

**PUBLIC HEARING  
of the  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & ENERGY COMMITTEE  
of the  
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

**Minutes**

A public hearing of the Economic Development and Energy Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on **November 19, 2001**.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Alice Amrhein - Commissioner of Economic Development  
Robert Deetz - KeySpan  
Jeff Tempera - Department of Labor  
Tom LaGuardia - Department of Public Works  
Scott Cullen - STAR Foundation  
Legislator Vivian Fisher - Legislature  
Gerard McCreight - Aide to Legislator Cooper  
Gordian Raacke - CAP  
James Hartnett - Economic Development

**ALSO PRESENT:**

George Proios  
Klaus Feindler  
Kelly Mason  
Marie Pendzich  
Mark Serotoff  
Kathleen Whitley  
Cynthia Barnes  
Janet Kagel  
Judy Fischer  
Gloria Rubino  
George Rubino  
Eve Kaplan  
Marianne Zacharia  
Ernest Fazio  
Jack Kulka  
Peter Quinn  
Fred Drewes  
Peter Maniscalco  
All Others Present

**MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Donna Barrett - Stenographer

(\*THE HEARING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 3:05 P.M.\*)

**COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:**

Good afternoon. My name is Alice Amrhein, I'm Commissioner of Economic Development, I'm also Chairman of the Suffolk County Legislative Energy Advisory Committee. It is now 3:05, and I am calling the public hearing to order. We are here to discuss various issues concerning energy and to make a public record. With me are

other committee members. To my left is Jeff Tempera from the Suffolk County Department of Labor, to my right is Tom LaGuardia, Suffolk County Department of Public Works, and Mr. Robert Teetz, who's an engineer with KeySpan. All of them are members of the committee.

Before we get started I'd like to say that I've had four written pieces of testimony submitted. When the hearing is over -- we have a court stenographer -- all the testimony will be taken down, we will compile a report, which will be available, and the written testimony will be part of the report. We have testimony from Ms. Sonya Bradley, from Mr. And Mrs. John Guthy, Mr. Kevin Rooney, from the Oil Heat Institute, and Ms. Donna Deedy. And I will make all of those available in the public record. Our first speaker for the afternoon is Mr. George Proios. If anyone hasn't registered to speak, either Janet at the end or Donna at that end will take your name and will bring the card up to me. And we also have some materials that you could take on our Emissions Statement and agenda. Thank you. George.

MR. PROIOS:

Thank you. I'm here on behalf of the County Soil and Water Conservation District, which has County and State-wide responsibilities to look at preserving our resources. I also sit on the State Soil and Water Conservation Committee as a voting member, which also has a similar responsibility in setting policies for the State in order to conserve our resources. And obviously, any place that we save energy will save our resources. I provide you just a brief outline of some ideas of saving energy at different levels of government. I think this is necessary because it's not something that just the County can do, we need every level of government working together. Federal government needs to set standards. I put some crazy things down here, for examples, we all know that energy deficiencies exist for air conditioners, but they are not really designed to help consumers. Right now, if you look at some of them, the scales are different for each different model. Sometimes they're one to ten, sometimes they're one to fifteen. Normally the arrow that shows the efficiency of the unit is to the right, and the one that's the furthest to the right is the more efficient, but that's not always the case because if the scale is one to ten, and it's way over to the right, it may be an efficiency of nine. On a scale of one to fifteen, it may be closer to the middle, but it may be an efficiency of ten. So it's very confusing to a consumer, and the manufacturers try to use these as guises to sell their appliances, which may not be the most efficient.

After you think you've gotten this down, you go look to the next section where there are washing machines and the whole scale is reversed 180 degrees. The more efficient models are to the left, instead of to the right. So after you think you've got it down pat,

it's a different story for a different type of appliance. And then there are many other appliances that don't have any efficiency ratings at all. So the whole area of energy efficiency from the federal level needs to be reexamined with some good standardizations coming out, and for all items. And then we have a whole series of useless items that every year are on the market. A few years ago I don't recall ever seeing Easter lights and Halloween lights, but now they're on the market. And things like, I think, the epitome, I think, of the United States waisting of energy, the electric toothbrush. Yesterday I saw one of my neighbors riding her bike with her four year old kid on a little motorized little vehicle. I don't know why four year old kids

need to drive motorized vehicles.

Two factors, I think, that we ought to keep in mind are these things that really effect my perspective on this, was last year, the Country of India reached one billion in terms of its population. I mean for one country -- we knew China was big, but for India to reach one billion and many other areas throughout the world are growing, which means increased energy usages. And where the United States fits in that scenario is that we represent about 5% of the world's population, and yet we consume 25% of the earth's energy resources, which is no wonder the world considers us gluttons, you know, our excesses are just -- anywhere's you look, you can see them, going into toy stores and other areas where we can see energy uses just tremendously increasing every day.

So I think the federal government has a major role to play in helping us, you know, to deal with this problem. State government, I think all governments; federal, state, county need to have all of their departments do energy audits. So I'll just skip other a lot of that stuff because it's redundant. But the state does have an energy plan, it's produced one every two years, but has never made it mandatory in terms of its implementation. So the state should really mandate that the plan that NYSERTA came up with be implemented, first, by all their own state agencies and then by the rest of the people in the state. It should also require that all local municipalities enforce new code requirements for new construction. We go through SEQRA, the State Environmental Quality Review Act, but there's no adherence to energy in SEQRA, and it should be a requirement that every project that's a Type I or an unlisted action list the total energy usage for that project as well as alternatives for reducing that usage.

And there was a report that the state came out with last year on quality communities, but it had very very little on energy conservation. And that should be revised to reflect, you know, our greater concern for energy. On the County, all of our departments should do their own audits internally to find out what we're using in electricity, oil, natural gas, fleet vehicles, and how we can reduce them. A directive to all the Commissioners for simple things, there used to be stickers back in the '70s that you placed on your light fixtures that told people to turn them off. I know in some of our buildings we didn't have switches until they were retrofitted, but -- the Dennison Building was one of them -- but now we do have light switches. And every night when I go home I walk around the whole floor turning off light switches because no one's turning them off. Computers can be reset so that they go to a stand-by mode after three

minutes. Many computers are left on all weekend; four day weekend coming up and computers will be left on. There should be somebody that should go around to every computer and reset the automatic timer so after three minutes it goes into a stand-by mode.

And every department needs to look at where it is using energy, how it can be conserved and what it's cost in pay back period would be. In some instances, you can have pay back in terms of a savings within only a couple of years. I think the Planning Department and -- or the Planning Commission and the Council on Environmental Quality that review project should be required to ask of every project that they're reviewing what is the energy that is expected to be used for that project. I find it incredulous that all the years I've been coming to the Planning Commission Meetings and even going to local town ones at

the town -- at the Brookhaven Town level, no one ever asks of a developer how much energy is your project going to use. And if you don't even ask that question, there's no way in the world that you're ever going to get any reductions in usage. So first, they've got to start asking the question of how much they're using and then are you talking any steps to reduce that usage. The Federal and State Aide Departments should work with each of the County Departments to find and secure grants for implementing energy savings, and they could also work with Brookhaven Lab that has an excellent program for doing this. In fact, their Employer Rewards Program is phenomenal in terms of having saved Brookhaven Lab, literally hundreds of thousands of dollars and giving their employees thousands of dollars in their pockets.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:  
Time, George.

MR. PROIOS:  
Time?

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:  
If you could just wrap up.

MR. PROIOS:  
Can I just mention this plan quickly? This summer we were fortunate to have an intern, Kelly Mason, who's with us in the audience today, who did a very quick ten week overview of trying to put together what our County energy uses were, looking at the various different departments and came up with a lot of interesting statistics and facts. I'll leave you to copy of this and hope you can make additional copies for the members or your committees as well as members of the Legislature may want to -- may want to review this. But I thought just some quick quick highlights is that we are one of the largest, we the Suffolk County, are one of the largest producers of greenhouse gases of all of the cities and counties that have so far done this report, this type of report. And there have been people doing this for the last three years. And there is a listing of -- I think Santa Fe, New Mexico was the only one that beat us out in terms of CO2 emissions of about over 25 tons per person, per year. It breaks it down by different departments, not surprisingly, I guess, the Community College is one of your largest users of energy. But when you look at buildings, you find some anomalies, the Medical Examiner's Office is way up by the top, number four. Our own County Farm is number eight. You'd think what does ask County farm utilize that makes energy usage high, and the reason is we have the meat processing facility that has freezers that are working 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. So it gives a lot of statistical data that can really get you to start looking at where there may be substantial areas for improving our operations in order to save energy. So I really strongly urge that you get copies of this and try to see how you can utilize it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:  
Thank you, George. Just hold on. Does any of the committee members have any questions? I just have one George. Do you have any idea how much energy could be saved by just turning off all the computers?

MR. PROIOS:  
I don't know how many we have. In a town that did this, I mean, they said they just hired somebody to just go around and change the setting

and they came up with a dollar amount of like \$10,000 of what they saved for a particular government agency.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

A year, a month?

MR. PROIOS:

I don't recall what that was.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Okay.

MR. PROIOS:

But that was a small one. I mean, we're the largest county in the State of New York, so our savings would obviously be significant doing something like that.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Okay. Thank you. Mr. Klaus Feindler. And maybe, Mr. Feindler, you could identify if you're speaking for any particular group.

MR. FEINDLER:

No. At this point I'm speaking for myself. In just briefly looking at your outline here, I have a couple of suggestions or questions or both. If I'm up-to-date on the Southwest Sewer District, it seems like the sludge that's produced by the Southwest Sewer District is being trucked off Long Island. Now, the trucking, of course, consumes energy and it produces air pollution. Now, it would be possible -- technically it's certainly possible and it's being done in many places -- that this sludge is anaerobically digested at the site, and the gas, which is mostly methane that would be produced during this digestion process would be used for generating electrical on-site for Suffolk County facilities, in this case the Southwest Sewer District Treatment Plant. And the steam bi-product, if it is co-generation, would be used to heat the digesters. So there's probably an opportunity here to make maybe -- and I haven't done the numbers so don't hold me to the numbers, I haven't seen their latest records -- but let's say it was ten megawatts, of making ten megawatts from a waste product.

