



# TOWN OF NANTUCKET

**NANTUCKET ENERGY  
OFFICE**  
16 BROAD STREET  
NANTUCKET, MA 02554  
508-325-5379  
WWW.ACKENERGY.ORG

## **Policy Guidelines for Town Roles in the Achievement of Energy Efficiency Goals and Objectives and Development of Renewable Electric Generating Facilities**

### **Appendix A. Energy Policy Survey Responses**

#### **Policy Recommendation #1 Town Involvement in Energy Related Activities**

##### ***Survey questions***

Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with these statements:

- (1-1) View Town involvement in energy-related activities on the same basis as all other Town activities. Evaluate initiatives to reduce Town energy costs on their economic merits on the same basis as initiatives to reduce other types of Town operating costs.
- (1-2) Evaluate capital projects to reduce Town energy costs on their economic merits in competition with other Town capital projects for available funding.
- (1-3) Focus on projects that involve attractive returns at a minimum of risk or potential adverse impact.
- (1-4) Provide services to support local residents and businesses in their efforts to reduce energy consumption and costs, and to take advantage of available state and federal incentive programs, on a basis comparable to other economic development programs provided to local residents and businesses.



***Survey responses***

	1-1 (#)	1-1 (%)	1-2 (#)	1-2 (%)	1-3 (#)	1-3 (%)	1-4 (#)	1-4 (%)
Strongly agree	<b>28</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>67%</b>
Agree	<b>10</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>24%</b>
Disagree	<b>5</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4%</b>
Strongly disagree	<b>2</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4%</b>
Don't know	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
Total	<b>45</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100%</b>

***Comments on Policy Recommendation #1***

I am a supporter of maximum energy conservation and efficiency measures as long as they are cost effective for the Town, residents and businesses. Stay AWAY from adopting state or federal regulations like the Green Communities Act - ACKEnergy office does not have any authority to promote that or even discuss it this year! The Town of Nantucket can pursue parts of the GCA that do not have public health or economic impacts to the island. Let's all work together to figure out how we can be a greener island without promoting one-sided activist agendas!

Focus should not be on reducing cost, but on reducing demand for non-renewable energy.

The town should prioritize energy costs above all others, as it is a municipal and residential cost that the Town can actually lower in the near and distant future, simply by moving it to the top of the priority list. Also, ALL benefits should be considered. Development and operating cost is not the true cost of an energy project. The financial burden of NOT developing a project is a cost too! The town needs to look at the long-term costs headed our way. A third electric cable to the mainland for \$60,000,000 is an energy development the Town will force all of us to pay by taking no action, and there is NO economic merit in that. Ratepayers are going to pay more and more for electricity unless we do something about it... even if rates don't go up(which they will) new surcharges are being piled on top of existing surcharges. In one way or another Nantucket has been producing its own

energy throughout history, and only until the recent installation of cables to the mainland, has opted out. It is costing ratepayers dearly and is a reflection of poor municipal planning. We have very little time to take action to avoid needing a very expensive third cable. Please stop giving committees and consultants busy-work and DO SOMETHING NOW! (Anonymous)

We should have a forum on the advantages of Styrene insulation over fiberglass. Including but not limited to poor interpretation of building codes regarding crawlspace and basement insulating and attic insulation with styrene. There is much information on the internet on this topic as we have an epidemic of damp and moldy crawl spaces that can be directly traced back to what the builder or homeowner were required to do by the Town.

1-1 thru 1-3 suggest all initiatives must compete with other break-even or deliver a ROI. This island should be more progressive in its thinking and must look at the long-term implications of clean water, reducing carbon footprint, etc. This department should not have to "compete" with other town originated cost saving measures. We should invest.

My home has solar hot water and heat at the moment, and is all wired for solar electric and soon will have its first panel put in. I pay minimal electric bills right now, and because of the solar heat and hot water the gas bills are minimal also. I also have a well and septic system so there is no water bill. All of these energy conserving aspects of my home were put in place by Habitat for Humanity, allowing me to really be an efficient energy consumer. It shows. I am way above the top 20% of my most efficient neighbors with electricity.

I'm not certain about the wording in 1-3, thus the "I don't know" #3 is too open to interpretation as far as "adverse impact", "attractive returns" and "minimum...risk". It seems to be a rephrasing of the narrative of those who opposed the landfill turbine.

The town definitely has a role to play in the energy policy arena, as our collective failure to invest in new renewables, and to under-invest in energy efficiency, has at its root a kind of "market failure" which is due (1) to a lack of good information for energy consumers and (2) a lack of leadership. I think the town can help supply both at little incremental cost, and very little risk, either to town residents or town officials.

