

CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Project Review Committee

February 10, 2022 4:00 – 5:00 pm

Remote Participation via Zoom

Minutes

Project Review Committee Members

x	Lee Cattaneo, Orange Commissioner	1
	John Brabant, Calais Commissioner	2
x	Bill Arrand Commissioner (Alternate Seat)	3
x	Peter Carbee, Washington Commissioner	4
	Janet Shatney, Barre City Commissioner	5
x	Robert Wernecke, Berlin Commissioner	6

7 Staff: Clare Rock

8 Presenters (representing Wireless Industrial): Brian Sullivan, MSK; Eric Kallio, site acquisitions for

9 Industrial; Lois Hodgetts, Dubois and King; Shayna Galinat, Industrial; Kevin Delaney, Industrial

10 Members of the Public: Rick Yeiser, Worcester resident; Peter Comart, Worcester resident; Philip and ...

11 (PE ipad) residents; Ted Lamb, Worcester SB Chair; Steve Barrows, Worcester resident; Roger

12 Strobridge, Worcester SB; James Wood, Worcester resident and neighbor of site; Brook Dingleline,

13 attorney representing abutting landowners; Toni Kaeding, Worcester PC; John Kaeding, SB member and

14 neighbor; David Delcore, Times Argus; Will Baker?

15

16 L. Cattaneo called the meeting to order at 4:05pm. Introduction were made.

17

18 Adjustments to the Agenda

19 None

20

21 Public Comments

22 None

23

24 Act 250 / Section 248 Applications & Projects of Substantial Regional Impact

25 a) Presentation of proposed wireless telecommunications facility at 334 Norton Road, Worcester,
26 VT by representatives of Industrial Wireless Technologies, Inc.

27

28 Brian Sullivan, MSK, gave an overview of the process. Industrial has provided the 60-Day Notice

29 which is a notice of intent. In the process have agreed to extend the 60-day process and will not file

30 before March 31, 2022. Between now and then hopes to have a constructive meeting with the

31 town.

32

33 Industrial is a licensed entity that provides 2-way service for business customers. (need to fill in
34 information up to 4:21 pm)

35

36 Referenced the Worcester telecom ordinance is outdated based upon the old technology and

37 doesn't account for the new technology and referenced the 248a statute where an applicant doesn't

38 have to seek a local permit for the project as it will be permitted by the PUC. B Sullivan noted CVRPC

39 can be involved in the process as an intervener and recognizes that the CVRPC will be looking at SRI.

1
2 Louis Hodgetts, DuBois and King presented the visual simulation photos (presentation is on the
3 CVRPC website.) Hodgetts described the methodology for creating the simulations. The green
4 locations are locations where the balloons were visible. This is also similar to the visual analysis
5 model which is depicted on the second page of the presentation. Areas in yellow are areas in which
6 you would see the tower in the absence of any trees or structures. It shows a worst case view shed
7 of the town. There are a few locations where the tower would be visible from RT 12. From the vast
8 majority of town roads the tower would not be visible.
9

10 B Sullivan acknowledges that Mr Wood and the Kaedings would have a view of the tower. Wireless
11 believes the project would not have any adverse impacts on natural or historic resources. B Sullivan
12 went on to read a statement from J Tierney, Commissioner "with federal funding available now if
13 the time to invest in cell coverage...." He thanked CVRPC.
14

15 C Rock provided a summary of the staff report (as included on the website) and specifically
16 summarized which SRI (Substantial Regional Impact) criteria staff flagged as being triggered by this
17 project.
18

19 P Carbee recognized the letter provided by the town of Worcester and would like to make sure that
20 is entered into the record. (This was provided to the Committee on Tuesday and is on CVRPC
21 website.) Carbee summarized the bullet points contained within the letter.
22

23 Ted Lamb, Worcester SB member indicated that there is no coverage map and do not know how
24 many people will get coverage. Referenced that the tower would be visible from the other locations
25 in town and from the B Ellis Trail which connects Worcester and Calais.
26

27 Brooke Dingleline, attorney for some of the neighbors, spoke about the 248a process and argued
28 Wireless has not been forth coming with some information about the project. Dingleline asked
29 about the coverage and took issue with the process being taking out by MSK, and suggests the RPC
30 doesn't have enough information to proposedly review the proposal. Feels like the views should be
31 considered not just from public roads, but from other areas which the public could see it from,
32 including the trail and referenced the Mount Philo case.
33

34 Toni Kaeding, PC Chair and neighbor, disagreed with the visual impact information, as the neighbor
35 has floated their own balloons. Kaeding shared the image which was included in the letter
36 submitted by Worcester (on the CVRPC website) and an image of the other neighbors house (which
37 is the last photo on this webpage: <http://worcestercellinfo.com/photos-cell-tower-simulations/>)
38 Bill Arrand, CVRPC Worcester Rep, PRC member stated he had received a letter, from Suzane Primo
39 (sp?) and summarized the letter which was not in support of the cell tower. The letter indicated the
40 resident lives on Gould Hill Road and stated that many residents are talking about this proposal and
41 that many people in Worcester share the same views.
42

43 Lee Cattaneo, PRC Chair, suggested the Committee look at the SRI criteria.
44

45 John Brabant, Calais CVRPC Rep, PRC member, Calais SB, introduced himself as the Calais Rep, and
46 Calais SB, has received a letter from the Calais trails committee indicated concern about the views
47 from the shared trails. Indicated concern about the lack of information about the coverage. Feels
48 this is important information needed to determine Substantial Impact and that if CVRPC has

1 approved the Worcester Plan then the local plan and the Regional Plan have been found to be
2 compatible along the other plans in the region.

3
4 C Rock clarified that the Worcester has a newly adopted plan and CVRPC has yet to formally review
5 and approve.

6
7 P Carbee feels like there is information lacking in order to make a decision on SRI.

8
9 B Arrand echoed other Commissioners position on not having enough information.

10
11 C Rock provided a general summary of next steps, and suggested the Committee may request
12 additional information and if this can be provided by the applicant then the committee can
13 reconvene and review such information.

14
15 B Sullivan, responded by stating that he cannot tell us what changes will or might be made to the
16 proposal based upon input, but does have additional information which can be provided. He would
17 like us to ask for specific information.

18
19 J Brabant would like to know the visual impacts from the Calais town line and other impacts, from
20 the Ellis Bruce Trail.

21
22 Lee Cattaneo referenced the staff memo and indicated they include additional information which
23 the Committee would like to have.

24
25 James Wood would like to collaborate on the balloon test so that everyone effected could be aware
26 of the methodology and agree on the results.

27
28 P Comart is concerned about what couldn't be seen, looks forward to getting more information
29 about coverage.

30
31 P Carbee would like to hear from Industrial about the positive and negative impacts, would like to
32 know how much coverage would be lost if the tower was 50ft shorter, for instance.

33
34 B Sullivan confirmed he found the staff memo with the info referenced by L Cattaneo and will
35 provided this info to CVRPC via C Rock.

36
37 **Approve meeting minutes**

38
39 *P Carbee moves to approve the July 22, 2021 minutes, seconded by R Wernecke. All in favor. Motion*
40 *carried.*

41
42 **Adjournment**

43
44 *R Wernecke moved to adjourn, seconded by P Carbee meeting adjourned at 5:30.*