Another item is -- I do see that you have biomass on your agenda, and one of the beautiful things about most parts of biomass, conversion into energy, is that the carbon dioxide that would be released, greenhouse gas, during the combustion process, roughly equals the amount of carbon dioxide consumed in the photosynthesis process of these plants and trees during their lifetime. So it's a renewable form of energy that is also as far as greenhouse gases, neutral. It seems to me that there was a power plant here some years back on the -- in Brentwood that was receiving from landscapers and perhaps even from Long Island Lighting Company at the time woodchips and other tree products. And that was converted into electricity. But when I recently went by the site, I see it's no longer there, so perhaps it's gone out of business. But I would encourage you to look into the possibility of having one or more biomass plants in Suffolk County that would certainly receive these wastes from landscapers, tree pruning programs, from the vineyards, vineyard pruning and so on and think about converting that to energy.

Third item is -- I don't know if this is possible in terms of

legislation -- but I would encourage you to formulate a minimum power plant efficiency standard that would have to be applied to all new power projects as well as repowering of some of the existing power plants. For example, it could say that all power projects ten megawatts and larger must have a minimum annualized energy efficiency of 45%. So this probably would mean that some plants would be -- become co-generation plants, where heat is also captured and is used for useful purposes besides the electricity that's made, or in terms of larger power plants, if they are on fossil fuel, they would be combined cycle type of plants.

And then finally, I have one other last point, it's out of no where but that's within your purview, but I have proposed several months ago that Neighborhood Review Boards would be created. And I first have tried to achieve this on a voluntary basis. And the purposes is that power projects, especially new power projects, have organizational set up as part of the neighborhood that is the host community to these power plants to participate in a monitoring and perhaps also in a constructive way in the administering, the operation, monitoring as far as compliance with DEC and Department of Public Service type of requirements is concerned. So it would go probably beyond the time I have available here to outline the details of such Neighborhood Review Boards, but if you're interested, I can make the correspondence available to you that I've had with Chairman Kessel of Long Island Lighting -- Long Island Power Authority, and he in turn thought that the concept had some merits, but suggested I should take it up with the Public Service Commission. I subsequently had correspondence with Ms. {Helmner}, and she also saw some merit in this concept but suggested that it should be followed through by voluntary compliance by organizations that are in the power business or power production business here on Long Island. And that's about where the case rests right now. And if you're interested, I'll make this correspondence available to you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

You can make a summary on a few of the correspondences, and we'll include it in the record. Thank you. Thank you. Ms. Kelly Mason.

MS. MASON:

Hi. I guess George Proios gave me a nice little segue into my section of it. Again, my name is Kelly Mason -- my name is Kelly Mason, and who am I representing? I'm representing you, I'm representing me, I'm representing the almost 1.5 million people in Suffolk County. But who do I work for? I work for Suffolk County Government Department of Environmental -- or Department of Health Services Pollution Control.

This past summer I worked for the County conducting an Energy Emissions Audit for Suffolk County. The audit was a result of a resolution that was passed back in June, whereby the County -- the County became part of the Cities for Climate Protection Campaign. And the campaign is there is to instigate local government action towards the international problem of global warming. At the end of my summer, I wrote this final report, which George showed you, which hopefully, you'll get a copy of. In it it summarizes everything that I've found. Since then, the County has hired me back to keep the momentum going on the project, and I'm here to write a local action plan to take the project forward and see what Suffolk County can do in the future.

But what I'm here today to do is give you a thumb nail sketch of what my report found, what the results were, an energy state of Suffolk

for the year 2000 so to speak. The first thing that people in Suffolk generally want to know is how do we compare. And again, George touched on this again, but when you come down to it, we're horrible, we're gluttonous. The New York State per capita average emissions is 11.8. Suffolk County is over double that per capita average emissions at 25 tons of carbon dioxide per person. You might want to say, well, that's because we're a suburb of New York City, it's because we're urban. But New Rochelle, New York and Westchester County, New York who also did their audits this summer had perspectivevely 13.6 and 13.1, and we have 25. And then you take other counties, Brookline and Somerville, Massachusetts, which are suburbs of Boston, they had 12.8 and 9.8. So Suffolk County is using more than their share of emission -- energy in subsequent emissions.

The work that I did this summer is basically split into two different sections. I audited the larger Suffolk County Community, which was residential, commercial, industrial, transportation and waste. And then I did an audit for the separate Suffolk County Government, which included buildings, operations and facilities. I want to start out with the government side of things and address the economics, which sadly enough, I think, this is all going to boil down to. Suffolk County Government spent \$25.7 million in the Year 2000 for their energy bills, and this includes electricity, natural gas, heat oil and propane. The Community College again was the largest spender, they spent \$4.2 million. The Sheriff's Department was next, with \$2.4 million. The Legislators \$56,000 and I can go and point fingers and tell you who spent the largest chunk of that, but I won't go into that. If we want to break it down even further and get down to buildings, some of the buildings; \$1.2 million, four point -- million dollars, bridge lights in Westhampton, \$8000. Now, \$8000 may not seem

like a significant amount of money, but \$8000 is more than my budget to be here to write this local action plan for the next six months, which I found out this morning is eliminated in 2002. So we're going to work on that. And that's a totally different subject.

It's a lot of money when you talk about energy. Talking about Suffolk County Government vehicle fleet. Vehicle fleet gets an average 17 miles per gallon efficiency. That's horrible. We can do better. We can improve that. Suffolk County waste, Suffolk County is not reducing, not reusing and they're not recycling. That can be improved. Suffolk County Government Buildings, they need to be retrofitted. They're not energy friendly. Computers, everything else, we're not using Energy Star Products, we're not turning our computers off, we're using too much energy. That can be improved.

For the larger Suffolk community, for the residential community, for industrial, for the corporations, transportation and waste, the numbers were unbelievable. When turned them into CCP, the organization who sponsors it, they were horrified. They didn't believe me. And I told them for sure that I got my numbers from the utilities companies, from the natural gas company, from my government. And as I mentioned before Suffolk County has 25.0 tons of carbon dioxide per capita average emissions. Suffolk County used 474.5 million BTUs of energy in 2000, which equaled 35.5 million tons of emissions. This is where -- pay attention to this. The residential sector was responsible for 47% of that, that's unheard of. They're almost responsible for half of the total energy usage.

Something needs to be done to educate the residential sector. They

need to not only -- we need not only to provide more energy, but we need to cut back, it's huge. Transportation numbers, when you're talking about tons of emissions and tons of -- or, you know, energy that was used in the transportation sector, the percentage is low because it's pushed down by the residential sector, it's 16%. But when you talk about the tons of emissions from the transportation, it's huge. It's shocking. The industrial and commercial sector is responsible for 18% more or less, around there. Suffolk's bus fleet, they're run on diesel. This can be improved. For the waste -- for the community waste -- not to dwell on all the negative things, a positive thing that Suffolk County is doing is we do have methane recovery facilities, that's a good thing, that's a positive thing that Suffolk's doing that's to be commended on. But the down side is the waste percentages is about is 1.7% total energy use, and that's low due to the incineration.

Recycling, Suffolk County, again we fall short. Average New York State recycles 42% of their total waste stream. Suffolk County is only at 37%, and that 37% is an average. You've got Babylon, 28%; Riverhead, 16% of their total waste stream; Smithtown 29%. But then you have other towns like Southampton who are recycling 51%, and that is bringing the average back up. Overall, we're not -- we're not cutting it. So the take-home message of today and of my report is Suffolk County Government, \$25.7 million in utility bills. We can do better than that. We need to reduce that. When you're coming down to economics, when you're cutting budgets, when you're cutting important positions like writing an energy plan for Suffolk County -- for the

Suffolk County community; transportation, we need to get people out of their cars, driving less, we've got to get them out of their SUVs. For the residential sector, we need to educate the residential, because the residential -- the private citizens, they're the ones owning the business, they're the ones running the corporations and the industries. And it all comes down to the individual. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:  
Thank you.

MR. TEMPERA:  
Excuse me.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:  
Kelly, excuse me. I was looking around to see if we had questions.

MR. TEMPERA:  
You talked about the residents of Suffolk County using, I think your number was 47%, and that our energy usage is double what it is in the state average and other jurisdictions. Did you look at why -- what we're doing differently down here that maybe, I think you mentioned Westchester and some other areas -- areas -- that they're doing differently, and if so, could you share that with us?

MS. MASON:  
I did my whole report in ten weeks, I didn't really have time to go into it. But my theory is the level of wealth and the quality of life and the standard of living that Suffolk County has down here. From everything down from electric toothbrushes to heated waterbeds. A large amount of the residential part is coming from heated pools.

MR. TEMPERA:

It's probably not my place to say this, but you talked about your funding being cut for the next year. You should probably make a presentation to the Legislature as to energy-saving ideas you could have. Maybe you could fund your own position through different cost savings, and I'm sure that something that Legislators would be receptive to because obviously, it's not going to cost anything if you're able to fund your position through savings. Just a thought.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Thank you, Kelly.

MS. MASON:

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Marie Pendzich.

MS. PENDZICH:

Hi. I'm here today to report back to three groups that I'm involved in, and one is Sierra Club Long Island, the other is the Central Nassau Greens, and the thirds is Peace Smith, which is an environmental and socially responsible organization that's in Amityville. I can't help but wonder what the heck is going on, not only -- let me digress a little bit from Suffolk County, but starting

with our government on the national level. I can remember back to the '70s when the lines around the gas stations were around the block. And you literally had to get up early in the morning if you needed gas to stand on line, and I can remember one of my friends telling, well, I can go to this station at any time because I also use their mechanic. Then all of a sudden we had a glut of oil on the market. And then with the September 11th crisis, now, all of a sudden, we need to be energy independent again from foreign oil. And it just keeps fluctuating back and forth, back and forth.

