



**CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission Conference Room  
29 Main Street, Suite #4, Montpelier, VT 05602  
September 28, 2017  
4:00pm

**AGENDA**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The Chair will call the meeting to order and ask for introductions of those individuals who are present.

**2. CHANGES OR AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

The Committee should determine if any alternations to the agenda should be made at this time.

**3. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Members of the public are encouraged to speak on items not on the agenda.

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Draft minutes from the August 24, 2017 Project Review Committee Meeting are included for review and consideration of approval.

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

Staff will provide the Committee with an update and overview of applications that have been received and any changes to the status of previously reviewed applications. A summary is ***included*** with the agenda packet.

**6. REVIEW OF SUBSTANTIAL REGIONAL IMPACT**

The Committee should continue its discussion regarding thresholds for Substantial Regional Impact. The Committee will be asked to provide feedback regarding specific uses that may qualify for Substantial Regional Impact as outlined in the draft information. The Committee should also identify any other uses that may be appropriate to include. This will be an on-going discussion for the Committee and it is anticipated that discussions will occur over several meetings. A draft of the Substantial Regional Impact criteria is ***included*** with the agenda packet.

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

If no additional business is required the Committee should consider a motion to adjourn.

**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.



**PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE  
SUMMARY SHEET  
SEPTEMBER 28, 2017**

The following is a list of projects that have been received by staff since the last project review committee meeting. Staff will provide a general overview of the projects if necessary to determine if additional discussion is warranted at a future meeting.

<b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>	<b>APPLICATION TYPE</b>	<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>PROJECT SUMMARY</b>
1	Act 250 – Administrative Amendment	Moretown	Conversion of a pulp and paper making facility in Moretown from a commercial use to classrooms for special needs students from around the region
2	Act 250 – Administrative Amendment	Waterbury	Addition of a one bedroom accessory apartment to an existing three bedroom home
3	Act 250 – Administrative Amendment	Warren	Change of the permitted use in an existing subdivision to increase the number of bedrooms on two lots from 3 bedrooms to 4 bedrooms
4	Act 250 – Administrative Amendment	Marshfield	Change in the layout and relocation of a storage building for a proposed residential development with no change in the number or size of units
5	Act 250 – Major Notice	Warren	Issuance of a permit based on an appeal to the Environmental Court
6	Section 248 – Telecommunications Petition	Barre City	Construction of an approximately 55 foot telecommunication pole in a GMP right-of-way located in an existing industrial/residential
7	Section 248 – Electric Generation Petition	Barre City	Reconstruction of an existing power generation substation to include new equipment and increased security measures
8	Section 248 Electric Generation 45 day notice	Barre Town	Reconstruction of an existing power generation substation to include upgraded equipment, increased security measures, and a temporary facility to limit power disruptions



September 29, 2017

Ms. Judith Whitney, Clerk  
State of Vermont Public Utility Commission  
112 State Street, 4th Floor  
Montpelier, Vermont 05620-2701

**RE: PUC Case Number 17-4070-PET – Verizon Wireless - Zan Street Cell Tower – Barre City**

Dear Ms. Whitney;

The Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission (CVRPC) received a petition on behalf of Verizon Wireless for a Certificate of Public Good on September 1, 2017. This petition is for the construction of a telecommunications tower to be located on Zan Street in Barre City. The project will consist of a new utility pole to be located in the Green Mountain Power right-of-way and new cellular communication equipment.

On September 28, 2017, the CVRPC's Project Review Committee met and discussed this project in relation to consistency with the Regional Plan and the possibility of this project meeting the thresholds for Substantial Regional Impact. At this meeting, the Project Review Committee determined that the above referenced project does not currently qualify as a project having Substantial Regional Impact as noted in the CVRPC's policies and procedures.

Based on this determination, the CVRPC does not intend to submit testimony or comments on this project. However, the CVRPC reserves the right to reevaluate this project and provide comments if conditions or circumstances regarding this petition were to change. Please feel free to contact the CVRPC if you have any questions or need additional information.