Reducing dependence on IMPORTED power should be a priority. Increasing our efficiency is one step.

(1-1) This item appears to be two separate statements or issues. It appears to address town involvement and initiatives – two seemingly distinct and separate matters. It would seem to be easier to make a definitive response if the item was made two separate response items. The first element is a bit vague because it uses the phrase “...on the same basis as all other Town activities...” without making it clear what that means. Not all Town activities are evaluated using the same criteria or basis.

(1-4) This item appears to be two separate statements or issues, so while agreement is indicated, that agreement is qualified due to the lack of specifics in the underlying document which is worded in a manner addressed above. It would be easier to make a definitive response if the item was made two separate response items.

1-4: Nantucket should be very cautious in accepting any state or federal incentive funds. Officials and the community should clearly understand what is required in return for the "free" funds. In general, "free" money is seldom free.

## **Policy Recommendation #2**

### **Specific Goals for Energy Conservation or Reductions in Consumption**

#### *Survey questions*

Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with these statements:

(2-1) Do not adopt numeric goals to reduce Town-wide energy consumption at this time.

(2-2) Rather, require energy consumption to be considered as a factor in all planning and facilities construction decisions that have a significant impact on energy use, and implement energy efficiency measures that make sense for Nantucket on a case-by-case basis. As an example, ensure that the implications for energy consumption are incorporated into and considered as part of the scope of the ongoing comprehensive wastewater management plan. Similarly, require energy consumption to be considered as a factor in all efforts to identify municipal space needs and in all infrastructure planning and regulation initiatives.

(2-3) Allow energy reduction targets to be used as an administrative tool to provide incentives for municipal staff to reduce energy use at municipal facilities in the same way that other budget-reduction goals are used to motivate cost savings. Encourage Town staff to pursue energy conservation and efficiency in their workplaces and in the facilities under their control or jurisdiction through measures and policies to minimize printing; encouraging central break rooms; limiting the number of personal appliances; installing devices to reduce water consumption; and similar measures to be suggested by the staff themselves.

*Survey responses*

	2-1 (#)	2-1 (%)	2-2 (#)	2-2 (%)	2-3 (#)	2-3 (%)
Strongly agree	7	16%	25	56%	21	47%
Agree	8	18%	14	31%	18	40%
Disagree	11	24%	3	7%	3	7%
Strongly disagree	11	24%	0	0%	1	2%
Don't know	8	18%	3	7%	2	4%
Total	45	100%	45	100%	45	100%

*Comments on Policy Recommendation #2*

(2-2) delete "Rather," ....I know this is about energy, but, I'd like to see it weaved into a total Life Cycle cost evaluation to ensure we are spending our money wisely with a Long term view.

(2-3) Using previously developed energy surveys for existing buildings, identify specific energy reduction alternatives. The investments required to implement these alternatives would be evaluated and ranked based on standard economic evaluation criteria, e.g., rate of return on investment (ROI) enabling Town Administration to compare and select the most attractive uses of capital. Encourage Town staff to ..... [text lost]

The Energy Office is supposed to focus exclusively on energy conservation, not try to parlay that directive from the Board of Selectmen into a further activist agenda! (Anonymous)

I'd strongly agree with these goals if the focus was on reducing demand for \*non-renewable\* energy. The larger cost will be borne long term as we pay more for climate change than we'd ever pay for wasted energy.

The Police Station should have been built and designed to LEED standards or another similarly focused energy conservation oriented framework. The process should have been a top priority. Town officials and not cognizant of opportunities and need at both design stages and for existing properties. Therefore, the only way to focus elected and administrative town officials is to create a framework where they can't "opt in" to energy issues, but rather they have to carry them out as a high priority item. They must be held to a high standard which they can then make decisions from and in relationship to - and be accountable to the citizens they are supposed to serve. They will not inherently look 10, 20, 50 years out but the buildings they build and control and refurbish will be around that long consuming energy in a less than optimal manner, which costs money and means higher taxes.

The wording of all of these questions is going to skew the results as people cannot connect the statements to the answers choices. Surveys need to be broken into brief one-thought statements for people to agree or disagree. With more than one thought you can agree AND disagree.

This is an example where the wording of these statements is very tricky. (2-1)  
"Do not" does not work when the answer clickers present a double negative. (2-2)  
"Rather" means instead. In fact someone could want 2-1 AND 2-2. (Anonymous)

I have found that once in place the energy efficient measures have made me aware of how much energy I was truly wasting before. I also now think of more ways to save energy and be more efficient in everyday activities. One example is because of the solar hot water, I now set the delay on my dishwasher for when I know the sun will be heating the water, instead of just starting it at 6am when I get up or 6pm when I am cleaning up after dinner. Just asking people to think about what they use, instead of thinking "it doesn't matter because the Town of Nantucket is paying the bill" will help.

as for 2-3: simply turning off of office equipment at the end of the workday and leaving off equipment until it's actually needed (do all printer/copiers see constant use each day??!!) could provide noticeable reduction in power use.

