**Agricultural and Ecosystems Subcommittee**

**PATHWAY F – Land use: Shape land use and development that support carbon sequestration and storage, climate resilience and adaptation, and natural and human communities for a sustainable and equitable future**

The way in which Vermonters live on the land will directly affect our ability to meet our goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, sequester and store carbon, and build resilience to the impacts of climate change. To meet these goals, we need policies and programs that protect our forests and fields, some wild and unmanaged, and producing non-material values like outdoor recreation -- and some used to produce materials such as timber, fiber and food. Similarly, we need policies and programs to protect and restore our wetlands, floodplains, rivers and lakes. At the same time, we need policies and programs that encourage development of walkable and livable villages, town centers and downtowns, together with policies and programs that discourage sprawl. Finally, we need policies and programs that guide decisions to help us site renewable energy projects and other components of the low-carbon energy infrastructure of the future so critical to our success in achieving our climate goals.

This kind of work, developing policies and programs to protect our land, is not new to Vermonters. We have a structure of governance, laws, policies and programs that further many of these goals already. Vermont has recognized the alignment of its future prosperity, and maintenance of our quality of life, depends upon protecting this landscape while continuing to draw sustenance from it. At the same time, we know that there are gaps in this system and that many people have not shared in the environmental, economic and other benefits associated with our state’s lands, our green hills and silver waters. We also worry that many people who now depend upon the land for their livelihood may get left behind.

To make an equitable transition to a system that fully realizes the potential of the land to sustain our community into the future, we need an inclusive and transparent planning process that uses science to inform our decisions and does not place the needs of any one group of Vermonters over another. We also need to provide today’s and tomorrow’s landowners with the information and tools to both meet our climate goals while still making a living. To achieve our goals, we need to invite all Vermonters to understand, be part of and to benefit from this transition. Finally, we need a system of accountability that ensures that we are all abiding by the plans and shared expectations that we establish for how we live on the land.

The following recommendations are intended to provide important steps towards this shared vision for Vermont:

1. **Promote and incentivize compact settlement and reduce forest fragmentation:** Effective land use in Vermont requires understanding both sides of the land use coin – Vermonters need walkable and livable communities with sufficient housing and places to work and shop. We also need healthy forests, farms, fields and waters. Our challenge is to plan for and guide development to the places where we already have or want to construct the necessary infrastructure for transportation, energy, communications and human services, and away from the open spaces so critical to both our ecological and economic health.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ltr.** | **Action and Timeline** | **Criteria** |
| a. | Provide enhanced technical assistance and support to municipalities and regions to develop and implement plans and bylaws intended to protect forest blocks and connecting habitat as authorized by Act 171, including outreach and education for landowners and community members. | *Impact:* Local and regional plans, and landowner understanding of and compliance with those plans, are foundational to making informed land use decisions |
|  |  | *Equity:* Transparent and inclusive planning processes are essential to ensuring that all Vermonters have a voice in determining an equitable balance of land uses |
|  |  | *Cost-effectiveness*: Investing in planning, plan implementation, and plan communications and outreach are among the most cost-effective means of informing and guiding development decisions. |
|  | Can be implemented in the near term | *Co-Benefits:* Making smart land use decisions, informed by science and robust public process will provide a full array of community and environmental benefits in addition to supporting our climate goals. |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility*: Yes |
| b. | Update Act 250 to include criteria that better address climate change, forest fragmentation and forest loss, to incentivize growth in the state’s designated centers and better address the specific challenges to working lands enterprises; and revise Act 250 governance, staffing, public engagement, and the role of State Agency permits in the Act 250 process to create the enterprise capacity necessary to implement new climate related criteria and respond to future land use pressure from climate change and in-migration of climate refugees. | *Impact:* Improved land use decisions, both in the Act 250 permitting process, and also by developers and landowners as they contemplate significant land development projects. |
|  |  | *Equity:* Reinforcing land use patterns that prioritize development in settled areas and protect open spaces and working lands has the dual benefit of providing housing in walkable and livable communities, while protecting open spaces and supporting rural communities. Improving the governance and decision-making process of Act 250 could increase the transparency, predictability, and effectiveness of the decision-making process, including making the citizen engagement and appeal process more accessible. |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* These changes will require only modest state investment in the state agencies tasked with implementing Act 250, and will provide greater predictability and efficiency of decisions regarding land use development. |