Well, one thing that's not fluctuating is the fact that oil is a dwindling resource. It's not going to be on the planet forever, and as time goes on we're going to find less and less of it. And it's going to be become more and more expensive. So the costs of using and wasting energy are going to be much higher than the statistics that Kelly gave you today in the future. The price is only going to go up. The groups that I belong to basically feel that we'd like to appeal to you that the following ways should be looked at in the order. Number one, conservation and efficiency should take place first. Secondly, repowering of the old terribly polluting and inefficient power plants. Third, we should consider renewables, and you all know what they are because they've been mentioned already. And only as a last resort should any new power plants be put up. We can save a lot of money through conservation and energy efficiency. Just to give you an example, a couple of years ago I had an electric stove, and I always felt that my bills were too high because of this electric stove. And I mean, I never even -- I don't use it to the point where, you know, you're cooking a turkey and it's got to be in the oven for three hours. Whatever meals I cook are, you know, on top of the stove and usually take a half hour. Yet my bills were \$129 dollars a month. When I converted to gas, the first bill I got was my gas stove was \$75. I'm only one person, one resident, I made one conservation effort, and my bill dropped in half. So just multiply that by all the residents, millions of residents that are in Suffolk County, and you see what you could be saving, what they could be saving.

Why they would be fighting energy efficiency when you really should be telling them that it puts money back in their pockets? They could be saving money by being efficient and not wasting. Just recently a bill went through Congress to up the mileage per gallon on cars, and it was defeated. Why is it in this time of crisis an terrorism and oil scarcity and dependence on foreign countries are we keeping the mileage per gallon for our cars as low as we can? It doesn't make any sense. Another thing too that I found out. If we are so in need of oil, then how come billions of gallons that we get out of Alaska every year are shipped to Asia? There's a unique one. So I'm here basically to appeal to you, and when you put together this plan -- to tell you that we really need to consider conservation and efficiency first, and building any power plants should be the last thing on the list.

There's something that I found that I got through e-mail that I'd like to leave with you. In San Francisco, voters went to the polls on November 6th, and overwhelmingly approved a measure that gives the City of San Francisco the authority to issue up to a hundred million dollars in bonds to finance solar energy facilities for use by city agencies and departments. There's an idea. Bonds.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Thank you. If you could leave that with the -- you could leave it with recording secretary. Just put it by her, then we'll make copies. Okay. Thank you. Mark Serotoff.

MR. SEROTTOFF:

You said it correctly.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

I'm trying very hard.

MR. SEROTTOFF:

That's rare.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

I have a very unusual name too.

MR. SEROTTOFF:

The world of energy production and regulation in that world where one utility can control energy production the need and siting of new power plants no longer exists due to deregulation of the industry. It should be noted that Enron and the energy industry in general through intense federal lobbying were the major forces responsible for deregulation. In the wake of abrupt energy shortages in California to several months later having excessive capacity to Governors calling for moratoriums on new power plant construction to class action lawsuits by civic environmental and local governments fighting the construction of new power plants to Long Island where there are over 20 proposals for new generators mostly in Suffolk, deregulation is a colossal failure.

The need for an Energy Advisory Board to the Suffolk County Legislature indicates the energy policy vacuum. The Legislature is to be applauded for taking this initiative, however, it's important for the Advisory Panel's recommendations not to be put on the shelf -- on a back shelf and collect dust. The Legislature must heed these recommendations by the panel. Decisions made on new power plants

affect the health and environment of the communities and the regions for decades -- this region for decades.

In addition to power plants being a terrorist target, even mid-sized state-of-the-art natural gas units emit hundreds of thousands of pounds a year of carcinogens and pollutants that permanently damage the heart and lungs. Power plants present the potential of contaminating the aquifer, Long Island's sole source of potable water. Combine this with comparable emissions from the regional incinerators, industrial and vehicle emissions, one can understand the inordinately high cancer rates, asthma and health problems in general on Long Island. In fact, the DEC has awarded Long Island nonattainment status in air quality for several years. I have several suggestions.

Maximum effort must be made to cut demand. NYSERTA and LIPA have tens of billions of dollars allotted for conservation. Use it to subsidize the purchase of energy efficient appliance, for example. And as Kelly

mentioned, almost half our energy usages at the residential sector and appliance -- energy efficient appliances; refrigerators, lights, etcetera would go a long way to help cutting demand. Significantly more utilization of renewable energy like solar, wind, tidal, and geothermal power should be used. Like California, make distributed solar generation and energy efficiency integral with building codes. Gordian Raacke of the Citizens Advisory Panel went to San Francisco recently; is that correct?

MR. RAACKE:  
(Shook head yes).

MR. SEROTTOFF:  
And building codes require every new construction to have a certain number of square foot of solar generation. It's in awnings, it's on roofing shingles, etcetera. And this is all by local mandated requirement. It could be done over here. A Pace University energy study showed efficiency is good for the economy. A one dollar expenditure in energy conservation could lead to a three dollar multiply effect in boosting economic -- the economic with represent to jobs and sales and so on. LIPA has several months left to exercise an option to buy all the KeySpan power plants. The Legislature should partner with LIPA and have them buy the plants. A County-wide municipal power authority would offer major benefits.

Number one, the profit motive would be eliminated resulting in even lower rates. Number two, repowering, which is dismantling the old inefficient and polluting machinery and substituting modern technology. Repowering the Northport and Port Jefferson plants could be expedited. Figures obtained by the Citizens Advisory Panel showed major benefits. Pollution can be cut up to 99%. Stack heights could be reduced in half. Generation can go up to almost a thousand megawatts from Northport alone. That's the size of two medium sized new power plants. Millions more would be available in community tax benefits. Many new jobs would be provided, long-term jobs and that's significant in this poor economy. And finally, lower fuel consumption would result also with increasing output, which is the definition of great efficiency.

Deregulation has resulted in the Public Service Commission enacting Article 10, which governs the need, siting and applications of new power plants. It has the effect of allowing any company to pick a

site, do the studies, file an application and build a plant. Need is defined to the state as just providing competition, not fulfilling electrical demand. Article 10 allows the state to override local zoning laws, codes and ordinances. This is unacceptable on Long Island because of it's groundwater protection laws an nonattainment air quality status. Some sites that never would be considered under the old scheme, such as Kings Park are in play. This site is over a Groundwater Protection Zone, across the street from a regional incinerator, within five miles of 87 schools and 67 paces from homes. Section 1020-G of the LIPA Act empowers LIPA to and I'm quoting, "to acquire, construct, improve, rehabilitate, maintain and operate such generating transmission and related facilities as the authority deems necessary or desirable to maintain an adequate and dependable supply of gas and electric power within the service area". Since LIPA is

also a state authority, I believe Article 10 wouldn't apply in this exceptional circumstance that exists on Long Island compared to the rest of the state. The Legislature and LIPA should push for the LIPA Act to be the law governing the need and siting of power plants on Long Island. It is preferable for Long Islanders to make energy policy decisions rather than Up-state siting boards.

We are not knowledgeable regarding our environmental protection, community concerns and infrastructure. To sum up, require, I guess that would mean legislate, put in building codes, require -- demand reduction, renewable energy, repowering and LIPA linked with the County as a municipal power authority. After all, it's name is the Long Island Power Authority. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Kathleen Whitley.

MS. WHITLEY:

Good afternoon. I'm Kathleen Whitley. I am a member of the Sustainable Energy Alliance of Long Island. I'm the energy analyst for CAP, Citizens Advisory Panel, but more importantly I'm here today as a long time, all my life resident of Long Island. I'm here to stress the need for a sustainable energy future for Long Island. This must be a plan that encompasses and maximizes aggressive energy efficiency standards and programs along with the reduction of energy waste in all sectors; private, commercial and government. We must also invest in what I call commensurate investment strategy, which would create a 10% minimum investment in renewables with current proposals for traditional power plants and turbine generators here on Long Island. But we cannot stop as Kelly Masson eluded to with aggressive measures that only address Long Island. We must address our energy needs as they fit into the bigger global energy picture.

The facts I'm about to outline give indisputable evidence to this fact an validate why we must act sooner rather than later. Word wide fossil fuel consumption has increased four times as rapidly as the world population in the 20th Century. And the world population is slated to double by the year 2050. The United States with less that 5% of the world's population uses over 25% of total world energy supply. We not only consume more than our share of energy, we also squander it through gross inefficiency on all levels. We use, for example, twice as much energy per dollar of the gross national product as Japan and other industrialized nations. In 1998 alone, Americans drove 60% more total miles in automobiles than the Germans, French, British, Japanese, Canadians, Mexicans and Swedes combined. Given the

gas guzzling appetite of the American new vehicle fleet, a fleet that is over 50% sports utilities vehicle, vans and light trucks this year alone, the problem becomes even worse. That's why American with less than 5% of the world population consume 43% of the world's gasoline.

To keep it on a level of what Suffolk County can do to address this, I have three specific suggestions. First, Suffolk County should double the efficiency and increase renewables four fold and target a one-third renewable energy target by the year 2020. We should in the next decade increase four fold the amount of energy obtained from nonhydro renewable sources such as the sun and wind. By the year

2020, Suffolk County should target to produce at least one-third of our energy from renewable sources and double the efficiency of energy use in home, buildings, transportation and industry sectors. Suffolk County immediately needs to address the issue of the Port Jefferson and Northport power plants. We must tighten up the pollution limits on these two plants the and aggressively move to repower them. We should close the loophole that allows these power plants to pollute much more than the newer plants, and Mark Serotoff mentioned -- reduce by 99% the toxic emissions currently being emitted from both these plants.