2-1 - Adopting numeric goals can have positive effects on our standing with the state. Smart growth Points) and also gives us a place to aim toward. Why would we not do that?

(2-1) This item contains the phrase "...at this time..." which lends to interpretation that the goals might instead actually be adopted in the future.

(2-2) This item appears to contain several statements and concepts that are worthy of separate discussion and consideration. The use of the word "...all..." in two places in the item should be examined in more detail since it makes the statements rather broad in scope and all encompassing or restrictive, when there might be need for a bit more flexibility.

(2-3) This item seems to be two distinct concepts, each worthy of consideration, but on different levels.

### **Policy Recommendation #3**

#### **Criteria for Designation as a "Green Community"**

##### *Survey questions*

Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with these statements:

- (3-1) Do not pursue designation as a Green Community for its own sake at this time. Pursue only those requirements for designation as a Green Community that make sense for Nantucket:
- (3-2) Continue to implement cost-effective plans to reduce energy consumption from the baseline that has been established
- (3-3) Develop and enforce policies to encourage efficient use of existing vehicles and purchases of fuel-efficient new vehicles. In particular: \* (1) Maintain an inventory of all vehicles that identifies vehicle make and model year, approved functions that determine the type of vehicle needed, requirements for the drive system (e.g., two-, four- or all-wheel drive) and other features; mile-per-gallon rating; and qualification as a heavy-duty vehicle, police cruiser, transport van, or other specialty vehicle, as and if applicable. (2) Monitor miles driven and fuel consumed for each vehicle in each department (which will be facilitated by the new fuel dispensing system). (3) Purchase energy-efficient regular and specialty vehicles whenever feasible and as models become commercially available. Require a demonstration that the specific model (e.g., pick-up truck or utility vehicle rather than a sedan) is required by the proposed function.

- (3-4) Do not pursue passage of the Stretch Code. Rather, (1) Encourage energy efficiency in existing buildings by promoting energy audits and assessments, and supporting the implementation of recommended energy efficiency improvements. (2) Encourage energy efficiency in new construction through education and promotion of the LEED program and comparable initiatives for voluntary improvement of energy efficiency. (3) Identify policies of Town boards that act as barriers to energy efficiency for renovations and new construction (e.g., strict requirements of the Historic District Commission or of the zoning code that conflict with energy-efficient construction), and find ways to surmount those barriers. (4) Facilitate efforts of local businesses and residents to implement energy efficiency measures by helping local contractors to get certified to perform energy efficiency services through state- and utility-sponsored programs.

*Survey responses*

	3-1 (#)	3-1 (%)	3-2 (#)	3-2 (%)	3-3 (#)	3-3 (%)	3-4 (#)	3-4 (%)
Strongly agree	10	22%	18	40%	21	47%	13	29%
Agree	15	33%	23	51%	15	33%	15	33%
Disagree	7	16%	0	0%	2	4%	1	2%
Strongly disagree	10	22%	0	0%	3	7%	5	11%
Don't know	3	7%	4	9%	4	9%	11	24%
Total	45	100%	45	100%	45	100%	45	100%

*Comments on Policy Recommendation #3*

(3-3) I agree to the extent that the life cost analysis supports that decision. Don't just do it.

(3-4) Again, I agree to the extent it makes economic sense.

Do not waste time just trying to make work for the ACK Energy office! There is no need to track vehicles, etc! Just let it alone. The BOS told you to focus on energy conservation - well, just help out and stop trying to make work for yourselves to justify the spending! If there's not much to do, then wrap it up and walk away. The Town of Nantucket has better things to do with its time than



trying to make up things to do for more and more employees / contractors.  
(Anonymous)

by focusing on efficient vehicles we could reduce demand for petroleum imports, and also introduce more electric/hybrid use.

More than 5 years ago the Town adopted ICLEA with help of Sustainable Nantucket - it has gone nowhere. A minimum requirement of ICLEA is baselining and inventory of town vehicles - manage these more effectively. Never done. Instead we have an electric charging station behind an empty building that used to house town offices. This proves town officials do not have a game plan and do not understand the true issues and meaning of leadership in this community. The Selectmen need a known and outspoken "champion" of this issue - energy efficiency - and they can't continue to water it down in public. Take it seriously but be practical - don't always "cry poor" - there are financing mechanisms. I suggest the Selectmen have an "Energy Advocate" - one of them has primary responsibility for understanding and always looking at the energy angle of all issues they are involved with. Pick one person, make them responsible for this, let everyone know - transparency, advocacy, progress.

