

Luly Massaro - Fwd: Deepwater Wind proposal

From: Mary Russell
To: Luly Massaro
Date: 8/4/2010 8:49 AM
Subject: Fwd: Deepwater Wind proposal
CC: himorry@aol.com

Luly,
For Commission record.
Thanks, Mary

>>> Morry <himorry@aol.com> 8/4/2010 8:30 AM >>>
Dear Ms. Kent,

I want to register my most vehement opposition to the Deepwater Wind project.

There is nothing whatsoever positive about it except the federal funds that will come to RI if it goes forward -- a one shot deal (and a two-edged sword), most of which will be spent in ways that do not help any but a few Rhode Islanders who may have special financial interests, along with many special interests outside the state. In return for tolerating whatever the polite term is for greasing the palms of special interests, Rhode Islanders will receive a permanent dose of harm -- of special note being the higher cost of energy imposed on those Rhode Islanders who can least afford it, in return for zero benefit to themselves. This project, by increasing energy costs, will unquestionably serve -- ultimately -- to increase unemployment for *many years into the future*, by far more than the slight amount by which it may -- temporarily -- decrease it for a short period.

We all know that most of the parties and individual witnesses involved in these hearings are well aware of the above, as are the vast majority of those citizens who have acquainted themselves with the available facts, even superficially. But of course, we also know it is not considered acceptable political etiquette to point out that the emperor wears no clothes.

For that reason as well as several others, the PUC is to be ENORMOUSLY commended for its courage this past Spring when it rejected this less-than-worthless proposal. Let me include my personal thanks -- and my applause, too -- as a Rhode Island resident, for the Commission's common sense and for its obviously conscientious seriousness in serving the public's interest. The PUC gave the public what it deserves for a change (and what it receives so rarely from those sworn to provide it, that many of us have become too cynical ever to expect it).

I wrote to you back in March with very detailed reasons for my opposition to Deepwater Wind, but I had few hopeful expectations. I was shocked to learn that the PUC had given me the first piece of positive political-development-type news in our State that I've heard in a long time. It was the first sensible decision based objectively on fact and sound financial considerations, and it was one of the extremely few decisions affecting the way our state will be run, which really addresses the best long term interests of its citizens rather than the short term interests of special groups and politicians.

I certainly hope the public appreciates the good sense and good character of the PUC, and understands what a friend and defender it has in the PUC. I will be very disappointed were the PUC to reverse its correct decision of this past Spring in favor of the wrong one. Despite the length of the two emails I sent you back then, there are even more things wrong with this project, horribly wrong, than I was able to include in a personal expression of opposition.

I am currently running for State Senate, and if elected I will do my best to make sure the citizens of RI learn how great a service they have received (and will continue to benefit from), courtesy of the PUC's protection of their interests. I can't promise this will happen, of course. I am not experienced in political campaigns, and it's common knowledge that an incumbent elected official is very difficult to oust -- particularly so in Rhode Island -- for reasons which are also common knowledge, but which no one is eager to mention.

BTW, I attended a couple of the recent hearing sessions at your offices on Jefferson Blvd. last week, but was unable to attend the cross-examination sessions this week, to my great disappointment. I will say that the testimony I heard last week made it obvious to me that the evidence for the project is unreliable because of the obvious biased self-interest of its sources, virtually all of whom will be either direct or indirect beneficiaries if Deepwater Wind is approved -- ie, the favorable testimony was virtually all from special interests with pockets waiting to be lined shortly after the project passes, and most of the numbers they testified to were exaggerated to their own benefit, some very grossly so. The opponents were a more objective mixture, and the testimony I heard from them was immeasurably more convincing -- from every angle -- than the other side's. On the issues I am very familiar with, the advocates for the proposal's approval gave testimony which often contradicted what I know to be true, while the side opposed gave testimony confirming what I understand to be the truth. I think anyone who is objective and who'd heard the testimony would agree with me, but of course we are not encouraged to make such charges (of bias, self-interest, and intentional cooking of the books for personal gain) out loud, in part for reasons very similar to the ones that underly that same story of the emperor and his clothes.

I was encouraged by the PUC's ability to see to the core of this issue when it made its first decision, which was the correct one. I hope the Commission will be as perceptive, as courageous, and as honorable now that a second decision on the same issue is being required of it. I don't know what if any extra pressure is being felt by the commission, but it would be so very nice for a change to see an example of courage and commitment to principle -- such as the PUC displayed last Spring -- actually succeed all the way to the finish line.

Thank you again for considering this comment.

Sincerely,

Morry Markovitz