

April 16, 2014, New Haven, VT

To: The Committee and Natural Resources and Energy  
Thoughts and Suggestions re Energy Siting draft 3.1

Page 3, line 11 Section 2

- **Change the capacity to greater than 100 kW.** The language of “a capacity greater than 150 kW” will leave 80-90% of the net-metered projects (150’s) untouched. If you leave it at greater than 150 kW you will have accomplished very, very little
- **Include the word “abandonment”** to go with “decommissioning as there will likely be projects that die before producing any electricity. I believe that a “joint and several” liability clause which includes both the land owner/ land lessor, and developer/project-owner is a good idea.

Page 3, Line 18 Section 3

- I applaud the realization that the interpretation of who is “average” needed lots of help
- Please put in language that requires the PSB to consider **municipal set-back regulations** (this is only a small sub-set of zoning laws). These apply to anything built on a property and do not specifically penalize solar. This should not be a big deal and will serve to improve Montpelier’s relationship with property owners. Candidly, if a 150 kW project is encumbered by recognizing a 75’ side set-back (what we have in New Haven), the site is likely a very poor one to begin with.
- Please, please put in language that allows the PSB to consider a **Good Neighbor Policy** (as I have described it) when it reviews applications. This will allow the PSB to make judgment calls while giving weight to well-sited projects and penalizing the more egregious examples of poor siting. I guarantee that this will put more solar on the ground and less in the newspapers.

In conclusion, I applaud the effort to get something passed that will move the ball down the field. The bill is not everything I would have wished, but it is a huge improvement over the status quo.

Thank you. 