3-3 would involve complex, time-consuming and expensive administrative costs.

I do not know the details or benefits of "Green Community" designation. I do not know what "baseline" has been established nor does any resident outside of municipal planning. I do not know the details of "stretch code" nor does any resident outside of municipal planning. (Anonymous)

3-3. Much of the content here is appropriate (buy the right vehicle for the right purpose) but hybrid technology should not be the assumed path. fuel efficient, blue-diesel, natural gas fleets, etc., feels right. I WOULD NOT support the incrementality of battery operated vehicle purchases as the only answer.

My home is LEED SILVER CERTIFIED. I really think that section 3-4 is an important step in making Nantucket homes more efficient. The solar panels on my home blend into the roof. They are the same color and at most angles really aren't visible. From plants to appliances, to the solar heat, hot water, the well, the reused materials, the GREEN building techniques. I live right next to the airport, and when my windows and doors are closed I can't hear the airplanes at all.

do NOT pursue designation as a Green Community under any circumstances

Does the established energy base line contain all the Nantucket Community influenced energy consumption, not just the Town Gov't energy use. It may enlighten us on currently unseen opportunities to improve our global green foot print. E.g. total propane, electricity, gasoline, fuel oil, etc.

The "Green Community" type programs are helpful to engage communities where they need some external incentives - I agree that Nantucket is self motivated as well as unique.

(3-1) This item contains two separate thoughts. First is whether to pursue designation as a Green Community (a concept I do not embrace for several reasons) and the sentence contains the phrase "...at this time..." As such, although I agree with not pursuing designation as a Green Community, my response should not be construed as being supportive of any future attempt to pursue such a designation. The Green Community Act has what I consider to be several onerous conditions that I believe are worthy of detailed discussion and review before there is consideration regarding designation as a Green Community under the Act. For example, the 69 page act contains at least five separate and detailed conditions. One of the five criteria would be for Nantucket to agree to upgrade municipally owned vehicles to more energy efficient vehicles and to continue that practice going forward. While this would potentially create an ongoing business opportunity for local and regional vehicle dealerships and maintenance operations, there are potential costs for purchasing the upgraded vehicles as well as ongoing maintenance costs and any additional cost for disposing of the replaced vehicles now and their replacements in the future. Existing police cruisers seem to be currently exempted from this upgrade requirement, but Nantucket would be required to commit to purchasing only certain fuel efficient police cruisers in the future. Police administrative vehicles are not exempt and would need to be upgraded in order to qualify under the GCA. I believe that many police cruisers, therefore, do not yet lend themselves to this type of efficiency. Additionally, do we know whether Nantucket "passes along" any of its retired vehicles, police cruisers included, to other municipal departments or are they disposed of in some other manner? This "pass along" practice is common in many municipalities. If it is something Nantucket does, then it would not be permitted under the GCA. Currently in place, non-complying vehicles would not be allowed to be passed along. Instead they would need to be replaced by new, complying vehicles.

There is a chart of vehicles that currently comply with the GCA energy efficient requirements. It should be shared with the various departments to try to get input regarding those vehicles before we make any policy or plans about it. The vehicles range from small compact passenger vehicles, mid-size and mini-compact cars, SUVs, station wagons, sub-compact cars, passenger and cargo vans, police cruisers, two and four wheel drive pick-up trucks and municipal four wheel drive work vehicles. It appears that heavy-duty vehicles such as fire trucks, ambulances and some public works vehicles are currently exempt.

My sense is that before Nantucket gets too deeply involved in this element of the GCA consideration process, that our police department, fire department, DPW and other municipal departments should be consulted about the vehicle upgrade requirements and how would their budgets be impacted. Can we first determine whether these vehicles have additional costs associated with them?

Also, from my read of the 69 page GCA, it requires that Nantucket would also need to formulated car-pooling requirements for municipal employees, establish preferred parking for hybrid vehicles, install bike racks at all municipal buildings and provide incentives for municipal employees to bike to work.

Additionally, the lure of funds for becoming a GCA community is sometimes viewed as being attractive. However, some communities have found that the cost of complying with the post-funding requirements (building changes, added parking requirements, equipment upgrades and the like) exceed the awards. There is a list of communities that have opted to not become GCA communities – perhaps an exploration of their reasoning would be beneficial.

(3-2) Mentions “...enforce policies to encourage efficient use....”, but the policies are not set out for consideration in replying to this item.

