

Exhibit 1

Excerpt of Testimony of Dr. Obed García,
dated August 25, 2012, 1-4 PM

(pages 1-2, 58-62 only)

Public Hearing - PSD Permit – Energy Answers

LION’S CLUB OF ARECIBO

August 25, 2012 1:00PM-4:00PM

Transcription by: Aledawi Figueroa

Table of Contents

Participant	Page Number
José Font -----	3
Dr. Osvaldo Rosario López -----	13
Attorney Aleyda Centeno Rodríguez -----	20
Natalia Pagán Pérez (Natalia Arelys in transcription) -----	28
Javier Biaggi -----	22
Angel González Carrasquillo -----	40
Jessica Seiglie: -----	46
Carlos Mario García -----	51
Obed García -----	58
Waldemar N. Flores -----	62
Dr. Ibarra -----	69
Wilfredo Vélez -----	75
Eunice Santana -----	79
Wigberto Rivera -----	84

Mark Green	87
Oswaldo Rosario	89
Angel González	94
Carlos Mario García	98
Waldemar N. Flores	105
Attorney Aleyda Centeno	109

(3,000,000) from discarded tires produced in Puerto Rico annually, so that we breathe for the next 30 years! Why what? Because discarded tires are "a gold mine that never is exhausted. "They represent a lot of money and greed of some not known limits, or care about the pain of others. I hope they give me another chance.

(Applause)

Jose Font: Next round is Mr. Francisco Perez. If Mr. Francisco Perez is not present, the next turn goes to Mr. Obed Garcia. After Obed García will be Mr. Waldemar Flores's turn.

Obed Garcia: Hello my name is Dr. Obed García I am a doctor in the Arecibo area. I am a member of the College of Physicians, board member of the College as District President Arecibo.

This evening I propose to comment on the impact statement environment. For me what are some inconsistencies I found in the preliminary environmental impact statement submitted by the company Energy Answers.

The justification for this project speaks of the need to create "renewable energy sources", to create a source of "energy

green. "It should be noted that burning garbage should not be considered a renewable energy source. On the contrary, are burning resources, which would be needed to extract the atmosphere again and re-create them, as for example paper, plastic timber. And in addition is organic material that could burn be used to create compost.

He also notes that this technology would reduce the impact environment by reducing CO₂ emissions to the environment. Without But talk is talk about incineration combustion. The combustion reaction is simple. Burning a compound (for example a hydrocarbon) and produces CO₂ or CO and water and heat. So this is not consistent with an environmental policy to reduce CO₂ emissions. Which is the major effect of emissions.

Incineration does not reduce greenhouse gas emissions related to the effect emissions. Although alleges that reduce emissions methane. This is not the only greenhouse gas and gas probably the most abundant greenhouse effect and is more responsible Global warming is CO₂ and CO. This would go against an

environmental policy to reduce greenhouse gases.

In advertising blurred by Energy Answers, talk, said the

incinerator corresponds to the need to close the landfill.

But there is no official date for the closure of the landfill in Arecibo.

Moreover EPA has said it will close the landfill in Arecibo.

Disposal of ash created by burning, as likely, these end up in the landfill at Arecibo. On page 1 of the environmental impact statement submitted by Energy Answers it says: "Energy is actively seeking possible re-uses for these ashes, however those for which a reuse is not identified will be arranged in a landfill authorized and in compliance with applicable legal requirements. "Same statement environmental impact of these ashes talks end in the landfill.

There is also talk of a crisis in the management of solid waste, which is true. However, incineration is far from solving this problem because it creates itself tons of ashes, which end up in the landfill. If we're talking about 2,100 tons of waste daily; would create at least 420 tons of ash. This is taken that only said Energy Answers create a 20% ash, from 2.100 corresponding to 420 tons 20%, and that's a lot of waste. There is talk that this would lower energy costs for Puerto Rico. However, in the preliminary

environmental impact statement says that the plant will produce eighty (80) megawatts of power from which seventy (70) would be sold to the Electricity Authority.

The Power Authority produces five thousand eight hundred sixty four (5.864) mega watts. Energy production for this plant corresponds to 1.19% of energy to Puerto Rico. It is possible cheapen energy production from Puerto Rico by incineration, or stabilize oil prices high in Puerto Rico as alleged by Energy Answers. In addition, a preliminary study found no public health in the environmental impact statement. Another myth that Energy Answers has disseminated the radio, in the local press, is job creation. The environmental impact statement speaks 150 direct jobs in the operational phase. They are arguing over 500 jobs, which is a lie.

My concern as a citizen and health goes beyond that build an incinerator in Arecibo. It should establish an environmental policy that is the benefit of all, that preserves our resources and improve the environment in every way possible. It must provide better public policy not only to the government of Puerto Rico but of U.S. to continue to be made no incinerators in anywhere. It should

promote reuse, recycle and reduce. As for example in San Francisco in the city of San Francisco where he has managed to divert 82% of landfill waste. This is all my paper thank you very much.

Jose Font: Thank you. The next person up is Waldemar Natalio Flores and after Mr. Flores it is Dr. Eduardo Ibarra's turn.

Waldemar Natalio Flores: Waldemar Natalio Flores, Officer of Quality Control on the Environmental Quality Board, the only one, who has been trained in Edison, New Jersey by Quality Assurance officers for a week. I prepared four (4) documents, two (2) are addressed to Attorney Rafael A. Toro Ramirez related to the information he promised me on Friday August 12, of last year about the scientific studies related to: Processed Urban Wood Waste, Auto Shredder Residue, Tired Derived Fuel, and other studies involving allegedly beneficial uses of fly ash, bottom ash and the aggregate. I have not received anything to that regard since he promised it to me. The second document is related to that in exhibit 34 and 35 of the permit application for impairment significant, including the comments made by Waldemar N. Flowers related to (QA / QC) on that day. The third document is a one-page evaluation of the application for the permit, which the boss of the division admitted to me has mistakes,