

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

VERSION 2.1, 9 March 2016

Rodgers amendments (2/12/16):

1. **OUT / DROPPED** ~~Remove siting jurisdiction over electric generation from the PSB and place it under Act 250 and local zoning, except that reliability generation would remain under the PSB and the PSB rules on interconnection with the utility system would continue to apply to all electric generation.~~
2. **MAYBE** Grant the PSB discretion to allow non-lawyers to represent individuals before the PSB.
3. **MAYBE** 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.  
[CB — make sure that the new ePSB system has this capability]
4. **MAYBE** Require that, starting in 2022, RECs from net metering systems must transfer to the electric utilities.

Campion amendments (2/26/16)

5. **MAYBE** 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.
6. **MAYBE -- get current NM data** The third instance of amendment would authorize the Public Service Board to allow one or more **net metering systems** of up 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.

7. **MAYBE** 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.

#### Amendments arising out of committee discussion—drafted

8. **IN/ADDED** (with edits, in 5.1?) Add a fee to fund expenses incurred by VAAFM (Ag Agcy) associated with RE projects.

#### All other amendments arising out of committee discussion—not yet drafted as best I know

9. (DS) **MAYBE** 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.
10. (JR) **OUT /DROPPED** Require retirement of all RECs produced in VT.
11. (JR) **MAYBE -- get current NM data** Require retirement of all NM RECs.
12. (JR) **MAYBE -- get current NM data** Reduce Net Metering cap from 500kW to 150kW.
13. (JR) **MAYBE** Add provisions to assess impacts on carbon over full lifecycle of project. **Need language drafted to evaluate.**
14. (JR) **MAYBE** If selling RECs out of state, then no public good and therefore full Act 250 assessment of project (ie treat it as purely commercial development).
15. (JR) **MAYBE** Add a moratorium on wind development in Vermont.
16. (CB) **OUT / DROPPED -- evaluate later in session with new 5.100 rule** Add provision(s) to determine the pace of development under Net Metering. [as with other things in 5.100, I am noting this as a concern, but I would want to wait until we’ve seen the final draft rule; i.e. acting now is premature, but we may conclude we want to act before adjournment).
17. (CB) **YES -- see Secs 2–11 to see if adequately addressed in 4.1** 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). [this relates more to the proposed planning paradigm]
18. (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 use of W-RECs (Weatherization RECs).
19. (DS) **MAYBE** “Have the SNRE committee write a letter to the PSB. See what Health and Welfare did as an example of such a communication.”) **Need language drafted to evaluate.**

### <end>