

CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Regional Plan Committee
Minutes
September 17, 2018

Present:

- Laura Hill-Eubanks, Chair
- Julie Potter
- Ron Krauth
- Dara Torre, Vice Chair
- Kirby Keeton

Staff: Bonnie Waninger, Laura Ranker, Pam DeAndrea

Guests: None

L. Hill-Eubanks called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm. Quorum was present to conduct business.

Adjustments to the Agenda

None.

Public Comment

None.

White River Tactical Basin Plan

L. Ranker discussed the Plan, noting that areas of Roxbury, Warren, Washington, and Williamstown are included in the White River watershed. Staff recommended the following changes to the draft Memo:

Page 2. Plan Conformance, 1. Stream Geomorphic Assessments (SGA):

- Add following paragraph: *CVRPC supports the Department of Environmental Conservation priority to focus on non-forested areas in determining segments for completion under the Stream Geomorphic Assessments. As a heavily forested community, CVRPC understands this may mean Williamstown is not included in the Second Branch SGA Assessment.*
- Edit wording of first arrow bullet point to read: *Make it a priority to complete the Phase II SGA for the entire section of the Second Branch, including consideration of waterways in Williamstown, and develop a River Corridor Plan. In Table 20, Strategy #1, Town Column, identify Williamstown.*

Page 4. Other Comments:

- Under 10th arrow bullet, add "Table 20" reference after the word Strategy.
- Under 11th arrow bullet, add a sentence; *"CVRPC will provide a corrected and updated table for Appendix F."*

1 Committee members requested staff make the following changes:

- 2 • Clarify the table title for ease of reading by the average citizen, making it clearer and helping it
- 3 convey the table's purpose more fully.
- 4 • Verify consistency of formatting. Ex. insure all Goals are in bold text.
- 5 • Add a footnote to clarify the purpose of highlighted text.
- 6 • Add a footnote to define "Septic Social" as defined in the Basin-9 Plan.
- 7 • Table Notes: Under Strategy #48 on page 40, reword note to read, "*Roxbury and Warren have*
- 8 *interim river corridor regulations. Roxbury and Williamstown do not have a completed River*
- 9 *Corridor Plan. Warren and Washington have a completed River Corridor Plan done in 2008 and*
- 10 *2014, respectively.*"

11
12 *J. Potter moved to recommend comments as amended to the Commission; D. Torre seconded. Motion*

13 *carried.*

14 **Preferred Site Designation**

15 **Municipal Planning Guidance Document:** The Committee offered the following comments on the draft

16 guidance document:

- 17
- 18
- 19 • Pg. 70 - The sentence is too long and complex. Use sub-bullets or multiple bullets.
- 20 • Pg. 71 - Modify to read "if a potential preferred site is within ___ feet of a municipal boundary
- 21 or would affect the aesthetics, water quality or natural resources of an adjacent municipality,
- 22 post a notice..."
- 23 • Pg. 72 - Strike "geothermal" as it is not a viable electric generation option in Vermont.
- 24 • Pg. 73
- 25 - First sentence - Strike "Digging deeper into...". Use "carefully evaluating..."
- 26 - Solar Siting Requirements – Does this have to be free standing or can it be within the
- 27 bylaws? [Note: Statute says "freestanding".
- 28 - Last paragraph – Add text to explain why a community might want to de-designate a
- 29 preferred site. Add text to suggest municipalities consider whether the designation of a
- 30 site for renewable energy generation means the municipality believes the site should not
- 31 be used for other types of development.
- 32

33 **CVRPC Preferred Sites Engagement Flow Chart:** Staff reviewed three types of plans to clarify terms:

- 34
- 35 • *Adopted* plans have been adopted by the legislative body or through a town vote based on the
- 36 municipality. These plans are not required to meet all statutory requirements.
- 37 • *Approved* plans have been reviewed by the municipality's RPC and were found to meet all
- 38 statutory requirements per 24 V.S.A. § 4350(b)(1).
- 39 • *Certified* plans have been reviewed by the municipality's RPC and were found to meet the Public
- 40 Service Department energy planning standards.
- 41

1 The Committee discussed designation of a single site outside of a comprehensive municipal planning
2 process. Members suggested CVRPC could “green light” a site if:

- 3
- 4 • The site was designated as preferred in an approved and certified municipal plan. This type of
5 designation does not require RPC review under PUC Rule 5.0.
- 6 • The specific parcel was included as a preferred site in an approved municipal plan.
- 7 • The municipality demonstrates the specific parcel meets a town “category” for municipal sites,
8 similar to the way the state uses specific categories. Ex. brownfields.
- 9

10 The Committee discussed an “emergency fix” for other sites. Initial elements for regional support of the
11 municipal decision would include:

- 12
- 13 • Public engagement is robust/enhanced.
- 14 • The municipality demonstrates the site use is compatible with the adopted municipal plan.
- 15 • The municipality demonstrates why the site is preferred locally based on criteria it previously
16 developed. (The municipality demonstrates its decision process.)
- 17 • The certified municipal plan includes a criteria or process for designating preferred sites and the
18 municipality demonstrates the site meets the criteria or the process was used for the site.
- 19

20 **Meeting Minutes**

21 *J. Potter moved to approve the January 31, July 16, and August 29, 2018 meeting minutes as presented;*
22 *D. Torre seconded. Motion carried.*

23

24 **Next Meeting**

25 Staff will poll Committee members regarding a date for the next meeting. The Committee requested the
26 agenda focus on expanding the flow chart about RPC engagement in preferred sites discussions.

27

28 **Adjourn**

29 *J. Potter moved to adjourn at 6:15 pm; D. Torre seconded. Motion carried.*