

**SNRE COMMITTEE, S.230,
ENERGY DEVELOPMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT:
PUNCH LIST**

VERSION 3.1, 10 March 2016

Rodgers amendments:

1. **MAYBE — resolve Thursday** Grant the PSB discretion to allow non-lawyers to represent individuals before the PSB. **JR to confer with Senate Judiciary. “Scope of practice” limitations?**
2. **IN / ADOPTED -- add to next draft (7.1)** Require that the REC monitoring system to be established by the PSB under existing law, allowing the public to see who owns the RECs produced by in-state facilities.
[not tied to ePSB, but rather whatever electronic means PSB prefers]

Campion amendments

3. **MAYBE — resolve Thursday** The first two instances of amendment address the **standard offer** proposal. Essentially, they would allocate
 - one-third of the annual increase to projects at preferred locations other than parking lots and parking lot canopies, and
 - another one-third of the annual increase to projects on parking lots and parking lot canopies, andwithin each allocation the projects would compete against each other.
4. **MAYBE — resolve Thursday** The third instance of amendment would authorize the Public Service Board to allow one or more **net metering systems** of up to 2.2 MW of capacity if each of the following is met:
 - Except for its capacity, the plant would be a net metering system.
 - The system will be wholly located on or in a preferred location.
 - The amount of the bill credit is adjusted to reflect economies of scale.
 - The RECs go to the interconnecting utility, which retires and applies them toward the RES.
5. **MAYBE — resolve Thursday** The fourth instance of amendment applies to a renewable energy plant of up to 2.2 MW or less that is not a net metering system. It would direct the Board to review such a plant under the “limited size and scope” procedures of 30 V.S.A. § 248(j) if the plant will be wholly located on a preferred location. Section 248(j) is analogous to Act 250’s “minor” application procedure. The reason to specify that the plant is not a net metering system is that § 8010 already authorizes the PSB to streamline procedures for those systems. **Resolve burden of persuasion in this proposal versus current law.**

6. (DS) **MAYBE — resolve Thursday** Local control over smaller RE projects (e.g. 150kW and under) via local town plans and zoning. No PSB jurisdiction; that is, no Section 248 process for these smaller projects.
7. (JR) **MAYBE** Add provisions to assess impacts on carbon over full lifecycle of project. **JR needs language drafted to evaluate.**
8. (CB) **MAYBE** Have DPS do an assessment of how we might address energy needs—for the planning paradigm—through demand reduction (weatherization). Include in the assessment how we might quantify, track, and monetize such work through the
9. (DS) **MAYBE** How can this bill address wind issues? **Need language drafted to evaluate.**
10. (CB) **YES -- as a committee revisit Secs 2–11 to see if adequately addressed** Add provision(s) to ensure the engineering considerations help drive locational planning (as opposed to being in a more reactive posture with the Department and Board responded to projects as proposed) within the proposed planning paradigm(state-RPC-muni)]

“WEAVE” into S.230:

11. incorporate **S.205** (prime ag soils) and AAFM considerations into S.230:
 1. intervenor status; optional, not a duty
 2. fee to support general obligation to monitor/respond
 3. bill-back to support extraordinary expenses associated with applications
 4. define precisely how prime ag soils criterion is imported into S.230

<end>