

Chris:

Some general comments/questions before I get specific:

- (1) Have you contacted all of the people/organizations to whom you refer to? (ie. Mirant, Brayton Point (not in RI, but in MA), town representatives, etc.) It may help clear up some of the misconceptions as well as just be a professional courtesy.
- (2) Generally, the noun or sometimes adverb “etc.” is not very clear. I’m sure that it was simply a placeholder initially until you could get more specifics, but there are quite a few of them still lingering on the pages.
- (3) Although there are alarming statistics for change, I think that more positive information should be related to those that may visit the web site. In fact, you might want to look at the 2003 Annual Markets Report from ISO New England. It offers good indications that we are moving toward cleaner fuels.

I have divided comments into page sections:

PRACTICAL TIPS FOR REDUCING ENERGY COSTS (for homeowners, businesses, and organizations)

Under “Saving Money,” the statement “Energy costs are generally higher on Cape Cod, Martha’s Vineyard ...,” could you provide a source for that?

Conservation and Efficiency Tips

Under Consumer Aggregation, you write, “As an *electricity aggregator*, Cape Light Compact...”. Instead of “electricity aggregator,” the proper terminology is “municipal aggregator”.

As well, I am glad that you have included our successful LED Retrofit Project, but it may be misleading for the audience as defined by yourself as homeowners, businesses, and organizations. It is usually an option for municipalities.

The links for Conservation and Efficiency Tips and Aggregation Tips are without any actual information. You probably already know this, but it’s nice to be reminded sometimes.

Under “Competitive Power Purchase,” the Brayton Power Plant is NOT located in Rhode Island. It’s actually located in Mount Hope Bay in Somerset, MA. I would definitely change this. As well, could you provide a source for “produces some of the cheapest electricity in New England”. Additionally, when you say “This coal-fired facility...,” this is not exactly true. They also burn fuel oil AND natural gas. PLEASE CONTACT BRAYTON POINT FOR EXACT INFORMATION.

Would you also provide a source for the assertion that certain fuels are more expensive than others? We are not convinced that this section provides the proper connection. Canal does not burn residual oil because of reasons stated. The plant was built to burn this fuel modified over the years to burn other fuels (natural gas) and is specifically permitted to burn certain fuels. Could you provide a source for your intimations on this matter? PLEASE CONTACT MIRANT FOR INFORMATION.

Under “Minimizing Indirect Costs”, you have yet another link (on the same page) for Conservation & Efficiency Tips. I would consider changing the link (which goes to a blank page) to something else.

In your last paragraph in this section “Practical Tips for Reducing Energy Costs,” you assert that shifting to cleaner fuels will shut down the Canal Plant, but it will not. In fact, despite our efforts here at the Cape Light Compact to reduce energy usage, a 3% or more annual growth in electricity consumption continues (ie. all of the new homes built/year) and it is not for us to shutdown a plant that provides locational value without fully considering the alternatives.

DELIVERY SERVICE PROVIDERS & POWER SUPPLY OPTIONS

In your second paragraph, you write, “They will have the option of buying electrons...” This is a fallacy. Consumers do not buy in electrons. You even say this yourself in the section on Electricity Policy and Market Context page. I would recommend that you substitute the word “electrons” with the words, “power supply”.

As far as the “Nantucket Electric Delivery Service” section, PLEASE CONFIRM WITH NATIONAL GRID.

ELECTRICITY POLICY AND MARKET CONTEXT

In the section on Massachusetts Electric Utility Restructuring Act, all of that is more fully addressed by DOER. We recommend that either you ask permission to copy their verbage or else provide a link to the DOER website section for a fuller explanation.

As well, the last bullet under “Four key types of organizations...” refers to aggregators. Please add “municipal” before aggregators for correct terminology.

Under “Market and Grid Operations: “Contract Path” & “Physical Path,” again electrons are NOT purchased by the individuals. It is electricity that they are buying. Please amend this statement. As well, in your first sentence before the dash, please add “from licensed suppliers” to be absolutely correct. I would recommend talking to the ISO on the matter to be perfectly clear.

The second to last paragraph, first sentence asserts that NSTAR and Nantucket Electric presently determine the contract path. Is this documented anywhere? Please provide source. As well, you should further explicate that the contract path for DEFAULT

SERVICE for those customers participating in the pilot project on the Cape and Vineyard are defined by CLC. Otherwise, your paragraph is a bit befuddled.

As well, please delete the last appositive, “owner of the Canal Generating Station” as this is not necessary to understand the contract path. Many times the contract entity is a trading and marketing firm – not the generator.

In the last paragraph, you again use the term “electrons.” Again, this is not true. Please change to electricity. As well, PLEASE CONTACT ISO NEW ENGLAND to provide consumers with a clearer picture of the physical path.