Also, Suffolk County could mandate and should mandate that their county fleet of vehicles and cars should be targeted to purchase vehicles which have a 45 mile per gallon standard fuel efficiency or more. And that could be increased so by the time the Year 2020 actually comes around, you are purchasing a fleet of government used cars that have at least a fuel efficiency standard of 65 miles per gallon. And they're currently -- they know how to do this -- they are currently making hybrids that get 80 miles per gallon or more. And these are just a few of the initial steps that the County could and should take.

In summary, we can wait until our backs are against the wall or we can choose to act proactively as a local government, as a community, as a region and as a nation. There is no greater opportunity for true patriotism than to be become a wiser more energy efficient society. We can choose to build a super efficient society powered by renewables and offering all the creativity, comfort productivity, employment, entertainment and security we could want. We will only achieve this if the people ask for it, if our government demands is it, and if the industry is willing to do it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Janet Kagel.

MS. KAGEL:

The Port Jefferson Power Plant is making me sick. My name is Janet Kagel. I have lived in Poquott for 25 years, and the Port Jefferson Power facility is practically in my backyard. I have had a chronic illness for the past 7 years, and according to my doctors, the pollution from the Port Jefferson Power Station is making me sick. Over the 25 years that I've lived in that area, I have watched my husband develop asthma, my daughter was always congested while she was growing up, she went away to college and now she is better. My 13 year old son recently development a sore throat and then had a lingering cough for months afterwards. And I'm worried that my son's lungs will not develop to their full capacity because of the all of the pollution he is subjected to from the power station.

We are not the only family who is getting sick from the power station. I've watched other long-term residents get sick also. Long-term residents in Poquott suffer from high incidents of respiratory ailments, including asthma, as well as heart disease and cancer. In a renal study that looked at adverse respiratory symptoms, it was shown that subjects living Poquott and in close proximity to the Port Jefferson Power Station suffered more adverse respiratory symptoms

then subjects living in a similar area in Saint James. The studies show that the closer the subject live to the plant, the more adverse respiratory symptoms they suffered. It is an understatement to say that the Port Jefferson Power Station adversely affects the quality of our lives. It is more than a nuisance, it is killing us. Now LIPA and KeySpan plan to build two gas turbines to add to the enormous pollution already being admitted from the Port Jefferson facility. This is unacceptable.

The Port Jefferson facility is old and inefficient. And it's dirty. It emits millions of tons of pollutants into the atmosphere every year. It's time to put pressure on LIPA and KeySpan to stop hiding behind the Grandfather Clause. It's time to put pressure on LIPA and KeySpan to repower their old and dirty plants, like the ones in Port Jefferson and Northport. The environment and our lives depend upon it. My family and I like our home, and we don't want to have to move. I became an environmental activist out of necessity. I don't feel I have a choice. It's something I must do, not only to protect my family and myself and the environment, but also because I care very much about all the children whose bodies are still developing and who take in a much greater percentage of pollutions compared to their body weight than adults do. And what about the elderly and the immune compromised? There is so much that can be done as far as conservation measures, developing and investing in sustainable and renewable energy sources and in repowering the old and dirty plants. Long Island needs a comprehensive energy plan that addresses these issues. I can't repeat enough that it's this earth that we are all responsible for, and we the people are counting on you to do the right thing here. We want to live, not die.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:  
Thank you. Gloria Rubino.

MS. RUBINO:

Hello. I am a member of the East Hampton Energy Advisory Committee, but most importantly, I'm a Suffolk County resident who feels very adamant about our lack of attention to the matters that we're discussing today, governmental intention I should say. After the events of September 11th, this year I see American flags everywhere being displayed as a symbol of solidarity, American solidarity. What I'd like to propose today is that we look at another form of solidarity and that is seeing our -- seeing our interest in reducing our dependance on fossil fuel energy as another facet of American solidarity, I think a very important facet of that.

I -- I don't have a lot of data and statistics and so forth, I think because so much of it is just common sense. I'm just making some very simple proposals. I would like to see government programs that look at promoting very highly visible programs that promote energy conservation, but doing it is one thing, but also making -- I mean, advertising agents -- agencies promote all kinds of products. Why

can't we see this as a product, promote it, let government set the example, have all the new police cars, Prius, Toyota Prius hybrid models with bumper stickers to the effect of letting the public know. We -- I know there has -- have been example of taking flat roof industrial buildings -- solar technologies is in place to turn these

into, in effect, miniature power plants providing energy where it's needed, when it's needed, clean green and doing that and making a spectacle of ourselves, showing the public. I mean, government has to set an example, and I think once the public sees that the government is doing this, it's going to be deemed an act of patriotism to follow. But we need leaders, we need the government to take the lead and the fact -- and I think by omission, by the fact that the government is not doing, our local government is not doing this, it's saying to the public, go ahead, keep doing what you're doing, keep -- keep using energy inefficiently and squandering it as has been said. So I think -- I'm just here today to tell you that you're very -- your actions are very, very important to us, and we're all watching you, and we want to support you in every way we can to effect these goals. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:  
Thank you. Jack Kulka.

MR. KULKA:

Good afternoon. Thank you. Excuse my laryngitis, I just came off a plane. Miami beat Syracuse by a small score of 59 to nothing, and it I was a Miami supporter, so I lost my voice. I'm here as the Chairman of the Hauppauge Industrial Association Energy Committee, and I'm representing the Board of Directors of the Hauppauge Industrial Association. And the Hauppauge Industrial Association consists of in excess of 800 member companies representing 55,000 people employed by 1300 companies in the Hauppauge area. It is the largest industrial park east of the Mississippi. And obviously, we have energy concerns. And the Hauppauge Industrial Association has been involved in the energy battles going back for many years.

Most of you know we were opposed to the LIPA/LILCO deal, when Gordian Raacke used to sit on the Board. I myself sit on the Suffolk County Electrical Agency, and I love the efforts of your committee to seek ways of solving Suffolk County's energy problems. And before I read the statement that has been approved unanimously by the Suffolk County -- by the Hauppauge Industrial Association Board, I'd like to say that as a start -- and this is something we started to look into with the Suffolk County Electrical Agency -- as a start, Suffolk County, which uses so much electricity in all of its facilities, especially in the Southwest Sewer District, should lead the way in looking and seeking for ways to develop energy efficiencies that then could be an example to the rest of Suffolk County. So we should be leaders in that as opposed to the followers. And there are many ways that that can be addressed, and I won't address them. But I'd like to read this statement, and I have copies of the statement for all the members of your group.

"The Hauppauge Industrial Association's Board the Directors acting upon the recommendations of its Energy Committee, which is Chaired by myself voted unanimously to endorse the following energy position statement. It is entitled need for generation of electricity on Long Island. Electric energy is an essential ingredient to the property and growth of the Long Island economy. The demand for electric energy

on Long Island has outpaced the state and national average, growing at rate of more than 3.5% a year since 1988. In marked contrast to this

growth, no new generation has been built on Long Island in nearly a decade. Today Long Island is facing a critical situation where new sources of electric energy supply are necessary to keep pace with this growing demand. We recognize that the Long Island Power Authority has a three-pronged approach to meet Long Island's continuing need for electric energy, which includes one, continued aggressive pursuit of energy conservation; two, the installation of a new cross Sound cable to link Long Island to Connecticut; and three, the development of new on-island generating facilities. We also recognize that while supplies are adequate to meet the needs of Long Island this summer and possibly next spring, siting and building new generating plants are necessary to support the increasing needs of the Island for the summer of 2002 and beyond are essential. We, therefore, support the Long Island Powers Authority's three-pronged approach to meet our energy needs. Moreover, we strongly endorse the installation of the new cross-Sound cable to Connecticut and the aggressive development of new on-island generating facilities. Furthermore, we support increased subsidization --subsidization for both energy conservation and alternative sources of energy".

It is one thing to talk about theory that we can build buildings with photoelectric cells, I'm a builder, I can tell you it's not very cost-effective. Unfortunately, customers don't want to spend that kind of money. Two, it's another thing to talk about looking into new technologies for the next decade, but the problem we face is now. There is not enough sufficient energy for the next couple of years. And if we have a black-out or brown-out on Long Island coupled with the other problems that we've had since September 11th and coupled with poor infrastructure when it comes to things like fiber optics, the Hauppauge Industrial Park will cease. And if that happens, there will be a tremendous shortfall -- additional shortfall in tax revenues to Suffolk County. Thank you.

LEG. FISHER:  
Madam Chair.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:  
Yes, Legislator Fisher.

LEG. FISHER:  
Hello. I apologize for my lateness, I was at another meeting across the hall. Mr. Kulka, as a businessman, I was wondering if you have any suggestions, the speaker before you, Gloria Rubine, I believe her name was, mentioned more aggressive ways of getting people to buy into conservation. And we all know that conservation is clearly a very important part of the this, alternative energy and sustainable energy is very important. But as a businessman, how can we get the public to buy into conservation?

MR. KULKA:  
Well, as an example of that, we are building a hotel right now that is nearing completion in Woodbury. It is being heated by a geothermal system, which is a system of piping that derives cooling and heating from the groundwater. We're going to save approximately 35% in energy costs. That was made possible by a \$200,000 grant, differential grant, that Scott Brothers, Enterprises, which owns the hotel, applied

for and received from LIPA. Its programs -- that's one of reasons we suggested that it is incumbent upon governmental authorities and LIPA to continue to develop more programs of this nature to encourage people.

LEG. FISHER:

So cash incentives.

MR. KULKA:

And there are incentives in place right now.

LEG. FISHER:

But to residential homeowners, are there cash incentives that would be really incentives -- real incentives to make a homeowner look for conservation measures?

MR. KULKA:

I honestly don't know, I don't build houses. But I can tell you in the case of industrial and commercial building, there are all kinds of incentives with regard to air conditioning units, light fixtures, but it's only a small step. If you really are serious about doing this, first you have to obviously expand that program -- and I've been in favor of that, I know Gordian has in the past -- and secondly, I think if you look at the tremendous amount of electricity that the County uses in places like the Southwest Sewer District -- because we had asked the DPW to send us those figures at the Suffolk County Electrical Agency -- and in some of the other facilities owned by the County -- I didn't even see my good friend Mr. Quinn here -- he will tell you that we could put a tremendous kink in the amount of electricity we use in Suffolk County, just if we modified some of the usage in the buildings that the County owns.