Regards,

Eric Vorwald, AICP  
Senior Planner

Cc: Certificate of Service List as attached



September 29, 2017

Ms. Judith Whitney, Clerk  
State of Vermont Public Utility Commission  
112 State Street, 4th Floor  
Montpelier, Vermont 05620-2701

**RE: PUC Case Number 17-3862-PET – Green Mountain Power South End Substation Rebuild  
– Barre City**

Dear Ms. Whitney;

The Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission (CVRPC) received a petition on behalf Green Mountain Power Corporation for a Certificate of Public Good on August 30, 2017. This petition is for the demolition and reconstruction of an existing power substation located at 121 South Main Street in Barre City. The project will consist of upgrades to the equipment and new fencing at the site, but generally maintain the existing footprint.

On September 28, 2017, the CVRPC's Project Review Committee met and discussed this project in relation to consistency with the Regional Plan and the possibility of this project meeting the thresholds for Substantial Regional Impact. At this meeting, the Project Review Committee determined that the above referenced project does not currently qualify as a project having Substantial Regional Impact as noted in the CVRPC's policies and procedures.

Based on this determination, the CVRPC does not intend to submit testimony or comments on this project. However, the CVRPC reserves the right to reevaluate this project and provide comments if conditions or circumstances regarding this petition were to change. Please feel free to contact the CVRPC if you have any questions or need additional information.

Regards,

Eric Vorwald, AICP  
Senior Planner

Cc: Certificate of Service List as attached (2 pages total)



September 29, 2017

Mr. Doug Best, Project Manager  
Vermont Electric Power Company, Inc.  
366 Pinnacle Ridge Road  
Rutland, VT 05701

**RE: PUC Case Number 17-4144-AN –VELCO Substation Rebuild– Barre Town**

Dear Mr. Best;

The Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission (CVRPC) received a 45 day advanced notice of a project filing on behalf of the Vermont Electric Power Company, Inc. (VELCO) for a Certificate of Public Good on September 7, 2017. This advanced notice relates to a project that will consist of the demolition and reconstruction of an existing power substation located at 411 Upper Prospect Street in Barre Town. The project will consist of equipment and building upgrades to an existing facility and will also include new security measures such as an expanded fence, cameras, and lighting. The new substation will utilize the existing building site but will require a temporary facility to be constructed during the process to maintain electric service in the area.

On September 28, 2017, the CVRPC's Project Review Committee met and discussed this project in relation to consistency with the Regional Plan and the possibility of this project meeting the thresholds for Substantial Regional Impact. At this meeting, the Project Review Committee determined that the above referenced project does not currently qualify as a project having Substantial Regional Impact as noted in the CVRPC's policies and procedures.

Based on this determination, the CVRPC does not have any specific comments to provide regarding this advanced notice. However, the CVRPC reserves the right to reevaluate this project and provide comments if conditions or circumstances regarding this petition were to change when final submission is received. Please feel free to contact the CVRPC if you have any questions or need additional information.

Regards,

Eric Vorwald, AICP  
Senior Planner

Cc: Ms. Judith Whitney, Clerk, Vermont Public Utility Commission  
James Porter, Esq. Vermont Department of Public Service  
Jennifer Duggan, General Counsel, Vermont Agency of Natural Resources



**PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
*SUBSTANTIAL REGIONAL IMPACT CRITERIA*

September 28, 2017

**DRAFT v.2**

**PURPOSE:** To provide a uniform, consistent, and quantifiable measure for evaluating land development projects to determine if they are regionally significant.

**PROCESS:** The Project Review Committee will use this criteria to evaluate the regional impacts a land development project may have in order to determine consistency with the Central Vermont Regional Plan. Projects that meet or exceed these thresholds will be evaluated for consistency with the Regional Plan and to determine if a regional impact (either positive or negative) exists. The Project Review Committee will review the proposal against the specific criteria to determine if comments regarding consistency with the Central Vermont Regional Plan will be provided. Comments will be sent to the District 5 Environmental Commission or the Vermont Public Utility Commission, as appropriate.