(3-3) These sound like good things to do. Would there be additional work or cost incurred to do these things? Sub-item (3) seems to be a separate concept that might be explained a bit more to understand how such a demonstration might be proved and reviewed.

(3-4) This is a good item to discuss with our builders, real estate people, the HDC, residents and others who may want to renovate or build, before we make final policy about it. There are several sub-item numbers, each worthy of a separate survey response. Sub-item (4) is of keen interest – there apparently is only one local bank participating in the HEAT Loan program and its loan limit is well below the amount set by off-island banks and regional banks. Perhaps we might try to ask that the local limit match what is offered elsewhere...or that the other banks participate. Massachusetts already has one of the most energy efficient building codes on the books without having to deal with the Stretch Code and its automatic upgrades / updates. We might think about looking at the Green Building Council’s Green Energy Code items that we might embrace...they have

some people on their staff who would come to Nantucket to meet with us to show how that might be something to consider and what additional building costs it might entail. Stakeholder input is important for all of the sub-items listed.

**Policy Recommendation #4**  
**Involvement in the Development of Electric Generating Facilities from Renewable Sources**

*Survey questions*

Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with these statements:

- (4-1) Evaluate Town participation in the development of electric generating facilities from renewable sources on a case-by-case basis.
- (4-2) Cooperate with and participate in feasibility studies related to renewable resource development that are funded or conducted by others. Advocate for such studies to address at an early stage the potential adverse environmental and nuisance impacts of development, especially those of particular concern on Nantucket .
- (4-3) Have the Town own and develop only those facilities that would be so small or so integrated into existing facilities (e.g., solar PV panels integrated into a roof replacement project, or waste heat recovery as part of a facility ventilation system upgrade) that it would be infeasible for such facilities to be developed or owned by a private entity.
- (4-4) For all other potential development opportunities for renewable electric generation on Town-owned land, procure a private developer through a competitive process that maximizes benefits to the Town. Avoid participation in facility ownership or financing unless the Town would (a) receive compelling economic benefits; (b) would be exposed to minimal risks; and (c) would experience minimal adverse impacts.
- (4-5) Before procuring a private developer for a renewable electric generation opportunity on Town-owned land, pre-screen the site to identify potential fatal flaws and significant development permitting barriers. Defer the

procurement process until site issues are understood regarding potential visual impacts (i.e., requirements for HDC approval), potential impacts on protected species (i.e., requirements for state- or federally-mandated conservation and management plans), potential impacts on wetlands (via consultation with the Conservation Commission) and constraints regarding property ownership and leasing.

- (4-6) Conduct a systematic inventory of Town-owned facilities and land to identify opportunities for development of solar PV facilities and geothermal ground-source heat pumps consistent with the principles stated above.
- (4-7) Defer Town sponsorship of large wind turbine generating facilities until the potential adverse environmental and nuisance impacts of development, especially those of particular concern on Nantucket, are addressed satisfactorily.
- (4-8) Be receptive to proposals to develop privately-owned gasification or other facilities that might utilize waste residuals received at the landfill as a feedstock. Ensure that such studies address at an early stage (a) integration and consistency with other activities for solid waste management; and (b) potential adverse environmental and nuisance impacts of development, especially those of particular concern on Nantucket.

***Survey responses***

	4-1 (#)	4-1 (%)	4-2 (#)	4-2 (%)	4-3 (#)	4-3 (%)	4-4 (#)	4-4 (%)
Strongly agree	23	51%	19	42%	11	24%	8	18%
Agree	16	36%	18	40%	16	36%	21	47%
Disagree	1	2%	1	2%	6	13%	7	16%
Strongly disagree	3	7%	4	9%	8	18%	6	13%
Don't know	2	4%	3	7%	4	9%	3	7%
Total	45	100%	45	100%	45	100%	45	100%

	4-5 (#)	4-5 (%)	4-6 (#)	4-6 (%)	4-7 (#)	4-7 (%)	4-8 (#)	4-8 (%)
Strongly agree	11	24%	17	38%	8	18%	11	24%
Agree	22	49%	23	51%	15	33%	22	49%
Disagree	4	9%	2	4%	6	13%	3	7%
Strongly disagree	6	13%	3	7%	13	29%	5	11%
Don't know	2	4%	0	0%	3	7%	4	9%
Total	45	100%	45	100%	45	100%	45	100%

