

**Towns that have signed and returned Rutland Town's Solar resolution**

**Town of Montgomery**

**Town of Bolton**

**Town of New Haven**

**Town of Orwell**

**Town of Lincoln**

**Town of Ripton**

**Town of Glover**

**Town of Derby**

**Town of Fairlee**

**Town of Barre**

**Town of Westmore**

**Town of Plainfield**

**Town of Georgia**

**Town of Landgrove**

**Town of Pawlet**

**Town of Andover**

**Town of Canaan**

**Town of Ludlow**

**Town of Pittsfield**

**Town of Dover**

**Town of Maidstone**

**Town of Newark**

**Town of Windham**

**Town of Poultney**

**Town of Danville**

**Town of Salisbury**

**Town of Sudbury**

**Town of Duxbury**

**Town of Greensboro**

**Town of Killington**

**Town of Middletown Springs**

**Town of Swanton**

**Town of Sutton**

**Town of Baltimore**

**Town of Woodbury**

**Town of Shelburne**

**Town of Grafton**

**Town of Ferrisburgh**

**The following Towns have signed similar resolutions requesting more municipal say in the siting of alternative energy projects.**

**Town of Middlebury**

**Town of Charlotte**

**If you do not see your Town on this list and you think your Town should be on this list, call your Select Board members and ask them to vote to support having a say in solar facilities development.**

**RESOLUTION TO INCREASE THE INPUT OF VERMONT MUNICIPALITIES REGARDING THE SITING OF RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS IN CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC GOOD PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD.**

**WHEREAS,** The General Assembly has set aggressive goals for the development of renewable energy in Vermont.

**WHEREAS,** as a result of these aggressive goals the number of certificate of public good (CPG) applications before the Public Service Board (PSB) has increased substantially.

**WHEREAS,** at best, the current CPG process provided by 30 V.S.A. §248 affords a limited and ineffectual role for Vermont municipalities, municipal planning commissions, and town selectboards. Regardless of the content, scope, or impact on a proposed renewable energy project or a municipality's efforts to have a say in the project's siting, the §248 process and the legal analysis employed by the PSB enable the PSB to disregard and/or avoid the policies and standards of the very municipality in which the renewable energy project is to be located. By focusing on regional impacts, to the exclusion of local municipal impacts, the PSB routinely ignores the input and evidence offered by Vermont municipalities. As a result, the "due consideration" of municipal viewpoints required by 30 V.S.A. §248(b)(1) has become consideration in name only.

**WHEREAS,** it has become clear that legislative changes are needed to afford Vermont municipalities a greater say in the approval and siting of renewable energy projects.

**THEREFORE,** it is **RESOLVED** by the undersigned Vermont municipalities, to instruct their state representatives and senators to develop amendments to the statutes that concern the siting and approval of renewable energy projects and to the procedures of the PSB in order to ensure that Vermont municipalities have a more meaningful role in the CPG process and to require compliance with appropriately-developed municipal siting standards.