Proposed Course of Action

May 14, 2019

**PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES**

I. Should we revise Sec.201.3 Conditional Use #4 on land below 2000 feet to say “ Solar arrays and individual wind energy systems.”?

II. Review Sec. 201.5 of zoning. What does it accomplish? Does it do anything to protect these resources?

* Change language in General Description Section to eliminate “ridgelines” and say instead “high elevation resource areas, or land 2000 feet in elevation or higher in Forest Districts.”

III. Create a High Elevation Resource Protection Area Overlay as a separate section in our zoning (see separate draft)

IV. Change Sec. 207 Prohibited Use #4 to eliminate “ridgelines” and say “Lands 2000 feet in elevation or higher in Forest Districts shall be left in their natural condition, free from all development, including roads, building structures, utilities, wireless broadcast telecommunications facilities, and industrial wind turbines.”

V. Sec. 209 Performance Standard #10, Eliminate references to ridgelines and instead say “Lands 2000 feet in elevation or higher in Forest Districts shall be left in their natural condition, free from all development, including roads, building structures, utilities, wireless broadcast telecommunications facilities, and industrial wind turbines.”

VI. Sec. 504 must be rewritten because it currently allows extraction of Earth (Mineral) Resources for commercial purposes as a conditional use in Forest Districts. We agreed at the last meeting to only allow mineral extraction for private use on lands below 2000 feet in Forest Districts. If we want to allow only private, on-site extraction, should we still maintain the standards and criteria listed in parts A,B,C and D of this section?

VII. Should we add a second sentence to the first paragraph of Sec. 505 to say “Wind installations are subject to restrictions set out in Sections 207 and 209 of these regulations.” This is what we say about solar energy systems in Sec. 506.

 **PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE TOWN PLAN**

I. p.72, Policy 1, Action 1. Eliminate “Prominent ridgelines” and replace with

“Lands 2000 feet in elevation or higher in Forest Districts shall be left in their natural condition, free from all development, including roads, building structures, utilities, wireless broadcast telecommunications facilities, and industrial wind turbines.”

II p.87, Policy 1: Change to read “The town prohibits any commercial or industrial operations on lands 2000 feet in elevation or higher in Forest Districts other than forestry and will not support any commercial or industrial activity that exceeds the capacity of its public infrastructure including emergency response assets.” *(Again, do we add exceptions?)*

III.) Eliminate references to “prominent ridgelines” on the Utilities and Resources map (p. 92 or 93); Refer to these areas as High Elevation Resource Lands or replace with a new **“High Elevation Protection Overlay” map.**

IV. Ditto for the Viewsheds map (pp. 102-3)

**PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE ENHANCED ENERGY PLAN**

A) Policy 3.1, Action Step # 4. Eliminate references to ridgelines and instead say

“Lands 2000 feet in elevation or higher in Forest Districts shall be left in their natural condition, free from all development, including roads, building structures, utilities, wireless broadcast telecommunications facilities, and industrial wind turbines.”

Policy 4.7 Bullet point #2 Change this to read “Fragile natural areas including lands 2000 feet in elevation or higher in Forest Districts”

Policy 4.12 Eliminate references to ridgelines and instead say “Lands 2000 feet in elevation or higher in Forest Districts shall be left in their natural condition, free from all development, including roads, building structures, utilities, wireless broadcast telecommunications facilities, and industrial wind turbines.”

Does the final sentence of that paragraph perform any useful function? It seems to imply that the town might support commercial or industrial activity that did not exceed the capacity of its public infrastructure including emergency response assets. Is it better to just eliminate the sentence?