

Items for Discussion

- Pulled out strategies/actions that had disagreement or many questions
- Left some details that seemed clarification, redundancy, or the like for editing later
- Will still need a solid cleanup of the whole matrix before next week
 - Council hoping for the matrix on September 21 . . . ?
- Will need to develop slides for next week to review prior to VCC
- Things important to you we missed during the topics – bring up!

Renewables

Appropriately compensate and/or incentivize on-farm solar

12

This is question and disagreement. what does 'appropriately compensate' mean? Net metered solar on farms, and other private land, is already heavily incentivized through the state's net meter program. Is the suggestion farm get more incentive than other landowners to net meter? I generally disagree with increasing rate-based incentives for larger net metered projects. with limited state funds to support climate mitigation, higher incentives for larger net metered systems are not an efficient use of those dollars.

I favor incentivizing the latter (rooftops) not the former (land). May also want to include incentives for other renewable energy sources on farm including methane digestors and wind

NEW STRATEGY OR ACTION: Educate, track, and appropriately reward on-farm renewable energy

Collect data regarding on farm energy generation to establish current baseline

Collect data to understand complexities of net metering's impact on farms (i.e. who is getting paid for renewable energy generation and who isn't - flagging that this could be an action within CSM potentially as well?) And research opportunities to further advance on appropriate on farm renewables

Educate TA and state staff about REAP grant programs and assist farmers in pursuing on farm renewable energy generation and efficiency

Reward and support renewables on farms on rooftops, barns, storage facilities, and minimizes or avoids loss of working and natural lands to large scale renewables development

Increase outreach and incentives to on-farm solar installation on existing built infrastructure.

Feed, buffers, and development

22	<p>Research and develop Climate feed management program, including both feed amendments (e.g. seaweed, biochar) and feed quality (e.g. forage quality)</p>	<p>Equity -However this is done it needs to ensure that farmers who have been feeding seaweed or utilizing these products do not lose access to their market because of a sudden spike in demand. Additionally, sourcing of any of these products needs to be closely examined. Are we supporting stringent harvesting standards for ocean products? Are we contributing to the loss of small fishermen and business because of flooding demand? Have we thoroughly examined the capabilities of our own soils to produce feed here that lowers GHG emissions? i.e. grass..</p>
		<p>Consider downstream impacts (goal to reduce enteric methane)</p>
29	<p>Outreach and increase incentives to restore or increase forested buffers in agriculture and other settings (e.g. through revisions to the RAPs to expand beyond water quality) REORGANIZE: focus on NR restoration strategies and the RAPs (RYAN)</p>	<p>Acknowledge over all land use implicaitons to maintain Ag. Equity consideration: what are the calculations of acreage lost (and tonnage represented) by increasing farmland buffers that will ultimately result in more imports from other places (with less stringent environmental regulations) that mean pushing impacts off elsewhere and increased GHG emissions from shipping/trucking. (full disclosure this was something a farmer brought up last night) Question - Are we where we need to be with other sectors and buffers? Does the public have education around this? Do municipalities? Do we have a monitoring system for this within other agencies/sectors? Do municipalities, conservation districts, RCPs, etc have the capability and resources to increase buffers?</p>
43	<p>Reduce regulation of development in downtowns and village centers to cluster development</p>	<p>Overall, clustering development is going to be contentious (personally I don't want to live downtown) and not sure reduce regulation is the correct approach if pursuing?</p> <p>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 (RR coordination needed)</p>
44	<p>Incentivize/mandate clustering for new subdivisions.</p>	<p>Remove "mandate"; reference zoning options such as PUDs</p>

Local Wood Products

52

Incentivize and support conversion of biomass energy to combined heat/power models (CHP); incentivize greater efficiency in existing or planned biomass generation facilities; harness opportunities for district heating models were applicable

We agreed in our meeting to move this to an action, but there isn't a great strategy to move it under and there are a few actions that fall under this; we may have to define 'local' here (change to 'regional'??) (CHARLIE) (CONCERNS ABOUT EXISTING FACILITIES)

53

Promote and incentivize use of local wood products over imported wood and/or non-wood materials with high embodied carbon footprints (steel, concrete)

We agreed in our meeting to move this to an action, but there isn't a great strategy to move it under and there are a few actions that fall under this; we may have to define 'local' here (change to 'regional'??)