LEG. FISHER:

Thank you.

MR. KULKA:

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Jack -- Jack, I have a question. Is the Hauppauge Industrial Association doing anything in the way of energy conservation with its membership or any type of promotion of energy conservation?

MR. KULKA:

What we have done is we have made the various different incentive programs, we have publicized them, brought them to the attention of our members, and a substantial number of our members who are upgrading -- we did one last year -- air conditioning, have gone to organizations such as LIPA and KeySpan and have gotten those incentives. But again, those incentives are limited, and I think that we should look into the possibility of government incentives in addition to -- in addition to private incentives in order to accomplish their needs.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

But you have found that the businesses are interested when they are

retrofitting their buildings and trying to make some energy efficiency?

MR. KULKA:

Good rule of thumb, if you can expend up front "X" dollars to accomplish energy conservation, and your pay back is no more than five years, you will see companies that are interested. But if your pay back exceeds five years, the general consensus of opinion is that companies do not want to spend the money. But if there were tax incentives, if there were federal government incentives for energy conservation, you would see a greater amount of interest in the project. We had one major company in Hauppauge, Reuters, that for years tried to do fuel cells, tried to come up with a fuel cell system, and finally, threw the towel in, gave up because of the cost involved and of the bureaucracy involved.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Thank you.

MR. KULKA:

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Mr. George Rubino. I think I separated you two from following each other there.

MR. RUBINO:

That's okay. I'm George Rubino from East Hampton. I just learned of this meeting about an hour and a half ago, so I don't have a prepared speech. But I just want to point out that in one of the recent elections in East Hampton, 75% of the voters called for the closing of the Millstone Nuclear Power Plant. I mention this to point out that the citizens of the East End want clean, safe, reliable energy. And if you come out to the East Hampton area and just poll the people there, you'll find that they all want this clean, safe, energy. And so I support the work of this committee in finding ways to do this, and that's just what I wanted to say. Thank you.

LEG. FISHER:

Madam Chair.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Yes, Legislator Fisher.

LEG. FISHER:

Mr. Rubino, it was in great part because of the work that I have been -- that I had seen that was being done in East Hampton -- wasn't that, Scott, East Hampton -- it was because of the work I saw going on there that this committee was formed. So it certainly is a testament to the people in East Hampton serving of an example and a model.

MR. RUBINO:

Great. That's very encouraging. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Eve Kaplan.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

She was here.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

I'm just going to -- I'll call the next person, then I'll call her. Marianne Zacharia.

MS. ZACHARIA:

Hi. My name is Marianne Zacharia. I'd like to thank this committee for the opportunity to speak today. I think this is a very important issue we all need to address. And I'm very, very happy that Suffolk County has chosen to take this format. The American Lung Association of Nassau/Suffolk believes that the goals of a sound energy policy and protection of lung health converged with policies that maximize energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources. The most effective quickest and least expensive means of reducing the use fossil -- fossil-fired fuel plants -- fossil -- that's a little tongue twister there -- fossil fuel-fired plants, greater efficiency, energy conservation, and renewable sources are also those that will protect the public health from air pollution and will -- help to meet the growing electricity demands here on Long Island.

The electric industry is the single largest industrial source of air pollution. It produces two-thirds of the acid aerosols, which is a very known lung tissue irritant, a third of NOx, which is contributed to summer time smog, and a third of the carbon dioxide emitted annually in the United States. And it is the only unregulated source of mercury air emissions. As Suffolk County is in a nonattainment area for air quality standards, all available opportunities to improve air quality should be pursued as the industry transitions from a regulated monopoly to an open and competitive one. Recognizing the inherent lung benefits from energy efficiency and conservation and renewable energy while taking into consideration the need for reliable sources of power to meet growing demand, the American Lung Association of Nassau/Suffolk supports a comprehensive energy policy.

Suffolk County can take a lead role in ensuring that a sound policy exists here. The American Lung Association supports actions that will fund energy efficiency and conservation programs. A public education campaign in Suffolk County on the economic and health benefits of energy conservation and efficiency would be an excellent first step in this process. Suffolk County can take a lead in the role in ensuring that all County facilities are utilizing the latest technologies in energy efficiency. We also support the development and deployment of renewable energy resources such as wind and solar power. The County should develop a plan to utilize these sources of energy as well as encouraging programs and policies that make it easier for the residents of Suffolk County to adopt renewable energy technologies.

The County can encourage economic growth by providing formal incentives to renewable energy and efficiency manufacturers to locate here in Suffolk County. We encourage the County to sort of think outside of the box when it comes to resolving our energy needs. Putting up power plants is only one solution, and we don't feel that it is necessarily the right solution here for Long Island. This is an opportunity to lead the way in New York State in the development of an economically and environmentally sound energy policy. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Thank you. Eve Kaplan.

MS. KAPLAN:

Sorry if I missed my first curtain all or whatever it was. My name is Eve Kaplan, and I'd like to speak about Long Island's energy needs from the perspective of Long Island's communities. I am the Riverhead Coordinator for the North Fork Environmental Council. We're a 1200

member grass-roots group working on the preservation of land, sea, air and quality of life on the North Fork. On the North Fork we use energy just like everyone else, and I think that I speak for many people in many communities all over Long Island when I say that our primary interest is finding a balance between the energy that we use and the new development we need to create that energy.

Balance is our goal, but the reality we face is something different. Let me paint you a picture, for example, of what's going on right now in Riverhead. Riverhead is a town of only 2600 -- 26,000 people without much of an energy problem. Yet, we face a proposal to build a 450 megawatt plant in our backyard. Okay, we say, reasonably. What are the costs and what are the benefits, we'd like to know? The benefit we're told is that this plant will be key in meeting Long Island's energy needs. So we ask, what are those needs, we receive no answer. The information we receive comes mainly from power companies. We ask someone, anyone to explain to us where this plant fits into plan a sustainable energy growth on Long Island? We are told there is no plan. So we ask the power company to see their proposal for this plant. What actually is going to happen here? What do they want to do in our backyard? They tell us, you don't really want to see that. We say, yes, we do. We file a Freedom of Information Form, and we talk to the Public Service Commission about Article 10. We find out that to protect our own water, our air, our way of life, our backyard, even if we choose not to fight the plant, but only to be involved as an intervener in the process, will cost us tens of thousands of dollars in fees to lawyers and engineering experts.

The entire budget of our organizations can be counted in the tens of thousands of dollars. And the budgets of the civic associations we work with the closely can be counted in the hundreds. We don't know where we'll find the money to participate in this process that's been designed to allow our voices to be heard. Our elected officials, whom one might turn to in a situation such as this, will be paid \$5 million to provide the land for this plant. They'll receive potentially receive \$6 million a year in much needed tax funds from this plant. They do not return our phone calls, so our message is, give us a plan. We need to know what the real needs are for communities such as ours. We need a plan, not crafted by energy companies, but crafted by the people who we voted to represent us; the County, citizens groups, citizens voices, technical experts and other agencies who are involved in oversight of the energy industry. Please find out for us using the resources of money, personnel, expertise, which we do not have access to, what the real story is behind Long Island's energy needs. Our community has found it almost impossible to have an effective voice in the energy development process once this process has begun. We cannot protect our air or our water through this process, much less protect ourselves and our health. So we look to you to provide this plan, to provide real answers, real information that we can trust and to protect us. Thank you. Also, I have some newsletters from our organization, if you just want to know more about it.

MR. TEETZ:

Just one point of information. Were you aware that Article 10 allows for intervening funding to be provided by a developer?

MS. KAPLAN:

I am, but the more I learn about Article 10, the more I found out and I'm told that the real place that you need to be -- you need to be acting before you even have access to that money. So you really --

you can't even prove that you need to have -- that you should have standing, that your voice should be heard unless you already have a lawyer, and you already have someone to explain to the PSC why you're involved. And it's -- I mean, coming up with that kind of up-front funding, it's like, you know, starting to -- trying to start your internet commerce site without your venture capitalist. So that's kind of what we're facing right now.

MR. TEETZ:

Is it already too late in the process with that particular plant to get standing?

MS. KAPLAN:

No, it's not. I mean, we will, you know, be involved. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Ernie Fazio.

MR. FAZIO:

Good afternoon everybody. I'm representing myself and the Energy Demonstration and Education Center, which is a newly formed entity and as a matter of fact, it's getting some help from LIPA and KeySpan, so I'm, you know, appreciative of those people because they would -- they know what my mission is. And my mission or our mission is to educate people on what's available in terms of energy efficiency alternative power, new ideas that are coming down the pipe, maybe that have been used in Europe or other parts the country and connect Long Island to those ideas so that the people who have the good intentions of building of buildings that are better, will have the information to do so.

One of the things I want to address is the idea that you can predict how much electricity you're going to need. I don't even believe that's possible. I've seen studies going back 30 years that were done by LILCO, and they had predicted that they would have need for three nuclear power plants at approximately 800 megawatts each, and they would all be on-line as we speak right now if all the -- if the political climate had let them do so. We would not be using all of that power. The fact of the matter is what happened is that motors get a lot more efficient, lighting got a lot more efficient, we changed the way we use the electricity. The growth that they expected in population and business did not happen quite the same, and on the

other hand, when we got in the '90s, everything reversed itself, and we had a tremendous load on our power.

So the reason why I bring this idea of predicting being difficult is that I'm not so sure I want to stop the progress in putting in new power. You know, I'm ambivalent about that. I like the idea that you don't have to put in more power because it means less pollution, but what I did was I proposed to KeySpan and LIPA that they tie a percentage of renewables to new work that they're doing. Now, that would incrementally change the way we get power and use it in this country and this region. What would -- how that would work is that if you want to put up a 300 megawatt plant, you have to commit yourself to putting up 30 megawatts of renewable power. Now, that would mean either wind power or solar or possibly even fuel cells. But fuel cells create another problem for me because we're all wedded to this one source of fuel in gas. All of the major four power plants are run by gas. I don't think anything on Long Island runs on oil, and

nothing runs on coals, of course. But we don't have the diversity of fuels.

