

From: Springer, Darren [Darren.Springer@vermont.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2016 4:04 PM
To: Gray, Laura
Subject: Fwd: Can you join divestment next steps/brainstorm mtg tomorrow 2:30 ceremonial office ?

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Nate Hausman <natejhausman@gmail.com>
Date: March 23, 2016 at 2:46:31 AM EDT
To: "Springer, Darren" <Darren.Springer@vermont.gov>
Cc: Robb Kidd <robb.kidd@sierraclub.org>
Subject: Re: Can you join divestment next steps/brainstorm mtg tomorrow 2:30 ceremonial office ?

Dear Darren,

Thank you for your invitation to join you tomorrow to discuss divestment. Unfortunately, I am on the West Coast this week so I won't be able to join your brainstorm session tomorrow.

As I have relayed to Robb, one of my biggest concerns with the subcommittee process is Tom Golonka's position that VPIC's "previous recommendation against divestment represents an appropriate starting point" for the subcommittee's assessment of this issue. To my mind, the standard of review for this subcommittee examination of this issue should be *de novo*, not a presumption in favor of the VPIC's finding last summer. It feels disingenuous to say on one hand that the subcommittee's process will be open and transparent, and on the other, to give deference to a prior decision based on a rigged, closed process and a paltry, prejudiced report. I think all of the evidence--both pro and con--should be looked at afresh.

Thank you,
Nate Hausman

On Tue, Mar 22, 2016 at 6:13 PM, Springer, Darren
<Darren.Springer@vermont.gov> wrote:

Sent from my iPhone