54

Through procurement standards, require that publicly funded building projects use local wood products (MASS timber, etc.) that have been harvested under sustainable procurement standards over materials with a higher carbon footprint (steel, etc)

We agreed in our meeting to move this to an action, but there isn't a great strategy to move it under and there are a few actions that fall under this; we may have to define 'local' here (change to 'regional'??)

Carbon Offsets

57

Research in-state purchase of carbon credits developed by- **Vermont-based** carbon projects addressing concerns of accounting (i.e. additionality and leakage), equity, etc.
Implement public incentives (Iris)

Equity concerns given current land ownership trends, therefore who can benefit from a market and who can't. How are we creating standards for this to ensure community/farmer/BIPOC/forester/logger benefits not just corporations? How are we dealing with greenwashing? What are the standards around this? Who is enforcing it? Do we need to incentivize this? Isn't there compensation within the process? How do we ensure compensation is just and adequate to encompass the full worth? Double counting problem

"Explore and evaluate existing or new carbon market-based opportunities to incentivize forest management practices which sequester and store greater amounts of carbon in our forests with urgency given developing private markets and address concerns of accounting (i.e. additionality and leakage), equity, etc." and as standards, enforcement, fair compensation.

Can we change the name of this strategy to **"Leverage market based solutions to incentivize forest management practices which sequester and store greater amounts of carbon in our forests" or " "?**
Explore carbon markets sounds sort of vague and like we're going on a treasure hunt. I think we can be more specific.

I am not ok with this one. This is not a strategy to contributes to our goals unless credits are purchased within the state, and if additionality and leakage are addressed

58

Promote participation by public and private landowners in carbon markets to secure forest carbon

Similar questions/concerns as above. I am not ok with this one. This is not a strategy to contributes to our goals unless credits are purchased within the state, and if *additionality and leakage* are addressed

Forestland Issues

65	Conserve/protect old forests	Should we include a metric, like the VCD old forest target?
		need to be more specific. Perhaps recommend that the state set a target for protection and conservation of old forests on public lands
		I think it's important that we clarify this strategy to include language "...modeled after Vermont Conservation Design". Just leaving at 30x30 targets is too vague
		Protect old forest & high priority block forests identified by VCD
		Amend this Strategy for this and all below to read: "Increase the pace of permanent conservation broadly around 30x30 targets, with Vermont Conservation Design acting as the guiding plan for prioritization of efforts.
		Protect old forests and plant colonies
71	State policy of "no forest loss" (and forest gain)	Needs clarification... no timber harvest or no loss of forest acres, presumably no net loss? Still question if appropriate, e.g. perhaps to become more self-sufficient/resilient VT needs more ag land to grow it's own food? If there is no forest loss, development can only take agricultural land out of production for high and low density development.
		Did we drop "net" from this? Recommend adding "...modeled after policy for 'no net wetland loss' (or however that's worded in state language)
		Why no increase?
72	Support efforts to allow for passively managed forestland enrollment in UVA	may want to reword strategy to allow for this action (issue is word 'permanent')
		flagging that the strategy says "permanent" conservation but UVA is not permanent -- do we want to edit strategy wording or move this action elsewhere?
		I think this one can be merged with the action above re: UVA and ESTAs, then maybe add additional language around permanent conservation of old forests (acknowledging these really need to go hand in hand)
		I would remove this action completely and focus efforts on action articulated above around ESTAs and old forests (ie. passive management is couched in broader management regime options under expanded existing UVA framework).
		Could focus this effort on high priority blocks identified by VCD
89	Support new state tax policy incentives for forest landowners and farmers to adopt climate-friendly practices (e.g. create a tier within UVA)	Recommend removing this one. I think we get at incentivizing management practices above, and I don't see a clear path to how this would be practically implemented in UVA (great idea, but no clarity on how we'd use UVA do to this). Stick with Action in Ln. 91, below
		We need to flag that using UVA do so this might be nearly impossible to impliment--it's hard enough to objectively measure management actions in the program as is (looking at cut contrary as a model)

