

CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Town Plan Review Committee
Draft Minutes

April 25, 2019 at 5:00pm
Steele Community Room at the Waterbury Municipal Center
28 North Main Street, Waterbury, Vermont.

Committee Members:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bill Arrand, Worcester
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lee Cattaneo, Orange Commissioner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ron Krauth, Middlesex Commissioner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joyce Manchester, Moretown Alternate Commissioner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Jan Ohlsson, Calais Alternate Commissioner
<input type="checkbox"/>	Karla Nuissl, Berlin Alternate Commissioner (Alternate Seat)

Waterbury Representatives: Steve Lotspeich, Waterbury Community Planner; Ken Belliveau and Mary Koen, Waterbury Planning Commission members; Duncan McDougall, Waterbury LEAP; Allan Thompson and Mike Hedges, Waterbury Conservation Commission
Members of the public: Stewart Clark, Glenn Anderson, Josh O’Gorman, Gunner McCain, George McCain, Jim Schroeder, Jennifer McCabe, Jeanne and Scott Zuckerman.
Staff: Clare Rock

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Bill Arrand, Chair. Introductions were made.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

PUBLIC HEARING: APPROVAL OF THE TOWN OF WATERBURY MUNICIPAL PLAN AND CONFIRMATION OF THE LOCAL PLANNING PROCESS

B Arrand opened the hearing. S Lotspeich provided an overview of the municipal plan. S Clark, a Worcester Planning Commission member, asked if the Town of Worcester was a sent a copy of the plan as an adjoining municipality. S Lotspeich will double check. B Arrand provided a brief explanation of the purpose of the hearing.

S Clark read his prepared comments about the Waterbury Municipal Plan. His comments included a request to not approve the Waterbury Energy Plan due to the flawed wind energy plan methodology. And that no other local energy plans be approved until the Regional Plan methodology is fixed and the Waterbury Plan methodology is fixed. He stated the conflict between the presence of bear habitat and travel corridor in the Worcester range and in the Shutesville Hill area and the acceptance of wind resources to be sited in these same areas. Clark iterated the application of the wind methodology poses a conflict with wildlife in the area.

1
2 G Anderson, a Waterbury resident and member of the Worcester Range Collaborative opposed wind
3 siting and stated the conflict with the wildlife habitat corridors for Shutesville Hill. Anderson also voiced
4 concern about the municipal water source withdrawal process and the absence of information in the
5 municipal plan. Anderson requested the plan not be approved and be sent back to the town to work on
6 the wind siting topic, the identification of bear habitat and the Shutesville Hill corridor and the water
7 extraction information.

8
9 G McCain voiced support of the plan as written and stated that as a Waterbury resident they should
10 allow for wind and alternative forms of energy generation and suggests the plan maps are broad brush
11 and in the event of an application to build a renewable energy project more site specific information
12 would be required as part of the approval process.

13
14 A Thompson stated that the Conservation Commission recognizes the map are generalized and have
15 adequately identified the energy siting constraints. The CC understands there is more planning to do to
16 further identify and strengthen the protection of wildlife corridors.

17
18 J Zuckerman, Waterbury resident, wants to ensure the mountains sides remain pristine.

19
20 Discussion followed about the energy plan standards, the wildlife corridors and the future land use map.

21
22 J Ohlsson made a motion to close the hearing, seconded by R Krauth, all in favor. Motion carried.

23
24 **RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CVRPC BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS:**

25 **a. CONFIRMATION OF THE TOWN OF WATERBURY MUNICIPAL PLANNING PROCESS**

26 **b. APPROVAL OF THE TOWN OF WATERBURY MUNICIPAL PLAN**

27 **c. DETERMINATION OF ENERGY COMPLIANCE**

28
29 The committee discussed its role and staff stated that if the committee found the plan to have not met
30 one of the statutory requirements (specifically state goal #6) then a committee finding would need to
31 clarify why. After further discussion about the wind constraints and the identification of the wildlife
32 corridor and the future land use map the committee made the following motions:

33
34 J Ohlsson made a motion to recommend to the CVRPC Board confirmation of the local planning process,
35 seconded by Manchester, all in favor. Motion carried.

36
37 Motion by J Manchester to recommend to the CVRPC Board approval of the municipal plan with the
38 recommendation that the plan text on page 72 be corrected to reference the correct map, seconded by J
39 Krauth, all in favor. Motion carried.

40
41 Motion by ----- to recommend to the CVRPC Board the issuance of energy determination, seconded by J
42 Manchester, all in favor. Motion carried.

43
44 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

45 A copy of the previous meeting minutes were not included in the packet. Therefore the minutes were
46 not approved.

1 **ADJOURNMENT**

2
3 *J Ohlsson made a motion to adjourn at 7:15 pm, seconded by J Manchester, all in favor. Motion carried.*
4
5
6

DRAFT