I brought this up with Chairman Kessel -- Kattel, and he reassured me that they have enough input coming in from different directions, that this would not be a problem. But we know that there are people in this world that would try very hard to disrupt those sources of gas. So that's another problem. So my big proposal is to make sure that the future changes incrementally. We can't rely on the good will of the power company to do this on their own. They're not going to take, for example, a hospital and put in an alternative fuel cell system or maybe a solar system and run a meter off it and own the piece of hardware, which is exactly what they should be doing, because the other thing that's not predictable is the cost of power. We know that the cost of power being what it is, with the oil prices being what they are, we know what the cost of power is, and we can predict that, but we can't predict that it's going to be that tomorrow.

Now, since we are a gas-based economy on fuels on Long Island, doesn't that mean we're immune from the cost of oil? Absolutely not. Because so much of the country does produce electricity by use of oil, that when the price of oil goes up, it changes the price of gas, because now the demands are different. So we -- even though we don't use any oil to my knowledge to produce electricity on Long Island, it will have an effect on the cost once we find it -- when, you know, the economy changes and the world nations like China starts putting demands on oil, and we have not a glut of oil, but a shortage.

The -- we must do something in terms of regulating how we use power in buildings. Now, I've noticed that since the last time I spoke in front of this forum to the Legislature, we had a different lighting system here, they've changed a lot. So this is -- this is the kind of things that will be changing and we want to be changing. And then and somebody point out, that the County has the power to do this. They don't have to ask permission. They can go out and do their own buildings, and they can make those changes and bring down the volume of electricity. The investment, even if you're thinking, as Jack says, a five year turn around may not be a five year turn around. Because if the price goes up, the turn around is longer -- is shorter,

rather. So these investments, let's say, if we did something in solar on a County budgets in some of their buildings, it may look like a very long pay out, but there are technologies to make those things work better too, and this is where conservation comes in. This is another area that we addressed.

Conservation is extremely important because if you have to build a -- say a solar power plant to build -- to power an inefficient building and you can make that building twice as efficient, you make the system half the size. So what was in -- was not financially viable becomes financially viable by virtue of the good engineering that you do in the building itself. So these things all work hand in glove. And I'm trying to point out these things because I want to see where -- what ways we can make legislation work for creating the environment for better situations in the future. There's another thing. We have emergency power locations all over the place, every hospital, every nursing home, every fire department, every police station, every city hall has their own back-up power, and they're all powered by a diesel engines. If we had a Class 3 hurricane on Long Island, all of those power plants would go on. And it would be impossible to breathe on

this Island because they generate an enormous amount of power. The Suffolk County Water Authority uses over a million dollars of electric power every month.

Now here's where I think we should -- excuse me, where we should be going with this emergency power situation. These units cost of money, they hardly ever run, and you can't justify the cost of these things on a pay-back basis. So when you start taking the better ways of producing power, and you put them on a pay-back basis, you're putting them in the very unfair position, because these things never pay for themselves. They're just a cost-plus item. Now, if we took those power plants -- and we're looking for distributed generation too -- and we took the Water Company's emergency generators and changed them to fuel cells, and instead of operating them on emergency basis, operate them on a full-time basis, and the only time that they would be used for feeding into the grid is when the grid went down.

Now, the use of water and the use of power at the same time is not necessarily congruent. For example, in the middle of the winter when you're not using a lot of water or even the hurricane season when you're not using a lot of water and you don't need a lot of power, you can then put that power back into the grid. That would make a lot of sense. Now, the only time that those people would be using grid power is when the grid is down. So you reverse the process. Instead of being emergency power, they become primary power, only taking in the power for their own pumps, when -- when they have a problem and the grid feeds them. Now we have an economically justifiable expense in all of these distributive power plants. Now if you did have a massive failure in the grid, would you be able to power everything else? No, you wouldn't. But you'd be able to do every that was emergency; you'd have all of your police, fire, water and hospitals, nursing homes, all of those things powered properly, and you might have some residual power to feed back in the grid.

So as a matter of security and to enhance the value of distributed power this would be a workable solution. Now, I haven't done the

economics on it, but I know what the economics are on distributed power in terms of diesel. They're no good, they don't work. So I do -- so whatever it is, it's got to be a plus. And maybe -- and I don't know how this is done -- is this done by education or is it done by legislation? But it's -- we've got to reverse that process and make the primary of power in the distributed generation.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Mr. Fazio, could you wrap up your remarks?

MR. FAZIO:

Oh, I thought I had an unlimited amounts of time.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

No, I'm sorry.

MR. FAZIO:

No. I'm only kidding. I didn't know how much time I had, by the way. Yeah, I've pretty much completed my remarks, so, you know, I'm -- I'll close it there.

MR. TEETZ:

I have a question. I find the idea of replacing emergency diesels

with fuel cells very intriguing. Obviously, it would be a tremendous expense for all those facilities that had those and would have to change to different technology. But I would certainly see the opportunity for that -- for any new facility that's built, a new hospital or a new police station. There is a possibility that we could mandate that the back-up generation be fuel cells rather than dirty diesel generators. How do you feel about that?

MR. FAZIO:

Well, that's exactly how I would approach it, because you're right, it would be an enormous expense for these entities to come up with that, and those entities by and large are being subsidized by taxpayers. So you'd had a big problem on your hands. And you're right, it's got to be new stuff. Now, I've spoken to Steve Jones at the Suffolk County Water, and he's very interested. He saying he thinks it's the way to go. And they build -- they're a growing entity. They're always putting on new wells, so here's a good -- lot of opportunities.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

One of your suggestions was that if someone got permission to build a power plant that they -- they at the same time would be asked to contribute so much money, I assume, to a fund for renewable energy.

MR. FAZIO:

Well, Alice, I wouldn't handle it that way. What I would do is I'd say build your 300 megawatts there where you're going to, build 30 megawatts somewhere else on a distributed generation on a alternative fuel-type -- and put it any place that you think it's appropriate to fit into your grid. Put it at a hospital, put it any place. But build it. And it's yours, you own it, you still bill the electricity like you would anything else, but that's how you got to do it.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Actually have them build a different type of plant.

MR. FAZIO:

That's right. So -- now, I'm trying to get them to do it on a voluntary basis, and they're talking to me, they actually think it's an interesting proposal. You know, because it's not like they're giving away the rights to bill. They retain the right to bill if they put it say at a hospital or some place like that. They're still measuring the electricity coming off there and taking -- taking the revenues for it. So it's not a totally obnoxious idea to them. So -- but, you know, if we could codify it into some kind of ruling, I think that would be helpful. On the other hand, it might just get them all upset.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

It's possible. Thank you.

MR. FAZIO:

Oh, that's it? Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Mr. Peter Quinn.

MR. QUINN:

Good afternoon members of the Suffolk County Electrical -- or Energy Advisory Committee. My name is Peter Quinn, I am a member of the Suffolk County Electrical Agency, having been appointed by the Suffolk

County Legislature. Forgive me, I left my reading glasses home, so I'll just have to read from my normal reading -- my driving glasses, and not doing -- I won't do rather well with those. At any rate, if Suffolk County had a master plan, it should seek to reduce energy consumption at all its facilities, including sewer plants, County hospitals, water pumping stations managed by the Suffolk County Water Authority and all its buildings, which -- the energy costs there total roughly 26 million this year and then efforts should be made to seek a reduction to 20 million by the Year 2006, five years from now.

Large fuel cells costing \$800,000 with a \$200,000 federal rebate should be installed at the Southwest Sewer District to reduce substantially the over \$3 millions spent annually in energy costs there, according to a filing that I arranged to distribute to you that was submitted by Fred Pollert of the County Budget Review Office. The -- just as there can -- there are EPA Energy Star Labels for refrigerators and air conditioners and for commercial buildings, there needs to be an Energy Star Label for municipal buildings. Suffolk's Legislature should jump-start that process along with the Public Works Department, but first, an updated energy audit should be in place to determine what needs to be done. Ernie Fazio made an important point about you don't put solar panels up to a leaky building, in effect, you first of all do the installation to cut down the numbers of panels of Solar PV that you need on your roof. The --at the Energy Advisory Committee's last meeting, I proposed you are pushing NYSERTA to arrange for a \$400 rebate to residential consumers who've purchased new energy efficient refrigerators consuming less than 500 kilowatt hours annually.

Most Suffolk homes currently have kitchen clunkers, refrigerators consuming over 100 to perhaps as much as 1500 kilowatts hours on a yearly basis. This plan requires appliance manufacturers, retail stores, consumers and towns, which pick up and dispose old refrigerators to become better educated as to how through the market place all of us can reduce energy costs. The rebates I envision for individual consumers could easily be upgraded and expanded to municipal governments and commercial businesses, which might make multi-appliance purchases and receive multiple rebates.

But your last question, how can Suffolk County be involved in energy production policy in the future can best answered by what the Suffolk County Electrical Agency, a creation of Suffolk County Legislature in 1983, and what it is currently doing. Our agency was empowered to create, buy and sell electricity if it chose to do so. After the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission established Order 636 in 1992 to deregulate, demonopolize the utility industry, utilities circled the wagons to protect 600 million -- \$600 billion in stranded debt nationwide and sought to write deregulation language to their benefit through hearings before the PSC over several years. New York State established those rules in 1998. But before that, the Suffolk County Electrical Agency filed with FERC to be Grandfathered in under the old rules to be a municipal distribution agency. In the mid 1990s, LILCO challenged Suffolk County's rights saying we are a paper agency with no generating capacity.