|  | Can be implemented in the near term | *Co-Benefits:* Making smart land use decisions, informed by science and robust public process will provide a full array of community and environmental benefits in addition to supporting our climate goals. |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |
| c. | Amend Act 250 to exempt certain state designated centers in order incentivize compact, dense settlment in areas with adequate local land use laws and exisiting infrastructure, taking pressure off greenfield and forested locations. | *Impact:* See (b) above. |
|  |  | *Equity:* See (b) above. |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* See (b) above. |
|  | Can be implemented in the near term | *Co-Benefits:* See (b) above. |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* See (b) above. |
| d. | Reduce regulation of development in downtowns and village centers to cluster development. Remove barriers to (i.e.. Act 250, local zoning, aging infrastructure, etc.), provide statewide guidance, and incentivize housing in village centers and existing built areas to encourage development away from greenfields and river corridors. | *Impact:* See (b) above. |
|  |  | *Equity:* See (b) above. |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* See (b) above. |
|  | Can be implemented in the near term | *Co-Benefits:* See (b) above. |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* See (b) above. |
| e. | Incentivize, prioritize, and/or require development in growth areas and town centers to achieve Compact Settlement (must include investment in water/wastewater infrastructure planning and siting). | *Impact:* See (b) above. |
|  |  | *Equity:* See (b) above. |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* See (b) above. |
|  | Can be implemented in the near term | *Co-Benefits:* See (b) above. |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* See (b) above. |
| f. | Develop required climate-based framework and/or criteria for state grant and regulatory programs. | *Impact:* State agencies make a multitude of decisions that affect the way in which Vermonters live on the land – and so we could realize a significant collective impact through building a climate framework to inform and guide those decisions |
|  |  | *Equity:* The climate-based framework should also include elements that address equity in order to ensure that the benefits of the decisions are equitably distributed, and that the process used to reach those decisions are inclusive and transparent |
|  | Can be implemented in the near-term | *Cost Effectiveness:* The time and expense of developing and implementing the framework across state government will need additional funding from the General Assembly  |
|  |  | *Co-Benefits:* Due to the breadth and scope of state decisions impacting the environment, it is difficult to speak with precision about the nature of the co-benefits, but the framework should be designed with the goal of optimizing co-benefits |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |

1. **Plan for and manage natural and working lands (public/private) for biodiversity and resilience.** Through careful study, monitoring, and planning, we can develop a shared understanding of how to optimize the many benefits of Vermont’s lands while making significant progress towards our climate goals. These plans need the support of strong policies and programs that provide both restrictions and incentives to guide land use in order to be effective.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ltr.** | **Action and Timeline** | **Criteria** |
| a. | Improve statewide forest planning efforts on State and Federal Lands, including development of an action plan by ANR for how State Lands will help accomplish Vermont Conservation Design targets by 2030 and 2050, and collaborate with Green Mountain National Forest planners for more unified forest planning across the state. | *Impact:* Through taking actions to implement the Vermont Conservation Design goals, and coordinating with the U.S. Forest Service regarding forest management in the Green Mountain National Forest, Vermont will increase the amount of carbon sequestered and stored in our forests |
|  |  | *Equity:* Taking action to protect the mix and range of values reflected in the Vermont Conservation Design goals, and goals for the Green Mountain National Forest, and through engaging in a transparent and inclusive planning process, Vermont can ensure that all voices are heard and considered in the decisions affecting the predominant land use type in Vermont |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* The State of Vermont will need additional capacity to fully support and realize the actions needed to meet Vermont Conservation Design goals |
|  | Can be implemented in the near term | *Co-Benefits:* Protecting forests through an inclusive planning process will ensure that we optimize the ecological, economic and other intangible benefits of Vermont’s forests |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |
| b. | Support efforts to passively manage forestland by fire and coppicing. | *Impact:* Increasing the use of forest management methods that reflect traditional ecological knowledge, and that mimic natural disturbance can have a variety of benefits and should be both encouraged and evaluated |