**GENERAL CRITERIA:** The following general criteria will apply to all applications that are submitted to the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission for review. If a project meets any of these criteria it will be considered to have a regional impact.

1. The project is located in more than one municipality or is located on property that is directly adjacent to a municipal boundary.
2. The project will impact a natural, historic, or significant resource that is identified in the Central Vermont Regional Plan. Examples include but are not limited to: rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat; wetlands, floodplains, river corridors, or named waterbodies; or similar regionally significant resources.
3. The project may require on-going participation by the Regional Planning Commission for a period of at least one calendar year.
4. The project proposes development that is inconsistent with the regional future land use map regarding the location or character of development type, density, or intensity.

**SPECIFIC CRITERIA:** The following specific criteria will apply to all applications that are submitted the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission for review. The municipality where the project is located will determine which threshold will be used to evaluate each project.

<b>SPECIFIC CRITERIA THRESHOLDS FOR SUBSTANTIAL REGIONAL IMPACT</b>		
<b>TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>MUNICIPALITIES WITH A POPULATION GREATER THAN 2,500<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>MUNICIPALITIES WITH A POPULATION LESS THAN 2,500</b>
<b>Office</b>	Greater than 30,000 gross square feet	Greater than 20,000 gross square feet
<b>Commercial</b>	Greater than 25,000 gross square feet	Greater than 15,000 gross square feet
<b>Wholesale &amp; Distribution</b>	Greater than 50,000 gross square feet	Greater than 30,000 gross square feet
<b>Hospitals &amp; Health Care Facilities</b>	Greater than 50 new beds; or generating more than 50 vehicle trips per day for new facilities or 25% increase of gross floor area for existing facilities	Greater than 10 new beds; or generating more than 25 vehicle trips per day for new facilities or 25% increase of gross floor area for existing facilities
<b>Housing</b>	Greater than 40 new lots or units	Greater than 20 new lots or units
<b>Industrial</b>	Greater than 50,000 gross square feet; or employing more than 100 workers; or covering more than 50 acres	Greater than 30,000 gross square feet; or employing more than 50 workers; or covering more than 20 acres
<b>Hotels</b>	Greater than 200 rooms	Greater than 75 rooms
<b>Mixed Use</b>	Gross square feet greater than 45,000 (with residential calculated at 1,500 square feet per unit); or covering more than 10 acres; or if any of the individual uses meets or exceeds a threshold defined herein	Gross square feet greater than 30,000 (with residential calculated at 1,500 square feet per unit); or covering more than 10 acres; or if any of the individual uses meets or exceeds a threshold defined herein
<b>Airports</b>	All new airports, runways, and runway extensions	
<b>Attractions &amp; Recreation Facilities</b>	Greater than 200 parking spaces or a seating capacity of more than 1,000	Greater than 75 parking spaces or a seating capacity of more than 500
<b>Schools &amp; Institutions (including post-secondary facilities)</b>	New school with a capacity of more than 750 students; or expansion by at least 25% of capacity	New school with a capacity of more than 200 students; or expansion by at least 25% of capacity
<b>Waste Handling Facility</b>	New facility or expansion of an existing facility by 50% or more	
<b>Quarries, Asphalt, &amp; Cement Plants</b>	New facility or expansion of an existing facility by 50% or more	

<sup>1</sup> Based on the 2010 U.S. Census, the municipalities with a population greater than 2,500 persons includes Barre City, Barre Town, Berlin, East Montpelier, Montpelier, Northfield, Waterbury, and Williamstown. All other municipalities have fewer than 2,500 persons.