***Comments on Policy Recommendation #4***

This is a back door toward restarting the entire wind turbine issue all over again!!! What about the past year do you not understand?? TWO turbines were rejected within 6 months of each other. THE TOWN DOES NOT WANT TURBINES! Take that off the table! Why do you people think that Nantucket has to become energy independent, or create symbols to the world that "we are doing our part"?? Why don't you focus on the important things like making sure that all energy coming on island is as clean as possible without destroying people's health, property values and our historic scenic vistas that we all love so much? What about all of this do you not understand?? (Anonymous)

re 4-7, this evaluation becomes too politicized and will indefinitely delay a switch to renewables by those who don't understand the responsibility, and who are willing to lie to their neighbors to scare them - witness the actions of Common Sense Nantucket. (Anonymous)

What can I say.....changing things is hard. I wish you the best of luck in all this. Nantucket has such a great opportunity to come from behind - it is so far behind 110+ other Massachusetts communities who have adopted Green Communities Act. And that's just in Massachusetts, not nationally. People respond to incentives, not gimmicks. One Florida community gives you a break on property taxes if you buy a Prius (or similar efficient car, smaller vehicles). Another helps finance through PACE programs the installations of solar "THERMAL" (heat and hot water, not electricity).

Perhaps a way to slowly impact how HDC thinks is to have as part of its application process a section about "alternative energy systems" - a checkbox (have you looked into it, do you have an area where it might make sense - not easily viewed from the road). Make the HDC provide a clear and ongoing map of ALL island alt energy systems approved, installed to date so everyone knows that they are out there. Let's institutionalize the review of all HDC applications to specifically look at alternative energy as a real option. Put it on the form. Clarify their rules. Do this with purpose rather than by exception, with the resulting fights and disagreements and frustration of the CITIZENS who want to do it. Other communities hold up renewables as a source of pride. We fear the HDC.

The English in 4-3 is so tortured that I don't understand the question.

Again, the wording is tricky. I can want 4-3 and 4-4 but 4-3 says "only." Every project should be considered on a case-by-case basis. Period. These statements are too broad. (Anonymous)

complicated issues and language is such that I question use-ability of respondents.

I did not understand the wording of 4-1.

Do NOT get involved in wind turbine electricity generation business either directly or indirectly by leasing land to a wind turbine developer. It is too controversial and the economics are questionable. With the new sources of natural gas it will become even more unlikely that wind turbine projects will be financially viable. It is too big a financial risk to take.

For what it's worth, question 4-7 is somewhat biased, as it implies that there are legitimate "nuisance impacts" with properly-sited large scale wind projects, which is simply not the case. Reasonable people may disagree about the aesthetic or visual impacts of large wind turbines, but with proper setbacks from neighboring homes the sound and flicker impacts will be minimal, and certainly not a nuisance. Sometime very soon we need to get real here--i.e., focus on the real issues at stake here for ACK, which are serious matters of climate change and sea-level rise, not the visual impacts of 500' wind towers!

We have already studied the landfill site for wind turbines since 2007 and spent thousands of dollars in state grants. The wind resource is 16 to 21 feet per second

and the only thing stopping a turbine is a well funded and smart opposition group and no support from the current selectmen and finance committee. If a vendor built a turbine at the landfill and all the town had to do was sign a PPA that would work very well. But town meeting is hopelessly hostile to wind here...

MORE TURBINES! We have the best wind in the state, may be even the country. We're dopes for not using it. Wind is an historic resource used by residents for hundreds of years. What is the old mill? A wind turbine!

I further believe that the greatest incentive happens when there is a direct and substantial impact on each of our wallets. Examples of prompt, privately directed efficiencies have happened every time the cost of fuel rises (or is believed to rise very soon) and stops when it doesn't. When prices of our finite fossil fuels are driven down by short term profits we not only risk our future security, but create barriers for easy improvements and encourage outright waste. There is a time when it makes sense to impose a price rise to create action (at the same time dropping all incentives such as gov't grants, tax credits, etc. while eliminating their associated bureaucracy). Maybe use it to pay off our nation debt.  
Amen.....

(4-2) This appears to be two separate issues, each worthy of its own survey consideration.

(4-3) Seems to be in need of lots of research regarding feasibility (financial as well as structural) before going much further. Infrastructure issues come to mind as does the structural integrity, for example, of roof construction on any building under consideration.

(4-4) This item seems to be two separate items, each worthy of consideration separately. How would the conditions set forth in sub-items (a), (b) and (c) be evaluated and determined?

(4-5) This items has multiple concepts expressed that are worthy of individual responses and considerations. This item also assumes a private developer would be an acceptable option. As the zoning articles are currently written, the Town might be at risk in the event a developer fails to perform or the project does not function as intended. The issues facing Falmouth right now are a prime example of a Town getting stuck with unbudgeted costs. Additionally, the failure of certain alternative energy developers in the State at this time is causing additional unbudgeted costs for other Towns. Perhaps a review of the specific bylaws in order to protect the Town finances and the tax base would be a good goal before looking to engage private developers under the current situation. We have learned



much over the past few years that should be prudently reviewed in the context of revisiting certain zoning bylaw articles and other requirements.