|  |  | *Equity:* Using traditional ecological knowledge is both respectful of the Western Abenaki traditions and provides an opportunity to learn from the experiences of the people who have inhabited and sustained the land in Vermont since time immemorial |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* The state will need to invest in developing the experience and tools to use and understand these methods which have not been commonly or sustainably applied in the past two centuries in Vermont |
|  | Can be implemented in the near term | *Co-Benefits:* The co-benefits of sustainably managed forests include the full array of benefits associated with keeping land open and working. In addition, there may be benefits not fully understood such as control of invasive species and pests, or improved regeneration of native species dependent upon natural disturbances. |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |
| c. | Adopt a state policy of no net-loss of natural and working lands (including active and passively managed forests, agricultural lands, and wetlands) accounting for the transitions of lands within and between these conditions, with aspiration for a net gain. | *Impact:* Maintaining the amount of land in working or natural status is essential to ensuring that Vermont has the ability to manage those lands to optimize climate benefits, and restoring the natural functions of even greater amounts of land provides a significant opportunity to grow those climate benefits |
|  |  | *Equity:* Through adopting this policy and taking actions to increase access to the benefits of natural and working lands, Vermont has an opportunity to address inequities in patterns of land use ownership and access |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* The costs of achieving this goal are associated with a number of related actions including land conservation and restoration programs, improved regulatory oversight, and additional landowner education and technical assistance |
|  | Can be implemented in the near to medium term. | *Co-Benefits:* Through adopting and taking actions to implement this policy, Vermont can realize a broad array of co-benefits beyond carbon storage and climate resilience, including clean water, wildlife habitat, open space, and vibrant, prosperous rural communities |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |
| d. | Amend the Use Value Appraisal (UVA) to allow for1. greater development of old forest structure to increase carbon storage and as articulated in the targets of Vermont Conservation Design;
2. the enrollment of wildland reserves under the existing forestland category where conditions and eligibility criteria are met as defined by Forest Parks and Recreation, facilitating the development of old forest conditions through active restoration and/or passive management as a means of enrollment in the Old Forest ESTA (ecologically significant treatment area) category;
3. privately held parcels with 'Forever Wild' easements on them, held by a qualified 501c(3), to be enrolled in the Current Use Program in the Conservation Category; and
4. the potential for, and implications of, developing a new category of enrollment for land in UVA which allows for passive management modeled on the ‘open-space’ designation included in similar programs elsewhere in New England.
 | *Impact:* The current use or UVA program has provided a substantial incentive over the past 50 years for private landowners to avoid developing their land, while supporting rural communities. Through adapting this program to consider the broader publicly realized climate benefits, we will both incentivize management practices that continue to support rural communities dependent upon the production of food and fiber from the land, while enhancing non-extractive uses which also support rural communities such as outdoor recreation and wildlife viewing |
|  |  | *Equity:* This recommendation most directly benefits current landowners and, given inequities in land ownership patterns, should be coupled with other policies that increase access to land ownership for people historically and disproportionately precluded from the same level of access to land ownership |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* Depending on how these changes are structured, there could be a significant increase in the state resources needed to sustain the investment in the benefits of incentivizing landowners to keep their land undeveloped |
|  | Can be implemented in the near to medium term. | *Co-Benefits:* Keeping land open and undeveloped brings with it the full panoply of environmental, economic and community benefits associated with our working lands. |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |
| e. | Identify priority Natural and Working Lands (NWL) for conservation in or adjacent to the built environment that have large impact to human health, wellbeing, and equity. | *Impact:* In addition to the climate benefits of conserving lands that have high conservation value, such as wildlife habitat, due their remoteness from human populations, we will also realize climate benefits from conserving lands that are closer to developed lands. |
|  |  | *Equity:* There is a substantial equity benefit of increasing the access of people living in developed areas to open and natural lands  |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* This recommendation alone will not hold a significant cost, but will require a targeted application of other conservation strategies on this list that will have costs in terms of the expense of building state capacity to administer the programs, and to pay for land acquired or conserved through those programs |