**SPECIFIC CRITERIA THRESHOLDS  
FOR SUBSTANTIAL REGIONAL IMPACT**

TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT	MUNICIPALITIES WITH A POPULATION GREATER THAN 2,500 <sup>1</sup>	MUNICIPALITIES WITH A POPULATION LESS THAN 2,500
<b>Wastewater Treatment Facility</b>	New major conventional treatment facility or expansion of existing facility by 50% or more; or community septic treatment facilities exceeding 25,000 gallons per day or serving a development project that meets or exceeds an applicable threshold as identified herein	New major conventional treatment facility or expansion of existing facility by 50% or more; or community septic treatment facilities exceeding 10,000 gallons per day or serving a development project that meets or exceeds an applicable threshold as identified herein
<b>Petroleum Storage Facilities</b>	Storage greater than 100 barrels if within 1,000 feet of any water body; otherwise storage capacity of 200 barrels	Storage greater than 50 barrels if within 1,000 feet of any water body; otherwise storage capacity of 100 barrels
<b>Public Drinking Water Supply</b>	New facility or expansion of an existing facility by 50% or more	
<b>Intermodal Freight Terminals</b>	New facility or expansion of an existing facility by 50% or more	
<b>Intermodal Passenger Terminals</b>	New facility or expansion of an existing facility by 50% or more	
<b>Truck Stops</b>	A new facility with more than five diesel fuel pumps; or containing half an acre of truck parking; or 10 truck parking spaces	A new facility with more than three diesel fuel pumps; or containing half an acre of truck parking; or 5 truck parking spaces
<b>Correctional/Detention Facilities</b>	Greater than 100 new beds; or generating more than 150 peak hour vehicle trips per day	Greater than 50 new beds; or generating more than 100 peak hour vehicle trips per day
<b>Any other development types not identified above</b>	300 parking spaces; or, if applicable, more than 250 daily trips generated	100 parking spaces; or, if applicable, more than 150 daily trips generated

**ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS:** In addition to the criteria listed above, the following situations will be considered when evaluating a project against the thresholds for substantial regional impact.

1. **Speculative Developments** – If the final development type is difficult to determine or unknown because a project tenant has not been identified, the thresholds for the highest intensity development type allowed under current land use regulations will be used. If local regulations do not exist, staff will consult with the municipality and the applicant to determine the possible development type.
2. **Multi-Phased Developments** – If a project is proposed in multiple phases, the cumulative total of the project will be reviewed against the thresholds for substantial regional impact. If the total project meets or exceeds any of the identified thresholds, the entire project will

be reviewed for substantial regional impact regardless of the timing of phases. If, over the course of the project, the phasing or type of development changes, projects that have previously been reviewed for substantial regional impact will be reviewed again to determine if additional thresholds have been met.

3. Multiple Land Parcels – If parts of the project are located on separate land parcels, the decision whether the project is a single (perhaps multi-phased) development, or actually separate projects should be based on such considerations as whether the separate parcels are owned by the same entity, whether a master plan has been prepared for the overall project, or whether any approvals have been sought for the overall project as a unit.

**DEFINITIONS:** The following definitions will be used to further identify or describe the types of development that qualify for the thresholds listed in the table above.

1. Attractions & Recreational Facilities means an establishment or set of establishments that provide leisure time recreational or entertainment activities occurring in either an indoor or outdoor setting.
2. Petroleum Storage Facilities means facilities used to store gasoline, motor fuel, or other petroleum products.
3. Truck Stops means an establishment that provides fuel, parking, and related goods and services to primarily support interstate truck transportation. Such facilities do not include convenience stores that have the primary purpose of selling goods and services to support the traveling public.
4. Intermodal Freight Terminals means an area and building where the mode of transportation for cargo or freight changes and where the cargo and freight may be broken down or aggregated in smaller or larger loads for transfer to other land based vehicles. Such terminals do not include airports or seaports or facilities primarily intended for the transfer of people from passenger rail to other modes.
5. Intermodal Passenger Terminals means an area and building where people change transportation vehicles in order to complete a trip. This could include but is not limited to, rail, bus, passenger car, or taxi service.
6. Waste Handling Facilities means structures or systems designed for the collection, processing or disposal of solid waste, including hazardous wastes, and includes transfer stations, processing plants, recycling plants, and disposal systems.

7. Wholesale and Distribution means activities within land areas that are predominantly associated with the receipt, storage, and distribution of goods, products, cargo and materials.

Adopted by the Board of Commissioners: \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_ / 2017

---

Julie Potter, Chair  
CVRPC Board of Commissioners

DRAFT