



CCRPC Long Range Planning Energy Sub -Committee

Minutes

DATE: Tuesday, December 19, 2017

TIME: 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 pm

PLACE: CCRPC Office, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT.

Attendees:

Catherine McMains,
Jericho (Chair)

Keith Epstein, South
Burlington

Regina Mahony, CCRPC
Planning Program
Manager

Matt Burke, Charlotte
alternate

Jeff Forward, Richmond

Melanie Needle, CCRPC
Senior Planner

Will Dodge, Essex

Robin Pierce, Essex

Jim Donovan, Charlotte

Emily Nosse-Leirer, CCRPC
Planner

1. Review November 28, 2017 Minutes

Keith asked why there is so much money in the MTP for highway expansion, and whether the energy committee can change this because it's contrary to our energy goals. Melanie explained that the MTP is somewhat constrained by federal funding requirements, and that our actions to shift to almost 100% electric light duty vehicles means that driving doesn't necessarily go against our energy goals. The committee discussed. Melanie reiterated that the plan will be updated in 5 years and we will be able to revisit this in the future. Jeff stated that he hopes that towns will be able to set transportation goals at the local level to get people out of their cars, and said that he supported Keith's comments.

2. Public Comment Discussion

Please see the attached spreadsheet for the comments CCRPC has received on draft sections of the ECOS Plan. The comments highlighted in yellow are the comments which need committee input. The committee discussed several of the comments, and decided:

- Lines 10 and 32: Not to advocate for a statewide carbon tax, because it is undergoing more study by the Governor's Commission on Climate Change, and not to call for a county-specific carbon tax.

- Line 11: That the discussion of natural gas that is currently adequate and clearly states the limits of CCRPC's ability to change this fuel use
- Lines 16 and 17: To keep the plan's discussion about the importance of energy storage to stabilize the grid in the future
- Line 25: To add a reference to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan's discussion of freight and passenger rail
- Line 26: To more clearly draw the link between CCRPC's land use goal (80% of new growth in areas planned for growth, which equal 15% of land area) with energy efficiency
- Line 38: To change "encourage" to "recommend" and to say that "inability to meet the guidelines does not necessarily preclude," rather than "does not preclude"
- Line 78: To recommend that any discussion of changing non-energy ECOS Plan goals is the purview of the full Long Range Planning Committee, not the Energy Subcommittee
- Line 79: A long discussion ensued about the benefit of stretch energy codes, and how effective they are because compliance is self-verified. While members feel that they are a good thing for energy efficiency, staff brought up that because they only apply to Act 250 permitted development, they may end up discouraging developers from larger compact development. The committee discussed this, and decided that, regardless of whether they agree that stretch codes would cause developers to avoid Act 250 permits, it is preferable for all new development to meet higher energy codes. The statement was changed to "Encourage the State of Vermont to implement a single energy standard which includes a process for verifying compliance"
- Line 88: Not to include a solar-ready requirement for new affordable housing stock

3. Renewable Generation Targets* (60 minutes)

Melanie ran two scenarios to see if municipalities can meet their local targets in various ways. (At the last meeting, we discussed that Essex Junction could not meet their individual energy generation goal. The goal is very high due to Global Foundries' high percentage of the county's energy use.) Combining Essex and Essex Junction's generation goal did not work, because it just meant that they both couldn't meet their goal. Distributing Global Foundries' energy consumption throughout the county fixed the problem for Essex and Essex Junction because the energy usage was distributed across the County. However, it increased the target for other municipalities. The Committee agreed that the best approach is to combine Essex Town/Essex Junction with Global Foundries' usage remaining with these municipalities because redistributing it only creates another issue. The plan will include Essex and Essex Junction's combined generation target, and a discussion of why their target is so high. Finally, Melanie explained that the county can meet its county-wide generation goals comfortably, regardless of where Global Foundries' energy use is counted.

Jeff suggested adding the number of acres in each town to the table showing their wind and solar potential acres. This will be reported in the plan.

Keith wants to know if we can get state tax data on delivered fuels. This may be possible in future drafts or future energy work. Jeff said that public entities don't pay the tax so it's not accurate.

A motion was made to recommend to the LRPC that the energy sections as drafted be included in the 1st public hearing draft of the ECOS Plan. Jeff made a motion and Keith seconded.

4. Next Steps (5 minutes)

It was unclear when the next meeting would need to occur, as the Board will hopefully be warning a public hearing for the full ECOS Plan at their meeting on 1/17/2018. Melanie will discuss the appropriate time for the next meeting with Catherine.