|  |  | *Co-Benefits:* While the benefits to wildlife may not be as substantial as protecting larger blocks of land remote from population centers and the built environment, there will be benefits to species of insects, including pollinators, amphibians, reptiles, birds and mammals that tolerate proximity to humans, as well as to migratory wildlife such as birds that need food and shelter  |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |
| f. | Revise the Flood Hazard Area & River Corridor (FHARC) rule to incorporate statewide jurisdiction and permitting authority for river corridors for all kinds of development. | *Impact:* Functioning floodplains are one of Vermont’s greatest assets in responding to the increase in the frequency and intensity of flood events caused by climate change. Local governments frequently lack the expertise and resources to implement floodplain protections at a watershed scale as needed. Enhanced statewide oversight of development within floodplains is a critical step for Vermont to be able to realize the opportunity to better protect floodplains from development |
|  |  | *Equity:* Underserved communities and lower income families frequently can only find housing in flood-prone areas. Regulating development in these areas both prevents housing from being developed where it is in harm’s way, and also reduces downstream flood damage. |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* The state will need to incur the cost of building the additional capacity necessary to administer an expanded regulatory program, including improved guidance and technical assistance. The state will also reduce the costs of responding to flood emergencies. |
|  |  | *Co-Benefits:* Floodplain forests are an important carbon sink in addition to providing climate resilience, are critical to protect water quality, and frequently provide important community natural space |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |

1. **Invest in strategic conservation in order to increase the pace of permanent conservation towards 30x30 targets, with Vermont Conservation Design acting as the guiding plan for prioritization of efforts.** One of Vermont’s great achievements over the past fifty years has been its investment in permanent land conservation, protecting natural and working lands from development through putting into public ownership, or purchasing development rights to be held by land trusts. We recommend taking advantage of the strong programs and our state’s experience in doing this work by doubling down on our investments, with special attention and focus to land conservation that serves our climate goals, while also addressing the longstanding inequities present in our current patterns of land ownership.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ltr.** | **Action and Timeline** | **Criteria** |
| a. | Expand use of the Water Infrastructure Sponsorship Program (WISPr) to improve accessibility and use for restoration projects. | *Impact:* Through innovative financing, local governments can support ecological restoration that provides important ecosystem services such as reduced flood damage, while also using methods that sequester and store carbon |
|  |  | *Equity:* If implemented in a manner that promotes natural climate solutions and green infrastructure in developed areas, this program has the potential to benefit people in communities with less access to green or natural space |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* This program provides a cost-effective means of using bonding and state financing to support projects that are less expensive than traditional water infrastructure projects |
|  | Can be implemented in the near term | *Co-Benefits:* Restoration projects funded through WISPr include benefits to wildlife, access to open and green space in communities, as well as a primary purpose to protect water quality |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |
| b. | Promote statewide landscape connectivity and forest blocks conservation planning through robust support of the Staying Connective Initiative and use of Vermont Conservation Design and TNC’s Resilient and Connected Landscape in state program prioritization frameworks. | *Impact:* Through conserving forestland, Vermont will increase the amount of carbon sequestered and stored in our forests |
|  |  | *Equity:* Taking action to conserve forests, and through engaging in a transparent and inclusive planning process, Vermont can ensure that all voices are heard and considered in the decisions affecting the predominant land use type in Vermont |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* The State of Vermont will need additional capacity to fully support and realize the actions needed to meet these conservation goals |
|  | Can be implemented in the near term | *Co-Benefits:* Protecting forests through an inclusive planning process will ensure that we optimize the ecological, economic and other intangible benefits of Vermont’s forests |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |
| c. | Through permanent conservation coupled with both active and passive restoration efforts on both public and private lands, allow approximately 9% of Vermont's forest to become (or be maintained as) old forest, specifically targeting 15% of the matrix forest within the highest priority forest blocks identified in Vermont Conservation Design to achieve this condition. | *Impact:* See 3.b. above |
|  |  | *Equity:* See 3.b. above |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* See 3.b. above |
|  |  | *Co-Benefits:* See 3.b. above |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* See 3.b. above |