(4-6) I feel this item needs some further discussion and explanation as set forth above, for example, in the comment about item (4-3) and (4-5).

(4-7) This item seems to be worded so as to set small turbines into a separate category from large turbines, without defining what a large turbine means. The proper siting of any wind turbine is an important consideration in any discussion about this form of alternate energy. Additionally, in my belief, based on the current peer reviewed scientific and medical documentation that the proper siting of wind turbines must also be such that they are, in the words of other folks more versed than I, sited & designed to protect valuable ecosystems, the neighboring families, property owners, workers, visitors and biodiversity which are all equally important for our sustainable future. At the end of the item, the term "...are addressed satisfactorily..." is used, but there is no mention of what that means.

### **Policy Recommendation #5**

#### **Capacity to Participate in the Net Metering Program**

##### *Survey questions*

Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with this statement:

(5-1) Seek to procure and purchase up to 8,000 MWh per year of net metering credits from all available and permissible sources in a way that maximizes the financial benefits to the Town, without regard to ownership of such capacity. Reserve capacity to purchase in excess of 8,000 MWh per year as needed to support development of 2.4 MW of solar PV capacity on Nantucket, which would correspond to approximately 3,800 MWh per year of electricity generation.

***Survey responses***

	5-1 (#)	5-1 (%)
Strongly agree	<b>15</b>	<b>33%</b>
Agree	<b>17</b>	<b>38%</b>
Disagree	<b>2</b>	<b>4%</b>
Strongly disagree	<b>3</b>	<b>7%</b>
Don't know	<b>8</b>	<b>18%</b>
Total	<b>45</b>	<b>100%</b>

***Comments on Policy Recommendation #5***

Look, solar is grossly inefficient. Just look into the technology more and you will see this is true. 14% efficiency? Is that what you really want? When clean natural gas is over 90% efficient? Also, remember that the HDC has jurisdiction on what is allowed on roof tops, so don't waste your time to pursuing net metering credits when the HDC is unlikely to allow so many solar panels. Another "make - work" thing for the ACK Energy office. Finally, I hope that you show all of these comments to the Selectmen, Town Manager and assistant Town Manager - they need to be aware of ACK Energy taking a new borderline activist agenda and stop it now. The entire ACK Energy office is a waste of time. The BOS should NOT accept any more activist money from Wendy Schmidt - she is a huge supporter of wind turbines - and that is diametrically opposed to the wishes of the past two Town Meetings where the PEOPLE AND VOTERS OF THE TOWN OF NANTUCKET OVERWHELMINGLY REJECTED TWO TURBINES. I am begging the BOS to reject all of her money and allow the town to heal after 2012 nearly tore the community in half. (Anonymous)

No idea what this means when it says; "procure and purchase up to 8,000 MWh per year of net metering credits" (Anonymous)

bidding should also include creative partnerships with manufacturers with a direct fulfill (no requirements for distributors, local retailers) if beneficial to Town and residents.

yes, yes, yes

Agree only for solar and NOT wind turbines!  
Good luck with the Power Company. They don't like net metering.

(5-1) This is an important issue. Net-metering, as currently configured, seems to treat Nantucket differently than other Towns. Until that inequity is resolved, our involvement should proceed carefully. Would the concept set forth be compatible with individual and municipal caps for Nantucket? What would happen if the Net-Metering subsidy is revised by legislature or commission in the future...how would the economic viability of projects based on the net metering be addressed?

**Policy Recommendation #6**  
**Requirement to Purchase Energy Products and Energy-Related Services**  
**Through Competitive Procurement Processes**

*Survey questions*

Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with these statements:

- (6-1) Institute a requirement that the Town purchase all energy products and energy-related services through competitive bidding processes only, notwithstanding the specific exemption set forth in the state procurement law (Chapter 30B) for energy products and energy-related services. In particular, as a matter of policy, the Town would procure purchases of electricity from third-party competitive suppliers, and net metering credits from project developers, through competitive processes.
- (6-2) As part of the policy, the Town would encourage or, as appropriate, provide a preference for procurement that involves local trade workers, businesses and suppliers.
- (6-3) Exceptions would be limited to special products or services that would be exempt from the requirements of Chapter 30B due to their proprietary and unique nature even if there were no specific exemption for energy-related services, and that are projected to pay for themselves through reductions in operating costs over a short payback period. An example of the latter is installation of energy efficiency measures that are available only through

National Grid Direct Install Program or other municipal incentive programs and that are the subject of state-level regulatory scrutiny. In this context, proceed to implement energy efficiency measures that can be financed through electric bill payments such that the projected savings exceed the projected annual costs (that is, the overall impact is a reduction in electricity costs) and that have paybacks of less than two years.

