

FEB 3 2017

Municipal Energy Survey Instructions

The Central Vermont Regional Planning Commissions is developing a comprehensive regional energy plan, and needs your input! This plan will identify goals and policies that can be implemented on a regional level to meet the State of Vermont's Comprehensive Energy Plan Goals. The CVRPC is working with its member municipalities to identify techniques to achieve these goals including the siting of renewable resources, rolling out building energy efficiency programs, coordinating transportation with land use planning, and protecting locally significant resources from adverse impacts of renewable energy development.

CVRPC is requesting the each Selectboard, Planning Commission, Energy Committee and Conservation Commission in the Central Vermont Region complete a survey which asks questions about energy mapping constraints and locating preferred sites for renewable energy development.

I have sent the Chair of each commission/committee an email with a link to the survey, an addendum document with definitions of constraint layers, links to the draft Energy Constraint Maps and these instructions. If your Chair did not receive that email, please contact me immediately, my contact information is at the end of these instructions.

The electronic survey is the same as the paper copy which should have been mailed to your municipal office. If possible, please use the paper copy to complete the survey with your committee/commission members but then **fill out the survey online** so that answers can be received electronically. If your entity is unable to fill out the answers online, please mail or scan the response to me.

We ask that your entity complete the survey and return responses either electronically or by mail, by **March 6**, **2017**. If you are unable to complete the survey in that timeframe, please contact me.

Thank you very much for taking the time to think about energy use in your community. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or comments!

Marian Wolz Assistant Planner wolz@cvreion.com (802) 229 0389 Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission c/o Marian Wolz 29 Main Street, Suite 4 Montpelier, VT 05602



Central Vermont Municipal Energy Survey

Introduction

The CVRPC asks that you complete the following survey as a group to provide a consensus opinion on renewable energy in your community. CVRPC is requesting one survey submission per Planning Commission / Selectboard / Energy Committee / Conservation Commission and that responses reflect the opinion of that entity.

If your municipal entity chooses to fill this survey out on the paper copy provided, please have someone fill in the responses online afterwords with the link provided in the email sent to the Chair. If your municipal entity is unable to fill in the responses online, please scan and email or send your responses to Marian Wolz, wolz@cvregion.com, address below.

Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission c/o Marian Wolz 29 Main Street, Suite 4 Montpelier, VT 05602

Responses will be used to inform the development of CVRPC's Regional Energy Plan and also to help to ensure municipal interests and opinions are acknowledged during our process. Some of these questions are meant to prompt discussion and the municipality, will not be held strictly to the responses written for this survey. However, care should be taken when responding to reflect the local issues in your municipality.

Please see the attached addendum which outlines the background for the Regional Energy Planning process and defines the mapping constraints discussed in this survey. Please refer to those constraint definitions as needed as you complete this survey. If you are already familiar with the Regional Energy Plan process and background, please disregard the first section of the addendum document.

1. What mu	nicipality does your body represen	t?
	▼]	
. What boo	dy is responding to this survey?	
	A	
	▼	



Central Vermont Municipal Energy Survey

Mapping

This section of the survey is in regards to the regional energy resource and constraint mapping. Please see the map links that were included in the email to your Chair, along with the energy planning glossary of constraint layers addendum document also included in the email. This addendum document describes the constraint layers identified on the maps and notes the significance of known and possible constraints.

Does your municipal body agree or disagree that these layers should be included as possible Regional Constraints? Please indicate support for adding the constraint layer by selection the box next to the layer below. If your municipal body thinks that certain layers should not be included as possible Regional Constraints, of should be changed, leave the box next to the constraint unchecked and provided a description of why/suggested changes in the comment box below. Elevations Above 2500 Feet Lake Shore Protection Buffers (250 Feet) Slopes Greater Than 25% Municipal Protected Lands (State fee lands and private conservation lands) Please provide justification for why a layer(s) should not be included or what changes need to be made to layer(s), below.	ı	B. Review the Regional Constraints Map. These constraint layers include those areas currently under review by CVRPC's Energy Committee and Board of Commissioners for consideration as possible Regional Constraints.
should be changed, leave the box next to the constraint unchecked and provided a description of why/suggested changes in the comment box below. Elevations Above 2500 Feet Lake Shore Protection Buffers (250 Feet) Slopes Greater Than 25% Municipal Protected Lands (State fee lands and private conservation lands) Please provide justification for why a layer(s) should not be included or what changes need to be made to layer(s), below.	(Constraints? Please indicate support for adding the constraint layer by selection the box next to the layer
Lake Shore Protection Buffers (250 Feet) Slopes Greater Than 25% Municipal Protected Lands (State fee lands and private conservation lands) Please provide justification for why a layer(s) should not be included or what changes need to be made to layer(s), below.	5	should be changed, leave the box next to the constraint unchecked and provided a description of
Slopes Greater Than 25% Municipal Protected Lands (State fee lands and private conservation lands) Please provide justification for why a layer(s) should not be included or what changes need to be made to layer(s), below.		Elevations Above 2500 Feet
Municipal Protected Lands (State fee lands and private conservation lands) Please provide justification for why a layer(s) should not be included or what changes need to be made to layer(s), below.		Lake Shore Protection Buffers (250 Feet)
Please provide justification for why a layer(s) should not be included or what changes need to be made to layer(s), below.		Slopes Greater Than 25%
		Municipal Protected Lands (State fee lands and private conservation lands)
	F	lease provide justification for why a layer(s) should not be included or what changes need to be made to layer(s), below.
	_	

