Approved: June 11, 2019

	CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION				
			NUT		
		May	14, 2	019	
Com	ımissioners:				
×	Barre City	Janet Shatney		Moretown	Dara Torre, Secretary
	·	Heather Grandfield, Alt.	×		Joyce Manchester, Alt
×	Barre Town	Byron Atwood	×	Northfield	Laura Hill-Eubanks, Vice-Chai
		Mark Nicholson, Alt.	×	Orange	Lee Cattaneo
×	Berlin	Robert Wernecke	×	Plainfield	Bram Towbin
		Karla Nuissl, Alt.			Jim Volz, Alt.
×	Cabot	Amy Hornblas	×	Roxbury	Jerry D'Amico
×	Calais	John Brabant	×	Waitsfield	Don La Haye
		Jan Ohlsson, Alt.			Harrison Snapp, Alt.
×	Duxbury	Alan Quackenbush		Warren	Alison Duckworth
×	E. Montpelier	Julie Potter, Chair			J. Michael Bridgewater, Alt.
×		Jack Pauly, Alt.		Washington	Peter Carbee
	Fayston	Karl Klein	×	Waterbury	Steve Lotspeich
×	Marshfield	Robin Schunk	×	Williamstown	Richard Turner
×	Middlesex	Ron Krauth		Williamstown	Jacqueline Higgins, Alt.
×	Montpelier	Kirby Keeton		Woodbury	Michael Gray, Treasurer
		Mike Miller, Alt.	×	Worcester	Bill Arrand
		ger, Nancy Chartrand, Clare F	Rock		
Gue	sts: Joshua O'Go	orman,Waterbury Record			
	L TO ORDER		_		
		the meeting to order at 6:33	•	•	
		introductions. Chair Potter w	veicome	ed new Board me	mber Robin Schunk of
iviar	shfield.				
VDII	USTMENTS TO T	HE VCENDY			
Non		HE AGENDA			
NOII	C				
DIIR	LIC COMMENTS				
Non					
14011	C				
MII	ΝΙζΙΡΔΙ ΡΙΔΝΙΛ	PPROVAL & CONFIRMATIO	N OF D	I ANNING PROCI	=55
					narizing the public hearing on
		fication of energy compliance			

participating in the hearing questioned the energy component of the plan and methodology used to calculate available land for wind energy generation. Arrand directed the Board to a memo in the meeting packet, which outlined the Committee's opinion regarding the methodology. He noted that it was good to have people actively engaged in plan review. S. Lotspeich noted the energy plan had was drafted by Eric Vorwald, previously of CVRPC, and the Waterbury Local Action Energy Partnership (LEAP) provided a lot of input. Lotspeich believed there was a misunderstanding on how known constraints and possible constraints are mapped; specifically related to large scale wind development. Known constraints (rare endangered species sites, significant habitat – especially with state lands) are deleted so as not to be shown as possible wind sites. Possible constraints (slopes over 25%, deer overwintering yards, bear habitat) areas are shaded. Lotspeich noted there was a misunderstanding that the Town might be trying to encourage development in the shaded area; which is not the case. Concerns remain.

Participants in the public hearing were also concerned that the Schutesville Wildlife Corridor does not appear on the Plan's Land Use Map. Lotspeich stated the Municipal Plan addresses the Schutesville Wildlife Corridor. He stated the Plan does not have a specific map of the corridor because it is still under development and needs more public input.

Lotspeich noted another important point that arose was if a municipality prohibits the development of renewable energy in a certain area in their plan, the municipality must prohibit any type of development (i.e. if wind is disallowed, all other development may need to be disallowed as well). Therefore, municipalities need to be careful in the energy plans in how they address these types of issues.

Arrand directed the Board to page 3 of the packet, which lists recommendations for Waterbury to consider in its next plan update. Arrand stated that the Committee determined the public comments about wildlife and wind did not affect whether the plan complied with the statutory requirements related to plan approval. J. Brabant inquired if any adjustments were made as a result of the public comments received. C. Rock said that based on the outcome of the hearing the plan was not sent back to the Town to make any adjustments. The Plan Review Committee did recommend a minor change to update a page reference to reference the correct map. S. Lotspeich advised the Waterbury Planning Commission did not see any need to make any changes based on the public comment. Lotspeich confirmed the Town Plan was adopted in December 2018. The Town Plan Review Committee found the Waterbury Town Plan was in conformance with statutory requirements. It met all the municipal plan requirements, showed progress toward attainment of the goals, and met the standards as required for the certification of energy compliance.

Chair Potter noted additional public comment had been received on the day of the Commission meeting. Copies of comments were distributed. Rock noted the comments echoed those made at the public hearing in that the Plan more stringently address development of constraints for the wildlife corridor and the ridgeline. Similar comments were brought up at the Town Plan Review Committee hearing and the Town Plan Review Committee stated the comments did not negate the Plan meeting the statutory requirements.