***Survey responses***

	6-1 (#)	6-1 (%)	6-2 (#)	6-2 (%)	6-3 (#)	6-3 (%)
Strongly agree	7	16%	15	33%	9	20%
Agree	21	47%	20	44%	20	44%
Disagree	7	16%	2	4%	4	9%
Strongly disagree	1	2%	3	7%	3	7%
Don't know	9	20%	5	11%	9	20%
Total	45	100%	45	100%	45	100%

***Comments on Policy Recommendation #6***

We MUST support our local businesses, even if it costs more. (Anonymous)

If Nantucket wants to continue to attract educated and affluent tourists, we must implement a responsible switch to renewable energy, even if it costs more - this is consistent with the values and expectations of educated, younger demographic we hope to attract.

6-1 should have a cost or BTU threshold above which this would apply, to avoid getting bogged down for projects of minor size.

6-2 ....just get the best deal when it comes developing a project to reduce energy costs. (Anonymous)

bidding should also include creative partnerships with manufacturers with a direct fulfill (no requirements for distributors, local retailers) if beneficial to Town and residents.

6-1 is this without consideration for the green energy? and just is directed at the overall cost? (

(6-1) Lots of good ideas here. There are multiple concepts and ideas bunched into three items. The multiple ideas are each worthy of separate responses. Would item (6-1) have any additional costs associated with it? It mentions net-metering and project developers without detailing whether the project developers are private citizens, commercial developers or the Town

### **Policy Recommendation #7**

#### **Other Recommendations to Achieve Energy-Related Goals and Objectives**

##### ***Survey questions***

Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement with these statements:

- (7-1) Provide Town funding for professional staff and technical support resources directed to implement cost-effective measures to reduce the Town's energy consumption and energy purchase costs. Such staff resources would be available to provide technical support for Town department heads and facility managers on energy-related issues, and to facilitate procurement and implementation of services to implement energy efficiency measures in Town buildings.
  
- (7-2) Such staff resources would also be available to advise Town residents and businesses how to control their own energy consumption and costs, and to provide guidance and technical assistance on Town-level energy-related policy issues.

***Survey responses***

	7-1 (#)	7-1 (%)	7-2 (#)	7-2 (%)
Strongly agree	<b>11</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>29%</b>
Agree	<b>20</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>33%</b>
Disagree	<b>9</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>22%</b>
Strongly disagree	<b>3</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7%</b>
Don't know	<b>2</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9%</b>
Total	<b>45</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100%</b>

***Comments on Policy Recommendation #7***

(7-1) I am not in favor of a large staff / office presence for this purpose.

There is absolutely NO NEED for an energy office. There is nothing for you people to do except to try to make work for yourselves and justify the grant from Wendy Schmidt. Please, BOS, shut down ACK Energy! (Anonymous)

Only agree if such resources specialize in implementing green energy solutions, not just reducing cost.

All Selectmen upon taking office must undertake energy training. All department heads incentives have to be aligned too. Staff cannot be the champion all the time.)

7-1 would be an expensive duplication of efforts already available from energy suppliers and state/fed government agencies.

7-2 shifts the burden of implementing efficiency from the consumer to government, always a poor decision.

7-1 I agree with this ONLY for one year, for the staff to create a way to fund itself thereafter... by creating an Electric Aggregate, as the energy committee proposed years ago. It will save money for the town, ratepayers AND pay for such staff

ongoing. As is, it makes no sense to pay for staff and consultants when our BOS kills every one of the initiatives they propose.

7-2 This statement does not offer a proposal to agree/disagree.

BELOW... I think it is ridiculous to ask for peoples' names. You will get less results. (Anonymous)

manager level only with project specific outsourcing.

Bigger government...?? I don't think so

this survey is ponderous. in general i support energy studies, conservation of energy, and the research and implementation of technology which can improve life for islanders.

This should be handled by the officials we already have in place. I would rather see the current officials educated about these processes than pay for an entire new position that after a few years should be easy enough to follow guidelines.

Would like to see more discussion about off-peak usage/pricing as it might be helpful - both for The Town and home owners. We could find ways to reduce our peaks with some price incentive. See other comments made on earlier items

(7-2) Until such time as planning, zoning, health, historic district interfaces and coordination issues are better coordinated (policy and doctrine-wise), such assistance should embrace only the first portion of this two part statement.