

CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Project Review Committee

Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission

Approved Minutes

October 25, 2018

Committee Members:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Byron Atwood, Barre Town Commissioner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	John Brabant, Calais Commissioner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jerry D’Amico, Roxbury Commissioner (Alternate Seat)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Laura Hill-Eubanks, Northfield Commissioner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Janet Shatney, Barre City Commissioner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Bob Wernecke, Berlin Commissioner

1
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

Staff: Clare Rock

Guests: Jackie Higgins, Williamstown Town Administrator; Alex Bravakis, Novus Energy Development, LLC; Peter Carbee, Town of Washington Representative.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Janet Shatney at 4:08pm.

Adjustments to the Agenda

None.

Public Comments

None.

Preferred Site Designation

Presentation & Request from Alex Bravakis, Novus Energy Development, LLC (Williamstown) Bravakis provided a summary of the project as outlined within the committee packet. He noted that they first looked at the UniFirst Site (former dry cleaner site, current brownfields, with on-going monitoring.) Due to mixed community sentiment, looked toward another municipally owned property – the water tower site. The town is interested in a net-metered project, it will power the water tower plus the sewer pump station. May also look to have the school hook on also. The solar project will power the equivalent of 30 homes. Novus has undertaken some additional environmental evaluation of the site and presented a site map which was developed by Arrowwood Environmental which delineates a wetland based upon a field investigation. No wetlands were identified on the ANR Atlas map. The array would be located outside of a 50ft wetland buffer. The existing access road would be used and extended to the solar site.

Discussion followed and included identification of the pros of the project which include: it’s not highly visible from the road or the neighbor, it’s on marginal ag soils, its small scale, on municipal land and is located close to the demand. The few con’s included: it’s a WEC project which may mean WEC rate payers might have to cover the cost of excess energy which is generated and dumped because it cannot be used within the system.

Shatney referenced the memo as included in the packet and noted that the site is located within the Regional Plan’s Resource Plan Use Planning Ara. Staff described the Resource Area and listed the

1 reasons why an area would be include in the Resource Area. Looking at the GIS data it appears the only
2 reason the site is within the Resource Area is because it is municipally owned – it doesn't contain any of
3 the sensitive environmental features which would classify it as a resource area. The GIS data identified
4 the property as a town forest. Jackie Higgins stated the site is not the town forest. This indicated the
5 value of looked at specific sites on a case by case basis. The committee agreed the site doesn't contain
6 any of the resources which may preclude the site from being used for the project.

7
8 The committee also stated that while they support the site, this doesn't equate to full support of the
9 entire project – only support of the location of the project. The committee still reserves the ability to
10 review the 45-day notice and the Petition and comment on other aspects of the project. The committee
11 also decided to not review the Preferred Site Request against the other Regional Plan Goals and Policies
12 as listed within the Staff Memo, as this can be part of the review of the entire project once the formal
13 application process has been initiated.

14
15 *J Brabant made a motion to approve the Williamstown Site as presented as a Preferred Site, seconded by*
16 *B Atwood, all in favor. Motion carried.*

17 18 **Projects of Substantial Regional Impact**

19 - Fecteau Residential, Inc – continued discussion and staff review
20 Staff provided a summary of the project from the last meeting. Shatney added that Barre City has
21 reviewed the project and approves the connection of the proposed neighborhood to City sewer,
22 stormwater and connecting to City roads. The Barre Town DRB approved the project, but the City of
23 Barre has to enter into an agreement with the developer as the property is located on the municipal
24 boundary and will rely on some City infrastructure. Discussion followed about school impacts, lack of
25 archeological resources and other items which were included in the Act 250 application.

26
27 *B Atwood made a motion to find the Fecteau Project in conformance with the Regional Plan, seconded*
28 *by J Brabant, all in favor. Motion carried.*

29
30 Limited committee discussion followed based upon a review of the most recent Committee Rules of
31 Procedure (dated 9/12/2017) and Rules of the Process (dated 9/12/2017) which were provided to
32 Committee ahead of the meeting. The Rules confirm the Committee has the ability to support, approve
33 or confirm these types of projects without making a recommendation for full board approval.

34 35 **Updates on other Act 250 & Section 248 Applications**

36 Staff provided a brief overview of the items listed on the Project Summary Sheet as contained within the
37 packet. General discussion followed about the projects currently underway in the City of Montpelier.

38 39 **Meeting Minutes**

40 *J D'Amico made a motion to approve the September 27, 2018 minutes, seconded by B Atwood, all in*
41 *favor. Motion carried.*

42 43 **Next Meeting**

44 The next meeting is scheduled for Nov 15, based upon the absent members availability.

45 46 **Adjournment**

47 *J D'Amico made a motion to adjourn at 5:20 pm, seconded by J Brabant, all in favor. Motion carried.*
48