

**CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE
AUGUST 24, 2017
MINUTES**

The regular meeting of the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission's Project Review Committee was held on Thursday, August 24, 2017 in the Conference Room of the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission.

Committee Members Present:

Byron Atwood –	Town of Barre Town
Gerry D'Amico –	Town of Roxbury, Alternate
Brian Fitzgerald –	Town of Duxbury, Chair
Laura Hill-Eubanks –	Town of Northfield
Janet Shatney –	Barre City
Jamie Stewart –	Central Vermont Economic Development Corporation

Committee Members Absent:

Bob Wernecke –	Town of Berlin
----------------	----------------

Others Present:

Eric Vorwald, AICP –	CVRPC Senior Planner
----------------------	----------------------

CALL TO ORDER

With a quorum present, Mr. Fitzgerald called the regular meeting of the CVRPC Project Review Committee to order at 4:02pm.

CHANGES OR AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

No changes to the agenda were offered.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Hill-Eubanks made a motion to approve the June 28, 2017 minutes with several corrections noted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Shatney. With no further discussion, the Committee voted 5 – 0 in favor of the motion to approve the June 28, 2017 minutes as corrected.

REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS & PETITIONS THAT MAY QUALIFY FOR SUBSTANTIAL REGIONAL IMPACT & UPDATE ON PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

Mr. Vorwald noted that 15 new applications had been received since the last meeting, however none of the new applications met the current thresholds for Significant Regional Impact. He indicated that of the 15 applications, 13 were administrative amendments and two were minor notices.

Next Mr. Vorwald provided an update on the Cellco telecommunications tower located on the Shutesville Hill area in the Town of Waterbury and noted that the Hearing Officer had issued a proposal for a decision.

The Hearing Officer's proposal was for a denial of the petition, however Mr. Vorwald noted that the Public Utility Commission would make the final decision and the case is still pending.

REVIEW OF COMMITTEE PROCEDURES AND PROCESS

The Committee continued their discussion on the proposed Rule of Procedure and Rule of Process. First, the Committee discussed the updated draft Rule of Process. Mr. Vorwald highlighted the changes that had been made to the first draft. The Committee discussed several additional points to clarify the document in order to remove ambiguity. After the discussion concluded, Mr. D'Amico made a motion that was seconded by Mr. Atwood to adopt the draft Rule of Process with changes discussed. The Committee voted 5 – 0 in favor of the motion.

Next, the Committee reviewed the updated draft Rule of Procedure. Again, Mr. Vorwald highlighted the changes that had been made based on discussions at the June meeting. The Committee engaged in specific discussions regarding the general activities, membership, and communications from the Committee. After the discussion, Mr. D'Amico made a motion that was seconded by Ms. Shatney to adopt the draft Rules of Procedure with changes as discussed. The Committee voted 5 – 0 in favor of the motion.

At the conclusion of this discussion, Mr. Fitzgerald asked for a motion from the Committee to forward the updated drafts of the Rules of Procedure and the Rules of Process to the Executive Committee for their consideration and possible action by the full Board of Commissioners. Mr. Atwood made the motion which was seconded by Ms. Hill-Eubanks. The vote was 5 – 0 in favor of the motion.

REVIEW OF SUBSTANTIAL REGIONAL IMPACT

Mr. Vorwald introduced the draft Substantial Regional Impact (SRI) to the Committee and whether or not the general direction of the proposal seemed appropriate for how to address SRI. The discussion was focused on the approach more than the specifics in an effort to determine how to proceed. The Committee was generally supportive of the direction staff presented noting that having specific thresholds would create a level playing field where there were known expectations. Mr. Vorwald reiterated that the thresholds would be used to determine what projects were brought before the Committee for review and not necessarily the barometer for how a project would be evaluated. The Committee asked staff to follow-up on several items related to the relationship between SRI and the regional plan and staff noted that additional information would be presented at a future meeting to continue the discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

With no additional business to discuss, Mr. Fitzgerald called for a motion to adjourn which was offered by Ms. Shatney and seconded by Ms. Hill-Eubanks. The vote was 5 – 0 in favor of the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 6:03pm.