CANAL ELECTRIC STATION

You mention a prominent plume of steam. This is incorrect. You cannot see steam. This is actually called condensate (note: the visual perception of this varies depending on the heat transfer out of the stack, the relative humidity and barometric pressure of the atmosphere). Please correct. As well, please be advised that Mirant has updated their power supply disclosure label. PLEASE CONFIRM ALL INFORMATION WITH MIRANT.

As well, for a clearinghouse of information, I think that if you call anything “Dirty Energy & Pollution,” there should certainly be a source for it as well as input from the parties involved (ie Mirant). It is certainly not a scientific term.

Also, just for your information and historical perspective, the town of Sandwich in the 1970’s WANTED this plant in their community as opposed to the nuclear plant that was proposed in Sandwich as well as at Brayton Point. You may want to search the archives of the Cape Cod Times (or its predecessor newspapers).

Under the section “Facts on Dirty Energy & Pollution,” I see no facts. As well, the visions of Dirty Energy & Pollution have no visions and no clear support. (ie. hazardous fish – Does this mean the fish are hazardous or that we are hazardous to fish?)

COMMUNITY SNAPSHOTS : BARNSTABLE (others were not up when we last checked)

Has the town of Barnstable agreed that the examples provided at the beginning are good examples to use?

Under “Electricity,” you write of “electrification,” in this context, could you provide a definition?

Under “Fuels,” you intimate that we are a source. This is not true. Please delete us. As well the first line, the phrase, “and other uses arise from a variety of sources” is poorly stated. Nothing is elevated or moved here. Please reword for clarity. Also, “Current

information is provided below on the sources of electricity consumed and purchased in Barnstable” is a non sequitur to the fuel section. I would recommend removing it.

Under the section “Electricity Supply: Overview,” please add words in caps. “Local consumers can purchase electricity from LICENSED SUPPLIES – WHO MAY OBTAIN THEIR SUPPLIES FROM power plants....” As well, consumers CANNOT buy directly from certain facilities. PLEASE CONTACT ISO NEW ENGLAND for further edification.

Again, you write of electrons consumed. Please change to correct terminology. As well, this is the physical path, but not necessary the power that the consumers may be getting. This paragraph is misleading and distorting a complicated message. As well, although it is correct that the Canal Plant burns imported oil, it is also natural gas capable. MIRANT WILL CLARIFY THESE MISCONCEPTIONS.

Under “Electricity Supply: NSTAR Standard Offer,” the numbers only add up to 90%. PLEASE CONTACT NSTAR FOR INFORMATION.

Under “ELECTRICITY SUPPLY: CAPE LIGHT COMPACT...” Please see new label.

Under “COSTS,” “Annual cost data enable trending analyses of energy’s influence...” is a bit tedious and confusing. I can only imagine what a person would think upon their first visit to the site. Could you also provide a definition from “capital flight”? As well, once again, please refer to aggregators with the correct label of “municipal aggregators”.

Under “CLC- MIRANT COMPETITIVE SUPPLY AGREEMENT,” could you clarify the second bullet and its meaning?

Under “Efficiency,” you name NSTAR as a source, but they do not provide energy efficiency programs for the Cape and Vineyard, and Nantucket Electric, a National Grid Company, provides those services for Nantucket residents. Please delete NSTAR here.

Also in this section, your first sentence is quite awkward. Perhaps you should change wording to something like “Energy efficiency programs are provided by CLC and Nantucket Electric through ratepayer funds (the Energy Conservation charge on your electric bill). Through these programs, efficiency measures can save energy, money, and help the environment.”

Under “2003 CLC Efficiency Program Summary” please add annually after each dollar amount.

Under “NSTAR/KEYSPAN/Oil Efficiency Programs,” this is a bit misleading. (1) NSTAR does not have efficiency programs for the Cape and Islands. (2) PLEASE CONTACT KEYSPAN about their efficiency programs, and (3) I don’t believe that there are any existing efficiency programs administered by oil vendors.

Could you further elucidate the purpose of the heading “Municipal Efficiency Programs & Initiatives”

As well, under “Emissions and Other Adverse Impacts,” could you explain where the “elsewhere” is after Barnstable? This is ambiguous.

Could you explain the National Security aspect of emissions?

Have all of the people been contacted as a courtesy to tell them they are on this website? Please fill in Green Team member contact.

Under “Representatives to Regional Authorities” and under “Cape Light Compact,” please use our official boilerplate with the proper description of who we are, or please link directly without description to our website.

Under “Renewable Resources,” please explain the relevance of the solar and wave sections as directly related to Barnstable as opposed to the audience at large.

CONTRIBUTORS

Please contact all listed in the Contributors list. I notice that not all are copied as stakeholders. Kevin Galligan does not recall contributing to this work, other than through this review. Robert Mahoney has no recollection of a request for his contribution. For CLC staff, please keep ONLY Margaret Song as a contributor. For CLC Board, please ensure that you have permission from those members as the staff was unaware of its large presence of contributors.