

While I agree that we as a society need to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels, I believe the proposed plan is not acceptable at all. I believe that there will be substantial and negative unintended consequences associated with an unreasonably accelerated proposal. First and foremost, I believe the plan should be science based, not developed around a political agenda. Since the State has such diverse geography, climate and demographics, I do not think that one policy fits all. I think that it should be regionalized to maximize the success of the proposal. Obviously, some of the ideas that will work well in urban areas will not work in rural areas and some of the large contributions to carbon sequestration that can be made in rural areas will not work in urban areas.

I do not believe that there is any way that the electrical grid can support your current plan. Trying to drive the conversion too fast will create environmental problems, brown and blackouts, human health and safety issues and unacceptable costs as companies scramble to meet unrealistic deadlines. As for electrical generation, I fully support hydroelectric and believe that it is the only truly sustainably reliable power. However, depending on Canada for the major supply of that is not responsible or realistic. Unfortunately, many of the physical resources to generate hydropower in NY have been destroyed in the name of fish habitat. There needs to be more time to develop hydropower responsibly while ensuring that critical fish habitat is maintained. I am very concerned about solar power sustainability cradle to grave. There needs to be tried and true processes for recycling and disposal that are environmentally sound. Just making a manufacturer responsible for disposal is not acceptable. That just means they will ship it to some third world country with few regulations and dump it just like the current recycling of most plastic resins. I also believe that biomass is a truly sustainable and carbon neutral and needs to be included in the proposal. Its use will support both power needs and ensure end markets for low grade trees to ensure forest health and productivity.

I am also very concerned with going with all electric vehicles too quickly. The present plan does not ensure that battery technology can be thoroughly developed from cradle to grave to be sustainable and safe. There are issues with mining resources, manufacturing, fire hazards, decommissioning, and recycling. To depend on legislation that holds the manufacturer responsible is not acceptable or reasonable and is naive. What is there to motivate the manufacturer to truly recycle it as opposed to just shipping it to a third world country, which would not be acceptable or responsible. The State should

incentivize the responsible development and safety of electric vehicles before setting deadlines for implementation.

As a small farmer and forestland manager, the current proposal will force us out of business and to sell our land which has been in our family since 1878. With current supply chain issues, it is not reasonable to expect industry to manufacture enough electric vehicles and equipment fast enough to meet demand. I also expect what is available to be extremely expensive. Our farming equipment has served us well for the last 30 years and because we have maintained it well, will serve another 30 years with minor repairs. We could not afford, nor would it be a wise use of resources to invest in all new equipment. We have historically depended on used equipment as a viable economic choice. There will not be any used electrical equipment for a long time. We would be forced to sell our land which might result in future development. This is just another example of the state putting the small farmer out of business.

As a forestland manager managing our forests for the last 50 years, we have ensured a strong, healthy forest for carbon sequestration. I truly believe that is required in the proposed plan. The New England Forest Foundation has done great work in researching the value of forest products in replacing current building materials. Wood construction materials are far superior to steel and concrete when it comes to carbon footprint and can play a major role in carbon sequestration. However, there must be quality wood grown to meet the specifications. To meet these needs, sustainable forestry needs to be practiced and markets are needed for low end materials that need to be removed to maximize carbon sequestering in quality end products. Wood is a carbon neutral fuel source that should be included in the plan for use in rural areas. To ensure an economical sustainability of active forest management this fuel source works well in rural areas where a robust electrical grid can not be economically justified or physically maintained. We have burned wood as our only source of heat for the last 30 years. We have not burned any fossil fuels. This has minimized our carbon footprint and helped us improve our woodlands to provide long term carbon sequestration.

In conclusion, I believe that the current plan needs to be completely revised to reflect good science and long term sustainability and more importantly success.

.