



CCRPC Long Range Planning Energy Sub -Committee

Minutes

DATE: Tuesday, August 15, 2017

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

Attendees:

- Catherine McMains, Jericho (Chair)
- Karen Adams, Colchester
- Matt Burke, Charlotte alternate
- Jim Donovan, Charlotte
- Keith Epstein, South Burlington
- Jeff Forward, Richmond
- Sharon Murray, Bolton
- Irene Renner, Essex

Staff:

- Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
- Emily Nosse-Leirer, Planner

1. Review July 18, 2017 Minutes

Staff will attach the language options A, B and C to the minutes, since the three letter options are referenced a few times in the minutes. Keith Epstein made a motion to accept the minute and Karen Adams seconded. Sharon Murray, Jim Donovan and Irene Renner abstained. The minutes were adopted.

2. Discuss Revised Generation Targets for Municipalities

At the last meeting, the committee reviewed high and low county-wide electric generation targets. The high target is 25% of the state's generation goal, and the low target is 15% of the state's generation goal. Staff allocated the targets to the municipal level by averaging the municipal of county population and the municipal share of electricity consumption, and applying that proportion to the county-wide goals. Existing generation in each municipality is subtracted from this share, so municipalities "get credit" for generation already sited in their community. Each municipality then has a net new generation target. This allocation is included in the packet. It was confirmed that generation only "counts" for a municipality if it is *physically located* in that municipality. (There's no consideration of RECs, who owns the facility, etc.) While Burlington Electric Department has argued that they should "get credit" for Georgia Mountain Wind, the solar installation at the Burlington Airport and the Winooski One dam, because they own all the facilities, this argument is contradictory to DPS guidance on the issue. The generation for the turbines at Georgia Mountain that are located in Chittenden County is counted towards Milton's goal, and the airport solar array is counted towards South Burlington's. The dam is located directly on the border of Winooski and Burlington, so this generation is split in half.

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Bryan Davis, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at (802) 861-0129 or bdavis@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.

Staff let the committee know that there is a discrepancy between the county's total current renewable generation as reported by the Vermont Energy Action Network Energy Dashboard and the Department of Public Service. The current generation as reported by DPS is 556,623 MWh, but the Energy Dashboard reports only 383,053 MWh. The targets reported here are based on the Energy Dashboard statistics. Depending on which number is correct, targets could be lower.

There was substantial discussion on how to report targets for municipalities that already produce more than their annual targets. The consensus was that these targets should be reported as being over 100% met, and the net target will be reported as zero instead of as a negative number.

These targets will likely be updated every 5 years along with the ECOS Plan, which will allow the targets to take into account new generation facilities.

The committee agreed that CCRPC should make a recommendation to the utilities to help update the Energy Dashboard with actual energy generation rather than the permitted or nameplate generation.

3. Screening of Local Constraints

Staff explained the methodology used to categorize requested municipal constraints as "known" and "possible" constraints. This methodology is included in the packet. Staff will work with municipalities individually if there are concerns about the categorization. Sharon Murray suggested looking at both regulations and the Plans because some of the Plans are more restrictive than the bylaws, especially if the plan is newer than the bylaws.

Originally, constraints in draft documents were included as "possible" constraints to give municipalities time to finish their plans and bylaws, but it was determined that we should have a deadline for when they can make local changes that can be incorporated into the Regional Plan. After that, anything still in draft form will not be included at all.

Additionally, a "time stamp" should be added to the discussion of local constraints to make it clear what version of the regulations or town plan was evaluated.

It should be noted that there is a footnote missing from the table included in the packet. A single asterisk means that a municipality requested something to be a known constraint, but staff moved it to a possible constraint.

4. Discussion of Siting Policy Statements*

The committee suggested looking at the Bennington Regional Energy Plan's definition of "suitable sites" for energy, which asks developers to use a checklist to determine whether or not a site is suitable.

The committee reviewed the draft siting policies provided by staff in advance of the meeting. It was determined that saying that renewable energy generation should locate on preferred sites was too broad a statement, because preferred sites don't make sense for wind, just for solar. In addition, preferred sites may not be appropriate for solar development that's not net metered, so the policy should not direct solar development exclusively there—it's basically a first choice, not the only choice.

Saying that energy development is preferred in areas planned for growth if possible also only really applies to solar.

It needs to be added that the criteria are policy *guidance*, and developers should meet as many as possible, but not necessarily all of them.