| d. | Create statewide environmental justice policy. | *Impact:* By ensuring that the various programs proposed to address climate change in this report are evaluated in light of environmental justice concerns, the state will ensure that a broader range of the public benefit from and support the actions taken under this plan, ensuring the long-term stability of programs that need to continue for decades in order to be effective. |
|  |  | *Equity:* By definition, the creation of an environmental justice policy will further equity. |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* The cost of this recommendation is the time and effort of state agency staff and leadership who will develop and adopt this policy across all relevant state programs. The benefits in terms of achieving a broader and more equitable distribution of the benefits of environmental protection and conservation will easily exceed those costs. |
|  |  | *Co-Benefits:* A central benefit of pursuing environmental justice is the engagement of all Vermonters in the critical work of taking actions to address climate change. |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes. |
| e. | Per the formula in statute, fully fund the Vermont Housing & Conservation Board (VHCB); including $3M for the Farm & Forest Viability Program, and increase annual VHCB funding above the statutory amount by 15%, targeting those funds for implementation of conservation actions recommended in CAP, especially those related to forests. | *Impact:* Through conserving forest and farmland, Vermont will increase the amount of carbon sequestered and stored in our forests and farms and prevent the conversion of those lands to development, with the added benefit of preventing sprawl and carbon intensive development patterns |
|  |  | *Equity:* Taking action to conserve forests and farms, and through engaging in a transparent and inclusive public funding process, Vermont can ensure that all voices are heard and considered in the decisions affecting the working and natural lands in Vermont |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* The State of Vermont will need to increase funding for this purpose over the long-term, as well as to invest in building the additional state and non-profit land trust capacity to fully support and realize the actions needed to meet these conservation goals |
|  |  | *Co-Benefits:* Protecting forests and farms will ensure that we optimize the ecological, economic and other intangible benefits of Vermont’s forests |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |
| f. | Identify and protect climate refugia. | *Impact:* Vermont’s plants and wildlife will be decimated by climate change, as will plants and wildlife throughout the region and the nation. Protecting natural and open working lands in Vermont may be the only hope for many species |
|  |  | *Equity:* People need the same benefits provided by open and natural lands as plants and wildlife – increasing investments in the places our wild flora and fauna need to thrive is an investment in the same places that people need to thrive |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* The cost of implementing this action is tied to the other related proposed actions to conserve and protect natural lands |
|  |  | *Co-Benefits:* The ecosystem services of the land we protect as climate refugia will provide community benefits such non-material benefits like outdoor recreation, clean water, and flood resilience |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |
| g. | Use best available data and mapping to analyze existing portfolio of conserved agricultural lands to identify forest, wetland or natural community restoration opportunities and prioritize funding for these projects | *Impact:* Through careful analysis and prioritization, Vermont will be able to optimize the use of public funds to have the greatest impact at a landscape scale  |
|  |  | *Equity:* Taking action to prioritize the land we conserve will provide an important opportunity to also consider historic inequities related to access to open and natural spaces for underserved communities.  |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* The cost of carefully analyzing and evaluating data about land conservation will be outweighed by the ability to focus public resources where they will have the greatest impact |
|  |  | *Co-Benefits:* Prioritizing land conservation programs to have the greatest climate benefits will also ensure that we optimize the ecological, economic and other intangible benefits of Vermont’s natural and working lands |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes |
| h. | Maintain a suite of Farmland Conservation & Protection tool ranging from voluntary, regulatory and planning (e.g. easements, Act 250, planning, zoning). | *Impact:* See 3.e. above |
|  |  | *Equity:* See 3.e. above |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* See 3.e. above |
|  |  | *Co-Benefits:* See 3.e. above |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* See 3.e. above |

1. **Increase technical assistance, capacity, education and resources to support private forestland owners and municipalities for intergenerational transfer.** Vermont is facing a significant demographic shift in land ownership, including working forests and farms, with the risk of a concurrent shift in the use of these lands from forests and farms, to being developed. Providing both today’s and tomorrow’s landowners with the tools to manage this transition, will help ensure that we protect both our rural, working lands and tourism based economies, and that we give a head start to the next generation of forest and farm landowners.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ltr.** | **Action and Timeline** | **Criteria** |