Act 250

<p>⁹⁶ Amend Act 250 to incorporate forest fragmentation and climate change criteria as well as changes to better support activities specific to working lands enterprises</p>	<p>Just a note that the industry viability criteria may be a better action under systems and markets, even if the implimentation of changes would be recommended as a package</p>
	<p>Same comment as existing---I think okay as written for now as we need Act 250 changes to move as a package</p>
	<p>Just a note that the industry viability criteria may be a better action under systems and markets, even if the implimentation of changes would be recommended as a package</p>
<p>⁹⁷ Modify the Use Value Appraisal (e.g., "Current Use") Program to allow municipalities the first option to purchase subdivided land</p>	<p>Could this tie into potential accessible entry points for BIPOC/young folks wishing to access land? Maybe there's a farm access/agrarian commons or BIPOC open space access component we could add.</p>
	<p>Need to clarify what this means and how it would work. As written it sounds like any subdivision would result in an offer of first refusal. This could be considered a taking as written?</p>
	<p>this seems like a massive change that's had no discussion.</p>
<p>⁹⁸ Amend Act 250 to reduce forest fragmentation from development in priority forest blocks; also expand Act 250 jurisdiction to provide greater protections for forested ridgelines, wetlands, floodplains and unique forest ecosystems not currently covered AND amenda Act 250 for changes which better address the specific challenges of working lands enterprises (criteria like hours of operation, ag soils mitigation, etc).</p>	<p>wetlands and floodplains are generally regulated outside of act250 - potential conflict of requirements.</p> <p>NEW LANGUAGE: Update Act 250 and other state land use regulations and planning tools to include climate change criteria and better combat forest fragmentation and forest loss, to incentivize growth in the state's designated centers and better address the specific challenges to working lands enterprises</p>
	<p>Combine with In. 97 OR se the language in line 150 instead, it's more holistic. (Note: Line 150 says ")</p>
<p>NEW STRATEGY OR ACTION: plan and regulate for climate resilience and adaptation</p>	<p>Revise Act 250 governance, staffing 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.</p>

Central Planning and State Climate Office

116	Using the findings of the audit, create planning and/or prioritization criteria that better align state programs (ideally developed/implemented through revived Central Planning Office)	I'm not totally supportive of the Central Planning Office concept, at least not without out a lot more detail, so I would remove that reference from this Action.
146	Revive the State's Central Planning Office to better, more comprehensively address land use and land use changes that support healthy natural and human communities and align state programs.	I am not supportive of state central planning office concept without more information/details.
149	Create an Interagency Office of Climate to coordinate implementation of climate change action across agencies. The office will include representatives from each xx agency, and have one secretary that answers directly to the governor, with an oversight board or committee with representatives from the NWL economy, NGOs and academia to inform and steer the process.	I don't agree this is the best structure within state government to manage these issues.
		Isn't this in some ways the VCC? Implementation is likely agency specific.
		I didn't want to flag this as a disagreement yet but I am having a lot of trepidation around this one. If this is tied into the Executive Branch (I would have same concern if we were suggesting it within Legislative Branch) for example how will equity be ensured in who is brought to the table? How does it not fall victim to partisanship and varying belief systems? How does it ensure coordination and education across agencies and build systems for cross pollination and the reduction of duplicative action?
		How about a board with a farmer or two and folks that work on the land?