- Chair Potter advised that the Town Plan Review Committee has recommended that the Board confirm the local planning process and recommended that the Board approve the Municipal Plan. The Committee also recommended the Board issue the Determination of Energy Compliance; however, staff had determined there was a procedural problem with the public hearing warning. That problem did not affect the Municipal Plan, approval of the Plan or confirmation of the Town's planning process. It only affected the determination of energy compliance. Staff recommended, and the Executive Committee concurred, that the Town Plan approval proceed and planning process confirmation move forward, and that CVRPC hold a second hearing regarding the determination of energy compliance. Additional discussion ensued regarding precluding wind development in certain areas and whether height constraints were included in the Waterbury Plan. Chair Potter suggested proceeding with motions related to the Town Plan and then having a discussion regarding the energy compliance.
 - B. Atwood moved to approve the Waterbury Town Plan to be in compliance with the Regional Plan and approving the process of the Waterbury Plan, and the energy compliance portion being subject to another warned hearing; J. Brabant seconded.
 - B. Waninger suggested the motion be amended, "to approve the municipal plan per 24 V.S.A. §4350(b) with the recommendation that the plan text on page 72 be corrected to reference the correct map". B. Atwood revised his motion; J. Brabant seconded. G. D'Amico asked whether the plan approval could change if a second hearing results in a chance to the plan. Waninger responded that the second hearing will address the determination of energy compliance only. If the Plan does not receive a positive determination, the Plan approval and confirmation would still be valid. B. Wernecke requested for clarification that the current motion solely was to approve the Municipal Plan. Potter confirmed it was. Motion carried with 1 no vote.
- Potter state the second component was to confirm the municipality's planning process per state statute.
 B. Atwood moved to confirm the municipality's planning process per state statute. R. Krauth seconded.
 Motion carried.
 - The Board requested the Town Plan Revieew Committee hold a second hearing regarding the Determination of Energy Complicance and bring this item to Board at a future meeting.
 - B. Wernecke moved to have the Chair sign the resolution regarding approval of the Waterbury Town Plan and confirmation of the Town's planning process; J. Shatney seconded. Motion carried.
 - CVRPC Bylaws

Potter noted the draft bylaws are being brought as an introduction and discussion item; no action is being requested. She advised the Board of the reasoning behind the Bylaw amendments and the work

1	of the Bylaws Work Group. The Executive Committee has reviewed the draft and believes the
2	amendments are appropriate. It recommends the Board adopt the revised bylaws.
3	
4	Potter outlined the bylaw adoption process. Once the Board reaches concensus on the amendments,
5	Commissioners must vote to place the Bylaws on a subsequent meeting's agenda for approval. 60% of
6	Board-designated seats (14 Commissioners) must vote in favor for the amendments to be approved.
7	
8	Questions ensued regarding quorum number change (seats vs. members). A municipality without an
9	appointed Commissioner counts towards the vote.
10	
11	Potter noted the current bylaws are available on CVRPC's website under Operating Policies. N.
12	Chartrand will provide a link to Commissioners.
13	
14	CVRPC's attorney will be asked to review the draft prior to next Board meeting.
15	
16	Further discussion ensued regarding establishment of Committees and voting vs. non-voting seats. L.
17	Catteneo suggested further clarification in Section 606 regarding individuals vs. towns being the
18	appointed seats on Committees.
19	
20	Following a question by J. Brabant, it was confirmed that dissolution of the Commission requires an
21	affirmative vote of all Board members.
22	
23	PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE CHANGES TO ACT 250
24	B. Waninger advised the bill is not out of Legislature yet. She provided a presentation regarding two
25	provisions in the bill - interstate interchange jurisdiction and enhanced designation jurisdiction – for
26	discussion.
27	
28	Significant discussion ensued regarding triggering of Act 250 jurisdiction near interstate interchanges.
29	Jurisdiction would apply to commercial or industrial construction within a 3,000 foot radius of an
30	interchange, unless within an existing settlement. The Board requested additional information about
31	the definition of "existing settlement" and the Interstate Interchange Design Guidelines referenced in
32	the bill.
33	
34	Enhanced designation jurisdiction is the trigger for when a municipality can apply to complete Act 250
35	review in designated downtowns, growth centers, village centers, new town centers, and/or
36	neighborhood development areas. For a municipality to be eligible, it must have an approved
37	Municipal Plan and meet a multitude of other requirements. Commissioners concurred that smaller
38	towns would be unable to meet all the necessary requirements. It was suggested that small towns need
39	to be considered more in this process and how Act 250 can better serve them.
40	
41	NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT

1 B. Atwood, Nominating Committee Chair, presented the final slate for Officers/Executive Committee as 2 follows: 3 4 Julie Potter, Member at Large / Past Chair 5 Gerry D'Amico, Member at Large 6 Janet Shatney, Member at Large 7 Dara Torre, Secretary 8 Michael Gray, Treasurer 9 Steven Lotspeich, Vice Chair 10 Laura Hill-Eubanks, Chair 11 12 J. Potter entertained nominations from the floor. None were made, and Potter closed nominations. She 13 said CVRPC's bylaws state the election is done by paper ballot. Staff will mail the ballots within the week. 14 It was questioned if the Commission could move the slate at the meeting. Potter noted he bylaws state 15 paper ballots must be used. Results will be shared at June meeting (Annual Meeting). The current 16 bylaws dictate the elected positions take effect upon announcement of the election results. 17 18 B. Towbin commended Chair Potter on her job as chair, which the entire Board endorsed. 19 20 **MEETING MINUTES** 21 G. D'Amico moved to approve April 9, 2019 minutes; B. Atwood seconded. Motion carried. 22 23 **REPORTS** 24 J. Brabant thanked staff for all the help they've provided Calais; J. Shatney mirrored the sentiment 25 indicating CVRPC has a great staff. Chair Potter requested the Director relay the sentiments to staff. 26 27 **ADJOURNMENT** 28 D. La Haye moved to adjourn at 8:10 pm; B. Wernecke seconded. Motion carried. 29 30 Respectfully submitted, 31 32 Nancy Chartrand 33 Office Manager