| a. | Support forestland succession/estate planning efforts to reduce forest parcelization and fragmentation through implementation of the Act 171 'Intergenerational Transfer of Forestland Working Group Recommendations' of 2017. | *Impact:* Keeping forests as forests, with all of the climate mitigation and adaptation benefits associated with forests, requires that the many and private forest landowners have access to the technical and legal resources necessary to keep those forest parcels intact |
|  |  | *Equity:* Managing through this demographic shift in land ownership patterns creates opportunities to enhance the access of people traditionally excluded from land ownership opportunities in Vermont |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* Support and technical assistance to private landowners requires resources and capacity. The state can invest in expanding existing programs within FPR, VHCB and other non-profit organizations to provide these services at a reasonable cost, with significant public benefits |
|  | Can be implemented in the near term | *Co-Benefits:* At the same time that this program provides helpful information to landowners about succession planning, these interactions will build trust and the opportunity to educate landowners about the best conservation practices to manage forests sustainably |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:*Yes |
| b. | Develop and implement a farmer retirement program to facilitate the transfer of intact farmland | *Impact:* Keeping farms as farms, with all of the climate mitigation and adaptation benefits associated with farms, requires that farmers have access to the technical and legal resources necessary to keep their farms from being sold for development |
|  |  | *Equity:* Managing through this demographic shift in land ownership patterns creates opportunities to enhance the access of people traditionally excluded from land ownership opportunities in Vermont |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* Support and technical assistance to farmers requires resources and capacity. The state can invest in expanding existing programs within AAFM, VHCB and other non-profit organizations to provide these services at a reasonable cost, with significant public benefits |
|  |  | *Co-Benefits:* At the same time that this program provides helpful information to farmers about succession planning, these interactions will build trust and the opportunity to educate farmers about the best conservation practices to manage forests sustainably |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:*Yes |

1. **Avoid, minimize, and mitigate the negative impacts of renewable energy generation on natural and working lands.** Vermont’s transition to a future in which renewable energy is a major source of energy is necessary to achieve our climate goals. At the same time, to date, that transition has been a bumpy one, with significant controversies over the siting of wind and solar, and a long-standing controversy over the use of electricity generated from nuclear. We must do the heavy lifting of engaging at the local, state and regional level to establish a process, guidelines and expectations for how we plan for, design and transition to a low-carbon energy future. Work by Regional Planning Commissions to inventory potential renewable energy sites as part of their Comprehensive Regional Energy Plans is an important step. We need to evaluate the effectiveness of these planning efforts. In addition, an underutilized strategy is to use a combination of siting requirements and incentives to encourage the development of renewable energy projects in areas that are already developed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ltr.** | **Action and Timeline** | **Criteria** |
| a. | Incentivize or mandate solar and wind capacity on new buildings as well as in previously-disturbed/developed areas and avoid and minimize forest clearing for solar through incentives and other siting polices, rule and regulations. | *Impact:* Increasing the amount of renewable energy developed in harder-to-develop locations will result in reduced market pressures to develop those projects on open and undeveloped land that is providing important ecosystem services, including the storage and sequestration of carbon |
|  |  | *Equity:* Reducing barriers to accessing renewable energy resources in more intensively developed areas, including multi-family housing, will extend the benefits of renewable energy to people who might not otherwise have access |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* A central barrier to the development of renewable energy projects in already developed areas are the costs. The state will have to consider a combination of greater incentives for renewable energy installation, and increased restrictions on projects on undeveloped land, both of which will have real economic costs. At the same time, extending the benefits of renewable energy to more people in more densely populated areas has the potential to become more efficient and effective once the necessary investments in technology and infrastructure are made |
|  | Can be implemented in the near term | *Co-Benefits:* Keeping natural and working lands open and undeveloped provide a much greater degree of environmental co-benefits including clean water and wildlife habitat than when developed |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes. |
| b. | Require incentives to site new renewable energy generation on parking lots, rooftops and already altered locations. And discourage and penalize siting of new renewable energy generation on intact ecosystems, priority forests, and natural land. | *Impact:* See 5.a. above. |
|  |  | *Equity:* See 5.a. above. |
|  |  | *Cost Effectiveness:* See 5.a. above. |
|  |  | *Co-Benefits:* See 5.a. above. |
|  |  | *Technical Feasibility:* Yes. |