Similarly, LIPA was formed in May of 1998, and they challenged our agency citing the same reasons. We had requested 200 megawatts of residential electric capacity and 100 megawatts of commercial power. On September 28th of this year, final, after all these years of challenges, FERC announced a favorable ruling saying, in effect, that

Suffolk County is a bonafide electrical agency capable to wield power from whatever wholesale source we chose. And the clock was set in motion on October 4th to have the parties agree to rates within 60 days. The Suffolk County Electrical Agency has since retained a right pricing consultant to negotiate residential rates and stranded cost issues. At our last regular meeting on November the 5th, our agency agreed to send out requests for proposals to supply vendors asking them to give us prices in blocks of 50 megawatts up to 200 megawatts.

If a agreement with LIPA can't be agreed upon, a FERC magistrate will call for a public hearing in Washington between the two parties to set a price. We expect to be up and running since we have just filed for request for proposals from vendors, and if we get the desired results from LIPA, we think that we could be in operation by June 1st, 2002. So I thank you very much for the opportunity to be heard.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Our next speaker is Mr. Fred Drewes.

MR. DREWES:

Good afternoon. My name is Fred Drewes. I'm a member of the Mount Sinai Heritage Trust in Mount Sinai. I also have a title that I -- Professor of Meritous from Suffolk Community College. I just shook hands with Peter Quinn, who I haven't seen in quite a while, but back in 1992, he and I worked together in presenting an energy conference

at Suffolk Community College that, in fact, talked about and presented to the community many of the things that are still being talked about.

The energy future is clear in my mind. There is just no doubt about what the future holds for us. The only question in my mind that exists is how long it's going to take to get there and how to get there. That's all. The energy future in my mind is going to -- is determined by five things; nature is a good model, all things are interconnected, everything goes somewhere, nobody gets a free lunch, stress causes change and change causes stress. These are things that determine my thoughts in reference to all of this and have guided me in the past and helped me present to my former students and my community a lot of the environmental -- the result of looking at a whole variety of environmental issues.

Nature is a good model. And what it says is that a whole living kingdom can be supported by solar energy and the movement of hydrogen atoms from one place to another through photosynthesis an cellular respiration. Those two things, in fact, support all living things. Technologically, we will some day, exactly when I have no idea, but it makes sense that some day we will using the sun, and we will be using hydrogen in combination to sustain our energy needs almost -- not entirely, but it will be a major factor for energy in the future. The stress that will come, we've seen this stress in the past. Since the first oil embargo back in the '70s, Desert Storm, there will be other things in the future that will say to us that we have to start -- in fact, start to come about and create some energy independence. And that energy independence can, in fact, be formed by a basis of solar and hydrogen -- the hydrogen atom, fuel cells for instance.

Now, with these things in mind, what I would like to suggest is that the County -- I don't know what its business plan is in reference to energy -- but I would question whether the County has a business plan that sets a certain mission and then establishes a mission that will

then be based upon certain goals and objectives. For instance, in your mission statement that you have, you indicate energy conservation. I would ask you to consider changing that to energy efficiency also or including energy efficiency, because they are two distinctly different concepts. When I think -- if you're old enough, if you think of energy conservation, you think of Carter -- President Carter sitting by the fireside with his woolen sweater on saying, turn down the thermostat. We just are not socially going to do that. I mean, you know, people driving around in SUVs don't want to hear nothing about that stuff. But energy efficiency is a handle that we can have that says, use those SUVs in a far for efficient way.

The question is with all the money that is spent by Suffolk County for energy in its various programs, what is the energy efficiency of the various -- various air conditioners, whether it be in public buildings or indirectly in the buildings that people live in that receive public assistance? What is the efficiency of the heating units? You, as the Suffolk County Legislature -- the Suffolk County Legislature has controlled LIPA, has controlled -- the feds control our automobiles in reference to efficiency. But how many heating units do we have, oil heating units, that are stationary burners that are not legislated in all of our homes? How much carbon dioxide? How many other

contaminants to the air pollution? And what is that inefficiency that they have? And what does that do the energy demands for Suffolk County? Should you -- should the County be legislating and considering some sort of legislation that would, in fact, control those individuals burners in businesses and homes in the same way that we want to try to control the burners that are in LIPA or any other producer of electricity?

It seems to me that solar energy is something that has a unique opportunity that there is -- there is something that -- I mean, we have beautiful furniture here, wonderful contour to this podium and desks. We don't ask particularly on this, what's the pay back for these things. But as soon as we come to energy, we say, what is the pay back for this equipment. And low and behold, when we come right down to it, photovoltaics has a pay back. Why is it -- why are we not, in fact, investing in something that will pay for itself over time? Because if we do start a procurement program -- and that's what I think Suffolk County should do -- start a procurement program that will establish photovoltaics on the rooftops of Suffolk County Community College, on the flat rooftops of any other County building, on the -- over the canopies of all of the parking lots of Suffolk County facilities, what will this do?

This will send a -- and it will be paid for -- for itself overtime. Where else can we bond, borrow money and have a pay-back period? And the pay back on this will in actuality be something that will, first of all, promote the photovoltaics by its procurement procedures, and we did this many, many years ago, we said we want to buy recycling paper. And we started to buy recycling paper, and that was a procurement program that stimulated the recycling effort. We should do the same for photovoltaics. There will be a pay-back period. The money will be -- the money spent on that, a larger majority of that money will be kept in the community, because we will not be exporting the money that we get from the solar energy, fuel. We won't have to be spending that. We'll be spending that on the hardware and the facility, and more of that money will be kept in Suffolk County because it will be Suffolk County workers who build it.

What about the designers? What about the engineers? What about the assembly people? And then ultimately, what about the maintainers of the photovoltaic systems that will be on acres and acres of parking lots that will be on acres and acres of flat top roofs. There has to be a maintenance. And that again, the money -- it will

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Mr. Drewes --

MR. DREWES:

Okay. It will provide the services of energy and it will then fold money back into the community. So I would ask that the -- you recommend and incorporate the idea of photovoltaics in the future -- then blend in eventually -- I mean hydrogen. And then in addition to that, the last thing I would recommend is that this -- this committee survey the County citizens by -- and possibly Suffolk Community College could be of service -- there as to what do people think about supporting through some sort of bond issue photovoltaics and renewable

energy? We've done that. We voted on buying land for preservation of our water. What about some sort of community -- County initiative in reference to supporting renewable energy. Okay. Thank you. There is much more that these five basic laws that I talked about spin off into, but it's a guide. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Thank you. At the minute, that's the end of our registered speakers. What I suggest is our court stenographer needs to take a break, but if anyone else would like to speak, if you could come up and see Janet over here and fill out a card, we'll reconvene in 10 minutes to see if there are any additional speakers. We'll be taking a 10 minute break. Thank you.

(\*THE MEETING WAS RECESSED AT 4:45 P.M.\*)

(\*THE MEETING WAS RECONVENED AT 5:10 P.M.\*)

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Maybe we can reconvene. We have two more individuals who would like to address the committee. Okay. We're going to reconvene, briefly. We have two additional speakers who will like to address the committee. The first speaker is Judy Fisher.

MS. FISCHER:

Thank you very much. I was coordinator of County energy programs when John Klein was County Executive during the energy crisis of the '70s. And I just wanted to share a few things with you. The first thing is that it was the -- if things get bad enough, people can serve on their own. And that was -- that was completely evident during the '70s, where people conserved electricity, bought smaller cars, did all of the things we're talking about today on their own. The second thing is that what we found most effective was encouraging people to do what you call low-cost/no-cost. And that's -- it's not glamorous. It involves things like installation, weather stripping, any of the things that enable houses to run more efficiently without there being a large cost to the consumer.

Jack Kulka mentioned a five year pay back period being reasonable for business. This is what we found as well. When businesses would come

in to talk to us about energy, they- they were looking at five year pay backs. There were a great many programs at that time. Brookhaven Lab had a -- had a large division dedicated to energy conservation. One of the things we did, we had an EPA grant to look at an energy rating system for new homes that real estate agents and new-homes salesmen could use, sorts of like the EPA mileage rating system on cars. And that way the consumer could actually compare the energy rating of different homes that -- new homes that he might want to buy.

One of the areas that was extremely important was residential housing, particularly for low-income people who really can't afford to spend a lot of money. There were several models that were useful at the time. There was a community in Massachusetts that had done a tremendous job of weatherization of low-income housing. We used that as a model. Davis, California required solar energy for all pools. That was one of the models we were looking at. When I left the County, I spent

some time as a consultant to the President's Clearinghouse for Community Energy Efficiency, sort of bringing together communities who wanted information. And so you can -- you can find information, you can use other communities as models. King County, Washington had done a tremendous job on energy conservation. But my main message is that what really seems to work is the -- is the nitty gritty low-cost/no-cost items that homeowners can do fairly cheaply.

There were tax incentives at that time. There were tax incentives for putting up solar panels, there were tax incentives, for example, for building -- if you wanted to build a solar greenhouse on the proper side of the your house, you could get tax incentives for that. These were all through New York State. That's about it. Any questions? Just one more thing. At the time Brookhaven Lab was working on low-cost photovoltaics, solar photovoltaics sales, and I think that program has, you know, died -- died an unfortunate death, but I expect that the cost of solar sales has come down considerable. Brookhaven also had a passive solar house, and they supposedly have been monitoring it for all these years. And that's another thing that the County might want to look at.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Judy, was there anything particularly that the County itself tried at the time with the County buildings?

MS. FISCHER:

We lowered the thermostats, put in thermostats that supposedly couldn't be changed by people. The County certainly went to smaller cars. One of the things that happened was I was often approached by companies -- I remember Royal Dutch Shell came in to meet with me one day and said, we'll put in this program for you and it's not going to cost you a penny. And it will effect, you know, you have thousands and thousands of dollars worth of energy savings, but what these companies did do is to cream it off the top so that they basically take the savings that you would get. And -- so I would just mention that in case you're approached on this basis.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

This was a company who wanted to come in and do energy audits or?