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Bryan Davis, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at (802) 861-0129 or bdavis@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.

Sharon Murray suggested, and the committee agreed, that the statements should be reworded to eliminate problem words like “shall” or “should.” Instead of “renewable energy generation should be located on...” we will reword as “locate renewal energy generation on...” This language is still aspirational plan language instead of bylaws but it will be given more weight by the PUC because it is clear, consistent and unambiguous. This will also make Policy III more positive by having it describe where we should locate things, not where we shouldn’t.

There was extensive discussion about whether we should use the prime and base wind potential map as a siting guideline by saying “Locate large scale wind installation in areas of prime and base wind potential.” It was determined that even though some questions remain about the data analysis, wind potential is a useful map and the policy may be useful since it is a guideline, not a requirement.

There was extensive discussion about the policy “Locate renewable energy generation where existing or planned (or will have adequate capacity) transmission or distribution infrastructure exists.” Some members felt that every project needs at least a small extension of 3 phase power. However, other members felt that expanding 3 phase power can allow for other kinds of commercial development and therefore may have unanticipated consequences, and therefore projects should only be near existing or planned transmission and distribution facilities. Staff will map a series of buffers around 3-phase power for the committee to consider. Within 1,000 feet of a planned or existing 3-phase power line may be the correct policy.

It was discussed that the plan should mention that local policies that are constraints or preferred sites for energy development may change as local plans change over time.

The committee discussed the fact that other renewable energy generation facilities like biomass plants should also not impact constraints, in keeping with the other policies of the plan.

5. Next Steps

The committee will meet again on September 19.

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Bryan Davis, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at (802) 861-0129 or bdavis@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.

Town Name	Average of Population and Electricity Use	Total Low Target (MWh)	Total High Target (MWh)	Existing Renewables (MWh)	Low Range Net Remaining	High Range Net Remaining	Low Target Per Capita (MWh per resident)	High Target Per Capita (MWh per resident)	Low Target Status	High Target Status
Bolton	1%	4,218	7,057	327,984	3,890	6,729	3.15	5.44	7.78%	4.65%
Buels Gore	0%	92	154	6,000	86	148	2.21	3.81	6.50%	3.88%
Burlington	22%	168,431	281,769	167,905	526	113,864	0.01	2.67	99.69%	59.59%
Charlotte	2%	12,607	21,090	5,059	7,548	16,031	1.97	4.19	40.13%	23.99%
Colchester	9%	67,204	112,427	2,086	65,119	110,341	3.77	6.38	3.10%	1.86%
Essex Junction	14%	104,508	174,832	40,212.12	64,296	134,620	6.62	13.87	38.48%	23.00%
Essex Town	14%	106,878	178,797	2,293.35	104,585	176,503	9.77	16.48	2.15%	1.28%
Hinesburg	2%	14,975	25,051	1,457	13,517	23,594	3.02	5.28	9.73%	5.82%
Huntington	1%	5,644	9,442	628.76	5,016	8,814	2.67	4.70	11.14%	6.66%
Jericho	2%	15,869	26,547	1,347	14,523	25,201	2.88	5.00	8.49%	5.07%
Milton	5%	39,817	66,610	102,752.32	(62,935)	(36,142)	(5.93)	(3.41)	258.06%	154.26%
Richmond	2%	13,445	22,491	4,485	8,960	18,006	2.18	4.38	33.36%	19.94%
Shelburne	4%	28,443	47,582	4,648	23,795	42,934	3.14	5.67	16.34%	9.77%
South Burlington	11%	85,841	143,604	14,626.77	71,214	128,977	3.84	6.96	17.04%	10.19%
St. George	0%	2,368	3,961	311.68	2,056	3,649	2.69	4.78	13.16%	7.87%
Underhill	1%	9,420	15,759	765	8,656	14,995	2.83	4.90	8.12%	4.85%
Westford	1%	6,209	10,387	411.30	5,798	9,976	2.88	4.96	6.62%	3.96%
Williston	6%	44,647	74,691	3,434.84	41,213	71,256	4.55	7.87	7.69%	4.60%
Winooski	3%	25,633	42,882	30,297.46	(4,664)	12,584	(0.65)	1.74	118.20%	70.65%
County Total	100%	756,250	1,265,134	383,053.42	373,197	882,081	2.34	5.52	50.65%	30.28%
					373,196.60	882,080.76				