one in particular.

A lady came in who paid a thousand dollars for a piece of equipment that monitors what these smart meters are doing, and it's just hundreds of hundreds of volume more than what KIUC proclaims them to be. And we can't all afford the prices this woman is charging in order to figure out which of our appliances in the house produce the most problem. Okay. Thank you. Thank you for listening. (Applause.)

MS. CHANG: Ken, did you want to? Before I bring Ken up, does anybody who hasn't spoken want to make a comment? Okay.

MICHAEL SCHULTZ: Aloha, my name is Michael Schultz. And I don't have anything new to say that hasn't been said other than I am really concerned about the integrity of the process. We've been dealing with smart meters here for quite a while now. And I've had a number of experiences that really brings up this concern, and I really wish that I didn't even have to mention this, but I do. I couldn't -- I stood back there and debated. And I said, No, I've got to speak.

The initial information that KIUC has put out has turned out to be totally false on pretty much every level in terms of the amount of radiation it puts out.

I've walked through my neighborhood and others with the meters and measured it personally, and it's hundreds of times greater as has been testified here.

The averages that are put out in the industry stuff that KIUC is using talks about 90 seconds a day, and it's totally misleading. Those are median averages rather than mean averages, which means that 50 percent is way above that. So the averages they use are totally distorted.

One of my ohana had their digital meter replaced with the original analog meter. And when they came to do that they came and requested that they use a digital meter rather than an analog meter saying they're more efficient in the maintenance, et cetera. When asked the question, Does this put out radiation?

KIUC representative said, No.

When my ohana member pointed out to them, showed them the document directly from the manual for the meter that they were proposing, it specifically says that it puts out radiation. So he knew that.

Later, a couple weeks later he came to my house to replace my meter and then met with me and some of my neighbors and again suggested doing the digital meter.

I specifically asked, Does this put out radiation?

Same person said to me, No, it doesn't.

I handed him the same document, and he just shut up and walked away. And he ended up putting in the analog meters, but at each level the integrity of the process has been really sad.

So, however this works, there's a vested interest that is not being up front to the decision-making process with the people of Kauai I know, and it is industry information that has been invalid every step of the way. So we're talking about a process here that would be really nice to be able to believe however this process plays out that the results have some level of integrity.

So that would be my wish that whoever is doing this work comes through from a heartfelt honest place with some other agenda than has been currently demonstrated, and that would be the well being of the ohana and the aina here in the islands. Because clearly there's only one motive that would lie about everything, and it's not the best interest of the people. So thank you very much. (Applause.)

MS. CHANG: If we have no other comment, I'm going to let Ken come up and make a second comment.

KEN TAYLOR: Thank you, again. I'm Ken Taylor. First of all, I want to make some comments that

I'm sure you're all aware that we're at the end of cheap oil, and the future is going to be very different than what has been in the past.

None of our alternative options -- wind, solar -- none of those pieces of equipment are being made with solar or alternative energy. They're still using relatively cheap oil. I know the world doesn't ever run out of oil, but it will get to a point where it takes a barrel of energy from a barrel of oil to get a barrel of oil. At that point in time, there will be absolutely no reason to go after the oil.

My concern is that I can do without the lights, but I can't do without water. I can't do without food. To me the future is to become sustainable on the islands with water and food, then we worry about turning on the power. But until the water and the food is dealt with in a sustainable manner, this other is all nonsense. Because if we turn the lights on and don't have anything to eat or any water to drink, we're history. So we need to really take a good look at that as we go through this process.

I'd like to read a quick paragraph from a commencement speech that Paul Hopkins made to the class of '09 at the University of Portland on May 3rd. This paragraph is:

We have an economy that tells us that it's cheaper to destroy earth in realtime rather than to renew, restore and sustain it. You can print money to bail out a bank, but you can't print life to bail out the planet. At present we're stealing the future, selling it in the present and calling it gross domestic product. We can just as easy have an economy that is based on healing the future instead of stealing it. We can either create assets for the future or take the assets of the future. One is called restoration, the other is exploitation. And whenever we exploit the earth, we exploit people and cause untold suffering. Working for the earth is not a way to get rich, it's a way to be rich.

And I hope that you guys will keep that all in mind as you move forward with this whole process because I think, as I said, we need water, we need food long before we need this. Yes, it's nice. We've come to know that the power is wonderful. We can turn on the computers. We can do all kinds of things. But without the food and the water, we can't do anything. And so put it all in perspective. Thank you. (Applause.)

MS. SUMMERSON: I would just like, again, to thank everybody for turning out tonight, taking time out of your busy schedules to share your wisdom with us.

We appreciate it very greatly, and our process is very dependent on the information that you gave us. So thank you.

MS. CHANG: And just a final comment. You have until October the 9th. So if many of you came here and you just wanted to listen, you can put a comment up until October the 9th. And please check that NOI as there are several different ways to make a comment. And really mahalo. Check the websites for any updates, but thank you all for being here. Thank you, mahalo, mahalo.

(Concluded at approximately 8:13 p.m., September 12, 2012.)

* * * * *

STATE OF HAWAII)
) ss.
COUNTY OF KAUAI)

I, TERRI R. HANSON, RPR, CSR 482, do hereby certify:

That on Wednesday, September 12, 2012, at 7:08 p.m.; that the foregoing U.S. Department of Energy, Public Scoping Meeting, Re: Hawaii Clean Energy Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, was held;

That the foregoing proceedings were taken down by me in machine shorthand and were thereafter reduced to typewritten form under my supervision; that the foregoing 45-page transcript represents to the best of my ability, a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the foregoing matter.

I certify that I am not an attorney for any of the parties hereto, nor in any way concerned with the cause.

DATED this 6th day of October, 2012, in Kapaa, Hawaii.

_____
TERRI R. HANSON, CSR 482
Registered Professional Reporter