MS. FISCHER:

They actually wanted to implement energy efficiency measures within the County buildings, and then they would take their fee from the

savings the County would get, but that meant that the County then didn't get the savings, so.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Okay. Anyone have any other questions? Thank you very much.

MS. FISCHER:

You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Our next speaker is Cynthia Barnes.

MS. BARNES:

Hi my name is Cynthia Barnes, and I am a private citizen. I am also the Legislative aid for Steven Englebright, but I'm not representing him here today. If I'm representing anybody, it's Affiliated Brookhaven Civic Organizations, of which I am a member. I'm also a Land Use Chair for the Brookhaven League of Women Voters, co-Chair of the Coalition for the Future Stony Brook Village, and a Board Member of the Setauket Civics.

And I didn't really come prepared to speak. I just had a few notes that I was -- as I was listening, I was writing down. And one of the things that I'm strongly recommending or felt it was -- is necessary here is that we really need to have a written energy master plan for the County, if not for the region. And that -- that should be with strong public input. I think the process of the public input into an energy plan would be an education for the public itself to realize what we could be doing in terms of conservation energy efficiency and in learning all the things that are out there. Long Island actually has an amazing industry, I believe, that it is working on a lot of these problems. So that really brought me to another point in reaction to what Jack Kula said. And that is about the businesses and the five -- five year pay backs and the loss of jobs or the potential for the loss of jobs.

Excuse me. I don't -- I get terribly nervous, and my voice gets. Renewable energy sources, I think, we should be weaning ourselves from fossil fuel for all the reasons that I've heard. One is that we are dependent on an energy source that comes from -- not on Long Island, whether it comes from Middle East or Russia or even the Antarctic, I think we should be weaning ourselves. And that is certainly is a long-term goal that I think we should set for ourselves. And in the mean time, we have on this Island amazing industries that can provide us with the technology to go to the solar panel -- to solar to wind to all these other sources of energy. And for every dollar we spend on oil, if we spend it on fossil fuel, we are creating two and a half times the number of jobs. So I think that we would be -- it's a win/win for us to go to renewables, and I think that should be a big part.

I definitely think that the other thing is that no new plant should be built unless we consider repowering the ones we have that are so dirty; Port Jefferson and Northport particularly. And I have an instinctive saying -- feeling that we should not be doing this peaking power station in Port Jefferson until we -- until we really do have a strong plan. Now, I know it's going to take some time, and we probably would have to shut down a plant and maybe we're going to need

some supplements in between while we're repowering. But unless we have a commitment to do that repowering, I don't think we should be considering new power plants. The other thing is that there are hidden costs to the use of fossil fuel, and I think everybody's really aware of them, and I just want to bring that out, because I heard the theme there, but I -- sometimes some people are bringing it out.

But we pay -- we pay, you pay, I pay, ratepayers pay, taxpayers pay for the damage done by fossil fuel, whether it's the extraction of the fuel, whether it's getting it to us here on Long Island, or whether

it's fighting a war. The other thing is the damage to the environment that the fossil fuel is and the potential for it, the potential for oil spills, the potential for -- the potential for ruining the environment. In fact, West Virginia, they're rebuilding the environment. Higher medical costs because of the -- the problem you heard from the person who lives in Poquott. There is higher asthma, there are problems. I understand that there was an advertisement taken out in the New York Times sometime last summer saying that there are 30,000 deaths per year from fossil fuel burning from power plants.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:  
Cynthia, could we wrap up?

MS. BARNES:  
Yeah. So we pay with our lives for fossil fuel. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:  
Thank you very much. Our last speaker Peter Maniscalco.

MR. MANISCALCO:  
Yes. My name is Peter Maniscalco, and I'm the coordinator of Citizens for a Progressive Energy Policy. I am hopeful, you know, today that for you to have this public gathering. I remember in 1978, when there was a group of us who were beginning the organizations to the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant. There were about 17 of us gathered at Shoreham, and the -- that day the news report -- the following day in Newsday was from a woman by the name of June Bruce, who was the former head of Atomic Energy Commission. And her spin to the media was well, at least we kept these group of people from stealing hubcaps. And that was the way that people who were trying to change the way energy is viewed were looked at in those days.

And although, that's probably somewhat different today, you're in a very unenviable position, because, I think, we live in a time where people's awareness of what's going on in the world is changing dramatically, and September 11th has just contributed to that. So I'm sure as Ms. Fisher could tell all of us, when you take a stand that's different from the main stream point of view of what the powers that be would like to see, you're going to pay a price if for it. And I would hope that you are men and women of courage, because that's the only way that we're ever going to make this change. And I would remind you of something that Albert Einstein said, which was that "problems that are created at one level of consciousness can only be resolved by moving forward to a higher level of consciousness" or awareness. And I think that, you know, we're at that moment, and if energy policies are going to change by some degree by you folks from our point ever view, it's going to be whether you can move to a different level of consciousness that presently exists.

You know, the present level of consciousness, for example, you know, has to fight wars for oil, the 6th Fleet that over in the Mideast, all of that money is paid to those young men and women, all of that, you know, material of fighting equipment is paid to defend oil. If all of that money were put into energy efficiency and renewables, there would be no need, you know, for that fleet. And so if you're going to look at the economics of fossil fuels, you have to look at the entire body

of the amount of money that's spent to defend the oil fields as well as what's paid to bring that oil over here. I would suggest to you that the -- that there's an underlying story line here, and I've worked on this issue since 1978, and I've learned a few things along the way.

One of them is to me the bottom story line here is we're saying no to nuclear power, no to fossil fuels, and yes to energy efficiency and renewables. And although it's a very simple story line, it's very difficult to implement, as I'm sure some of you are well aware. But I think there are ways today that people in your position can advocate for the County partnering with businesses on Long Island, for example, if would be wonderful if the county would partner in a program with Computer Associates on the expressway to put solar panels on that building. And solar panels are very efficient in running new computer systems, I'm sure anybody who who's looked at this issue, you know, knows that, or other businesses that could partner with the County to do something like this.

Usually the problem is where do you get the front money from. And NYPA, the New York Power Authority, ran a program a number of years ago called a Help Program, where they went into all the school districts on Long Island and they -- they put all energy efficiency equipment in those schools, and NYPA was paid back out of the savings that the school districts realized. And I would suggest that the County look for a way to find a pool of front money to do the same type of investment and get the payback out of the savings that businesses or homeowners or whomever would -- would gather because of the energy efficient equipment. And I -- I probably -- somebody has mentioned before I got here, but there is a wonderful opportunity to bring some of these solar industries to Long Island or the wind power industries. You know, we have the development at Calverton, and that was explored to some degree, and as I recall, the state kind of backed out of on it. But I think you folks are in a position now to be advocates for that. And I hope that you will consider doing something like that.

And I would just leave -- the last thing is is to partner in some way with the unions. The unions -- and this is not about good people and about bad people. This whole issue is about out of date -- out of date ideas and new ideas. There is more union labor in, intensive labor in doing energy efficient enterprises for unions than there is in building new power plants. Although the unions are used to, well, this is always the way we've done it, and that's all we know. And that's one of the issues, the unions have to learn that it's about, you know, work for their employees rather than, you know, short-term building of power plants. And I hope that you can engage the unions on this, and Jack Kennedy in particular, to convince these people that there's actually more. And there are people that could help you that have the expertise in this area to provide the statistics that you need to make these points.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Thank you for coming.

LEG. FISHER:

Madam Chair.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Yes.

LEG. FISHER:

Peter, thank you for being here. You are always a good supporter of energy issues and preserving the environment. It's interesting that you mention unions. I just ran out to speak with Scott Cullen as he was leaving and told him I was surprised that the only opposition my resolution charging this committee with putting together a master policy came because of labor fear that the County is stepping into an arena where it doesn't have a place and that looking at energy conservation would somehow threaten jobs. And I expressed at that time exactly what you expressed now, which is that jobs would not be fewer, there would probably be greater jobs, different jobs and that creating an entirely new way of providing energy would require labor. And I believe that's one of our challenges is to bring labor into the fold, so to speak.

And another thing I wanted to mention very quickly was last night -- my daughter is in 8th Grade, and in 8th Grade, Social Studies children have to do DBQs, which are data base questions. And she was working on the Progressive Era at the beginning of the 20th Century. The question was, you know, how did -- how was government changing, and everyone of the quotes said in this age in our country, our challenge is to look at how much we waste. There was a quote from Teddy Roosevelt talking about conservation and how much we were wasting in our country. So you speak of 1970 and how you've been working since then, and I think that there's been awareness -- an awareness this entire century of progress being seen as a way for us to waste resources. And I think maybe we're reaching the point where we're feeling enough urgency that people will finally believe they need to do something.

MR. MANISCALCO:

Well, I think if people are educated and understand the issues, I think the obstacle is always fear. When people are afraid that they'll do, you know, things that are not, you know, rationale. Okay? And I think if -- if you took the opportunity to meet with the union labor people, with the people that have these status on jobs and, for example, that help program, which was run by NYPA, every job in that help program was a union job. And so there were many jobs created for union labor. And once again, you have to be able to walk into the lion's den and present the information and convince the men and women in labor that this is in their best interest. And I know that that can be done, it may not be easy, but they can be convinced. And I hope that you take the opportunity to do that.

LEG. FISHER:

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Thank for coming. And I want to thank everyone who came today for coming to participate in this public hearing. We will make a record

of the hearing, it should probably be available in January. And you can call my office, 853-4800 if you want a copy. Any written testimony will be included in back up for the hearing. We also next year will probably have two hearings, possibly one out on the East End as required in our legislation, but at that point we may have more material to hand out on the committee's recommendations for a plan. So thank you all for attending. The hearing ends at 5:30.

LEG. FISHER:

I'd like to thank the members of the committee. I'm very impressed with the work you've done, and I couldn't have envisioned all of this when I first proposed the legislation. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AMRHEIN:

Thank you.

(\*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 5:30 P.M.\*)

{ } DENOTED BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY