

ISLAND PLAN

CHARTING THE FUTURE OF THE VINEYARD



Energy and Waste Forum July 11, 2007

Proceedings

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Presentations
3. Discussion
4. Final Evaluation

Please consult the separate Appendix that includes the poster, the agenda, the discussion paper, and the presentation.

The Island Plan Energy and Waste forum was held in the Katharine Cornell Theater in Tisbury from 7:30 to 9:30 pm

Attendance

A total of 53 people participated in this forum including members of the Steering Committee, the Energy and Waste Work Group, the Network of Planning Advisors, Island Energy and Waste organizations, town boards, MVC staff, and members of the general public.

<u>Moderator</u>	Linda Sibley, Steering Committee member
<u>Guest Speaker</u>	Warren Doty, Chilmark Selectman
<u>Energy and Waste Work Group Core</u>	Kristen Clothier, Phil Forest, Don Hatch, Kitt Johnson, Fred Lapiana, David Nash, Paul Pimentel, Bart Smith, Russell Smith, Paul Strauss, Sharon Strimling Florio, Kate Warner, Susan Wasserman and Bill Veno (MVC staff)
<u>MVC Staff</u>	Christine Brissette, Christine Flynn, Mark London, Ed O'Connell, Sarah Raposa, Donna Stewart
<u>Others</u>	Susan Scheuer, Dana Thibeau, Caron Soond, Ed Auld, Barbara Auld, Brian Nelson, Lee Fierro, David Nash, Robin Nash, Tess Bramhall, John Abrams, Christina Brown, Jim Hickey, Larry Gitlitz, Adam T Hayes, Holly Stephenson, Linda Thompson, Alexandra London-Thompson, Tomar Waldman, William L Skinner, Linda Cohen, Greg Morva, Lincoln Hanson, Michael Florio, Martha Shaw, Binnie Ravitch, Henry Stephenson, Gus Lewis, Art Flathers, Catherine Lowther, Judy Crawford, Tad Crawford, Ned Orleans, Mimi Davisson, Stephen O. Engh, Bill Strauss, Donna Strauss, Judith Scheuer, Timothy G. Connelly, Christine Rose

1. Introduction

Linda Sibley opened the Forum by introducing herself as the moderator and by welcoming members of the public. Ms. Sibley gave an overview of the Island Plan in addition to the planning process. She pointed out that the Discussion Paper is a summary of all of the work that has been done by the Energy and Waste Work Group this past winter and spring. The Discussion Paper should not be viewed as a final document but rather as a work in progress. The Energy and Waste Synthesis Document is a more detailed and comprehensive document, which will be modified over the summer and finalized by the end of the fall.

Ms. Sibley explained the format for the evening, namely a presentation of the emerging proposals by members of the Energy and Waste Work Group Core followed by an opportunity for feedback and discussion by participants.

Warren Doty, Chilmark Selectman, gave introductory remarks placing the Work Group's efforts into a global perspective. In regards to global warming, he said that in fifty years people may ask themselves, 'What were they thinking fifty years ago? How could they ignore the signs of climate change?' Alternatively, they could ask themselves, 'How did they figure it out? How did they know what they should do?' Mr. Doty referenced Al Gore's seven-point pledge to improve the world: some are aimed at individuals, others at governments, and still others at community groups. The Island Plan Energy and Waste Work Group's work is a community effort that asks the community to decide how it is going to address these mounting problems. It is very much in keeping with the adage: Think globally; act locally.

2. Presentation

Paul Pimentel of the Energy and Waste Work Group Core gave a PowerPoint presentation that summarized the issues, goals, emerging directions and promising initiatives as identified so far. The presentation was organized into the following categories:

- The Energy and Waste Situation Today
- Overall Goal
- Proposals divided into four subtopic areas:
 - Energy Efficiency
 - Self-Generation of Energy
 - Waste Management
 - Energy in Transportation

Readers are referred to a separate appendix to these proceedings, which includes three documents

- Forum Poster
- Forum Agenda
- Energy and Waste Discussion Paper
- PowerPoint Presentation

3. Discussion

The discussion took place in blocks of time, corresponding to each general topic in the presentation. At the beginning of each topic, the sense of the room was sought by asking for a show of hands for each of the Emerging Directions and Promising Initiatives, indicating whether people had the following preliminary opinion:

- **Blue:** Agree – High Priority
- **Green:** Agree
- **Orange:** Generally agree but have concerns (including wording)
- **Red:** Disagree

Energy and Waste Forum Voting Tally, Questions, and Comments					
		Agree Priority	Agree	Agree Concerns	Disagree
Energy Efficiency					
E1	Reduce energy needs by 50% through increased efficiency of energy use.	20+	4	1	0
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The assumptions of energy usage may not be correct. Demand could grow due to the increasing demands of new technology.</i> 				
P1	Move to becoming an incandescent-free island.	20+	6	5	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>CFLs have mercury and we need safe recycling facilities for compact fluorescent bulbs before moving forward. Note that both Tisbury and the Refuse District currently have the capacity for recycling CFLs.</i> ▪ <i>Technical improvements are needed in fluorescent lighting. These are not fully developed.</i> ▪ <i>LED devices are even more efficient than fluorescent and don't use mercury. However, they are not in general commercial distribution yet.</i> 				
P2	Require that new pools be solar-heated.	20+	3	5	0
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The wording should be clarified to indicate that not be that all new pools be heated, only that if a pool is to be heated, it should be by solar.</i> ▪ <i>It would also be desirable to convert all existing heated pools to solar, using education and/or incentives. This is very cost-effective.</i> ▪ <i>Plastic covers are often used to retain heat; however, they disintegrate easily and quickly. Perhaps they are less needed for solar-heated pools.</i> 				
P3	Adopt a Vineyard Energy Code requiring new construction to be more energy efficient.	20+	5	2	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The wording should make clear that this would be required only for those improvements which have a payback of no more than 10 years.</i> ▪ <i>Some participants thought that there should be an incentive to motivate people to do this, but it should not be an absolute requirement.</i> 				

		Agree Priority	Agree	Agree Concerns	Disagree
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Others felt that it has to be a requirement to be effective. Many owners of summer homes are in an income bracket that a financial incentive wouldn't make much difference. Pollution concerns and energy concerns are a public health and safety risk that justifies building code requirements. 				
P4	Require energy audits and upgrades upon property sales.	15	7	6	3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Again, this should only apply to upgrades with a payback of less than ten years. We have to be able to explain to people what kinds of property upgrades would be useful, such as installing new windows or upgrading insulation. There should be an exemption if it would undermine the historic character of buildings. Would this generate new unnecessary waste? A first step would be to just make the energy audit mandatory. Alternatively, there could be some mandatory upgrades and some recommended ones. The audit should take place right after the sale, so it doesn't hold up the sale. 				
Local Generation of Renewable Energy					
E2	Generate our own renewable energy.	28	8	2	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was a concern about the size of installation that would be required for the Island, especially if it was on land. There was a concern that large-scale renewable generation wouldn't work because it is difficult to store of energy. No mention was made of tidal power. The Work Group Core concluded that there are not many opportunities here. This has much more potential on the West Coast. 				
P5	Pursue local, large-scale generation of energy.	20+	6	5	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern was expressed that this doesn't make sense for the Vineyard and that it would involve creating a large bureaucracy. We should be more specific as to how this would be done. For example, that we are talking mainly about large offshore wind turbines. We should be clearer about the scale of wind turbines. We are talking about very large-scale turbines. The Hull turbines are mid-range and the one proposed for the Tisbury Park & Ride is small scale. We could use the terms: residential scale, municipal scale, and Island-wide scale. Several people were concerned about the possibility of using the State Forest either for photovoltaic arrays or for wind turbines. In comparing the centralized versus decentralized system, we need to include the cost of the distribution system, which could offset some of the cost savings of the centralized systems. 				

		Agree Priority	Agree	Agree Concerns	Disagree
Waste Management					
E3	Convert all our waste into resources.	28	3	5	0
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We should clarify that used materials (such as recyclables) would continue to be shipped off-Island, but that we should process them more fully to extract still useful materials, or to produce a more valuable 'resource' (e.g. sorted glass for recycling) for export. Clearly, we will not convert cars on-Island. Also, many high-tech products have toxic ingredients that will have to be exported for proper disposal ▪ We should be thinking about limiting the waste that we are importing before undertaking task of converting waste to resources; i.e. putting waste reduction responsibility in the manufacture of products. ▪ Did the work group considered incinerators? A: The work group does not recommend incinerators. ▪ We should include examples of how the waste would be converted to resources. ▪ We could do more education about recycling. ▪ We now have Red Cross boxes for reusing clothing 				
P6	Create an integrated, Island-wide waste conversion system.	20+	2	1	0
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What size of facility would be needed? ▪ We should pass the responsibility back to the source of waste generation – eliminate waste by manufacturers. ▪ We should find out what are the markets for waste. ▪ Someone mentioned an article from Bristol, Connecticut about converting waste to electricity. 				
Energy in Transportation					
E4	Reduce energy used for transportation.	29	6	0	0
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need to look at the whole transportation system. For example, the congestion created by driving around looking for parking causes pollution from idling engines. It was pointed out that hybrids don't idle. ▪ It was clarified that, in the transportation and energy estimates provide in the presentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Steamship Authority was included in costs, - No reduction in aviation fuel was included. - Gasoline figures include only fuel purchased on Island. ▪ Pleasure and fishing boating was omitted, as it is too diffuse. 				
P7	Promote the use of hybrid vehicles.	27	4	4	0
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need to consider the toxic elements in rechargeable batteries with respect to safety and the costs associated with disposal. ▪ We should consider response times for emergency vehicles. ▪ We should clarify what incentives are available for hybrid vehicles. Not everyone is prepared to pay the extra expense. ▪ Negotiate a discount for buying large quantities of hybrid vehicles (Ernie Boch Jr.?) ▪ Later, we could consider use of hydrogen vehicles and other innovative technologies. 				

		Agree Priority	Agree	Agree Concerns	Disagree
Comprehensive					
E5	Provide means to support energy generation and efficiency efforts.	20+	11	1	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need a funding mechanism to help pay for coordination, technical assistance, education, an information clearinghouse, and subsidies for improvements. ▪ It was suggested that we refer to "incentives" rather than "means". Concern was expressed about creating bureaucracy. ▪ We need to thoroughly debate what is public and what is private; what is compulsory and what is voluntary. 				
Additional Feedback					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We should be using more biodiesel, especially for the Steamship Authority, buses. There is a health issue of schoolchildren and diesel fumes. ▪ The comment was made that these were terrific proposals, really on track. These initiatives are all valid and important. ▪ We should look first at public energy use, such as municipal buildings and public transit. ▪ We need to prioritize those initiatives that give the biggest bang for the buck. ▪ We should look for mentoring examples in other communities ▪ We should establish and publish timelines for the short-term goals, with clear milestones. The Vineyard Energy Project is focusing on the short-term strategies. ▪ We should encourage everyone to recycle. Tisbury picks up recyclables, but Oak Bluffs doesn't. ▪ There have been many gloomy predictions in the past twenty years, but in the past two years, there has been a sea change in interest in these issues. ▪ Are there opportunities for bartering our local strengths in renewable wind energy for another region's tidal energy? ▪ Waste wasn't treated adequately in this presentation or discussion. We need to work on this more. ▪ This forum had a helpful presentation of the research. It had good energy about saving energy. 				

Meeting notes were prepared by Sarah Raposa, Mark London and Bill Venio.



ISLAND PLAN

c/o MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION, BOX 1447, OAK BLUFFS, MASSACHUSETTS, 02557
TEL 508-693-3453 FAX 508-693-7894 WWW.MVCOMMISSION.ORG