* 4. Review all three constraint maps (known, possible and regional). Are there any land use types or areas	
that your municipal body feels should be included as a regional constraint layer. If so, please list below	
along with if your municipal body feels they should be KNOWN or POSSIBLE constraints ¹ . Please see the	ł
addendum document for details on the significance of known and possible constraints. Also, please provide	
justification ² for any land types or areas you list.	
justification for any land types of areas you list.	
(1) If locations are constrained for the development of renewable energy due to the desire to protect a	
locally designated resources (whether a natural resource or community-identified resource, like a view),	
then the land use policies applicable to other forms of development must be similarly restrictive.	
(2) Any regionally or locally identified constraints identified must be supported through data or studies	
and must be consistent with the regional and local plans.	
ON The second of	l
None. This municipal body feels the constraint layers identified on the known, possible and regional constraint maps accurate protect the resources of the Central Vermont region. This body does not have further constraints to add.	y
protect the resources of the Central Vermont region. This body does not have further constraints to add.	
Yes. This municipal body feels there are land types or areas that should be protected from development at a regional level that	
are not currently included on the maps. Constraint layer(s), whether they should be known or possible constraints and justification	ition
(why this constraint layer should be added and data or study that supports it) are listed in the comment box below.	
Additional regional constraint layers:	
e e	

should be eleva	ted to KNOWN cou	notrointo? If				nt layers that	
				ase review the	e included me	mo for detailed	
descriptions of t	the known and pos	sible constra	aints.)				
Agricultural So	oils						
FEMA Special	Flood Hazard Areas						
Protected Lan	ds						
Deer Wintering	g Areas						
Vermont Cons	ervation Design Forest	ł Blocks (Conne	ectivity, Interior, P	hysical Landscar	oe Diversity)		
Hydric Soils							
Act 250 Ag Mit	tigation Parcels						
None, this mu	nicipal body feels that t	the possible cor	nstraints shown o	on the map should	d remain as possi	ble constraints.	
your municipal ho	dy feels any of the pos	sible constraint	s should be elev	ated to known ble	ease include iustit	fication for that	
election here.				210 0 10 11101111 p.1	saes meraes jacan		,



Central Vermont Municipal Energy Survey

Preferred Locations

While the constraint layers discussed in the questions above are meant to identify areas that are unsuitable for siting of renewable energy projects or particular categories or sizes of those resources, CVRPC is also identifying locations that are *preferred* for siting a renewable resource generation site.

By locally or regionally identifying preferred locations for development, communities in the Central Vermont region that identify preferred, potential, and unsuitable sites will provide a green/yellow/red signal to developers regarding the challenges of developing on particular sites.

The State has identified the following preferred locations;

- rooftops (and other structures),
- parking lots,
- previously developed sites,
- brownfields,
- gravel pits,
- quarries and
- Superfund sites.

Regions and municipalities have the ability to identify additional potentially preferred locations. Including sites that are or will be identified in municipal plans as preferred is an important aspect of the Energy Planning process as "a specific location in a duly adopted municipal plan" is one way for a net metering project to qualify as being on a preferred site. The Public Service Board's net metering rule, which went into effect in January, establishes a financial incentive for 15-500 kW generators to be located on preferred sites.

The questions that follow aim to begin the discussion of identifying preferred locations for renewable resource developments in the Central Vermont Region.

	suggestions for preferred site	es that can be identified in the Central Vermont Re	gional
Energy Plan. Please	e consider these land types/s	sites and check those that your municipal body feel	ls would
be appropriate to ide	entify as a preferred location	for renewable energy development.	
development that we	ould be appropriate, the type	sites, consider the size and scale of renewable of renewable resource development, economic fe	
of developing that re	esource in that location and a	access to transmission and distribution infrastructure	re.
Unranked and not o	currently farmed agricultural soils		
Unused land near a	already developed infrastructure		
Locations suitable f	for large-scale biomass district heat	or thermal-led cogeneration	
Potential locations t	for biogas heating and digesters		
Industrial Parks			
Decommissioned L	andfills		
	 Wetlands that are typically difficult ocal regulations and federal laws. 	to identify without a soil test. Development can occur on these	e wetlands
		t you feel would be appropriate for some scale of renewable en low, please list those sites in the comment box.	nergy
	Sim		
	a		

*	7. The cost of transmission and distribution of electric generation increases as the generation facility more further away from the energy user. It costs on average, \$1,000,000/mile to build new transmission lines (Transmission & Distribution Infrastructure, Harris Williams & Co., 2010). Location of generation in proxito the transmission lines that connect to distribution substation and lines can affect the cost of energy for consumers. Considering this, please indicate below preferences for preferred locations for renewable energy generation facilities in relation to existing transmission lines.	mity
	Renewable energy generation facilities should be sited within a 1/4 mile of existing transmission lines.	
	Renewable energy generation facilities should be sited within a 1/2 mile of existing transmission lines.	
	Renewable energy generation facilities should be sited within 1 mile of existing transmission lines.	
	Renewable energy generation facilities should be sited 1 mile or more from exiting transmission lines.	
	Existing transmission lines should not be a factor when siting renewable energy generation facilities.	
	Please include additional comments here:	
	-	
		o.



Engagement

Central Vermont Municipal Energy Survey

8. What is the best way to engage members of your community on energy related planning? Do yo

8. What is the best way to engage members of your community on energy related planning? Do you has suggestions for mediums, forums or other engagement strategies? Please select the <u>two</u> most effective methods and include additional suggestions in the comment box.	
Email	
Online mapping platform	
Front Porch Forum	
Public evening meetings	
Paper materials available at the town office	
Please list additional engagement methods below.	r.
g.	