Invasives

Incentivize and provide support for invasive species control efforts, specifically where populations threaten the perpetuation of forest cover

85

No, No, No. Allow introduced plants to grow and find balance while adding to plant diversity

Promote invasive plant and pest management, especially in ecologically sensitive areas

131

No, No, No. These are not invasive plants they are introduced and add to the diversity. If they are left alone they will find balance. Look at apple trees.

Lakes and Headwaters

<p>109 Support a lakes – climate mitigation & adaptation fund to mitigate climate change impacts such as rapid changes to water levels, less winter ice, challenges to cold weather fish species, proliferation of invasives, increased temps leading to more plant and algae growth, increased stormwater runoff, and more rigid summer stratification creating anoxic conditions at lake depth that are bad for wildlife and promote sediment phosphorus release.</p>	<p>challenges to cold weather fish species, proliferation of invasives, leave these alone, they will find balance. increased temps leading to more plant and algae growth, increased stormwater runoff, and more rigid summer stratification creating anoxic conditions at lake depth that are bad for wildlife and promote sediment phosphorus release. How about reducing phosphorus release? ?</p>
	<p>What would this program do?</p>
<p>133 Incorporate headwater storage as a Use Value Appraisal (UVA) enrollment opportunity</p>	<p>What does this mean? Forest provide a range of services and values, including but not limited to headwater storage, and that is in part why the UVA program exists. It seems odd to identify one value here and it's not clear to what end.</p>
	<p>This needs to be more fleshed out if we're advancing it---how would this be different than the functions forests are already providing? Is it targeting management practices?</p>
	<p>What does this mean and how is it different than the functions enrolled forests already provide?</p>
	<p>Educate and incorporate headwater storage as a UVA enrollment opportunity</p>

River Corridors

140 Expand the Flood Hazard and River Corridor (FHARC) rule to incorporate statewide jurisdiction and permitting for river corridors, as modeled by the State's Wetlands and Lakes & Ponds programs	why are the wetlands/lakes and ponds programs suggested as models for an expanded FHARC program? Those are not good comparison. FHARC already exists - it's expansion doesn't need to rely on other programs for models.
	note that this might overlap with rivers/floodplains
	What does this entail?
161 Strategy formerly: Improve and incentivize river corridor and floodplain reconnection and restoration (e.g. incentivize riparian buffers, invest in berm removal, expand FHARC to include statewide RC jurisdiction)	should actions related to incentives be seperated from action related to expanded regualtoyr programs? Also, FHARC already has statewide jurisdiction.
	this should be removed

Mowing and Pollinators

136	Reduce roadside mowing for multiple benefits	This seems like a huge stretch to include here, agree in principle but does this jump the shark?
139	Minimize lawn mowing frequency and amount mowed lawns to promote biodiversity	This seems like a huge stretch to include here, agree in principle but does this jump the shark?
141	Incentivize/fund pollinator planting for existing or new solar fields	This seems like a huge stretch to include here, agree in principle but does this jump the shark?

NEW STRATEGY: Develop program for tracking and reducing GHG contributing chemicals/substances, etc (use statute language) in the state

Target: Understand and quantify full scope of usage of GHG contributing chemicals, etc across ALL sectors by 2025, Reduce by 30% 2030, Reduce by 70% 2050

Food Systems

NEW STRATEGY OR ACTION: Develop, expand, and sustain local markets specifically for food, agricultural, and forest products.

Food hubs as public infrastructure (like libraries - again idea from last night)

NEW STRATEGY OR ACTION: Develop community-based structures within Food Hubs? Under Farm to Plate? to measure, assess, and create increased local food access and reduced food insecurity.

Target: 1 Farm to School Coordinator within each supervisory union by 2025, one per district by 2030, one per school by 2050?

NEW STRATEGY OR ACTION: Ensure equitable access to local foods, culturally relevant foods, land, funds, grants, and TA for people who have been historically marginalized and impacted.

Ensure the compilation of data to understand who our current programs are missing or are not serving. Work to understand gaps and establish metrics to track how we are meeting them.