

# CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

## Project Review Committee

August 4, 2025 2:00 pm

*Remote Participation via Zoom*

## Draft Minutes

### Project Review Committee Members

x	Lee Cattaneo, Orange Commissioner
	John Brabant, Calais Commissioner
x	Bill Arrand, Worcester Commissioner
	Peter Carbee, Washington Commissioner
x	Robert Wernecke, Berlin Commissioner
x	Alice Peal, Waitsfield Alternate Commissioner

1 Staff: Lorraine Banbury, Sam Lash, Christian Meyer

2

3 Public: None

4

5 L. Cattaneo called the meeting to order at 2:13 pm.

6

### 7 Public comment

8 None

9

### 10 Adjustments to the Agenda

11 L. Cattaneo added setting the date and agenda items for the next meeting to the end of the agenda for  
12 today's meeting.

13

### 14 Election of New Officers

15 R. Wernecke nominated L. Cattaneo for chair. A. Peal seconded. There were no other nominations. L.  
16 Cattaneo was elected unanimously. L. Cattaneo nominated R. Wernecke for Vice Chair. A. Peal  
17 seconded. There were no other nominations. R. Wernecke was elected unanimously.

18

### 19 Approval of Minutes

20 R. Wernecke moved to approve the May 22, 2025 meeting's draft minutes. A. Peal seconded, all in favor,  
21 motion carried.

22

23 There was discussion about whether to limit the agenda to the new Allen Street Battery Storage facility  
24 Section 248 application, but as commissioners were prepared and had reviewed the packet, the  
25 committee decided to cover the full agenda including the revisions to the Rule of Process and Guidelines  
26 for Review.

27

### 28 Reporting to the Board of Commissioners

29 L. Cattaneo raise the issue of how to keep the full commission informed about the work of the  
30 committee. In the past, Will Pitkin had included updates in the meeting packets for the full board of  
31 Commissioners. One option could be to have the Committee Chair report out at meetings. Another  
32 would be to share the summary packet of cases that is prepared for each meeting with the full

Commission, but those packets are already quite dense. The desire was to highlight actions taken by the Committee, so a summary of actions taken would be a good way to formalize that reporting to the full Commission. Staff will begin preparing that going forward.

#### **Project Review Guidelines and Rules of Process**

L. Cattaneo suggested the following edits to the documents in the meeting packet: in Appendix 2: Project Review Guidelines, instead of listing the Substantial Regional Impact definition in the Additional Considerations section in full and also in the definitions, write “Substantial Regional Impact - See Definition 7” in the Additional Considerations section. The Rules of Process document needs to have Appendix 1 added to the title. S. Lash noted that the link to the review checklist for Section 248 and 248 (a) cases was missing from the guidelines and needed to be added back in. With those edits, R. Wernecke moved to recommend the amended Rule of Procedure with new Appendix 1: Rules of Process and Appendix 2: Project Review Guidelines to the full Board of Commissioners for ratification. A. Peal seconded, all in favor, motion carried.

#### **Allen Street Storage Project, Barre City**

S Lash reviewed a 4.99 MW storage facility pursuing a Certificate of Public Good and authority to own and operate the project. This is in the same area as I Love Cows solar, who also received a CPG last year. The items which Barre City had listed in their letter of support as reasons they support the project were not included in the project petition itself, so staff suggested that the project amend the petition. She did not use the checklist this time because the larger project already had its CPG, but can use that in the future if desired. 2000’ of distribution line is also being upgraded as part of this project. She did the due diligence looking at fire safety report for battery storage. E. Wernecke – moved that staff submit the comments as proposed to have those points added to the petition. B. Arrand seconded, all in favor, motion carried. Staff anticipate seeing more projects as people will be trying to take advantage of federal credits while they still exist. If towns have sites they want to work on siting projects on, now is the time to move that forward, as taxation and listing

#### **Update on Waitsfield-Fayston Substation**

A. Peal asked if there were any updates on the substation in Waitsfield-Fayston. S. Lash talked to wetlands specialist and engineer on the project it is proceeding as expected. Once get notice to file will review again. Staff will request if it’s possible for the project to share the impact assessments when ready, instead of waiting for the petition to be filed.

#### **Conservation Easements**

Looking for feedback C. Meyer shared that CVRPC receives notifications periodically of conservation easements. There’s a ~500 acre easement in Kent’s Corner/Robinson Cemetery in East Calais that is not affecting a village center, but in the future, it an easement could conceivably be proposed for land in a preferred development area. One guideline could be using Future land Use Map designations of rural areas (rural general, rural agricultural/forestry, or rural conservation), does not require further consideration. But if in one of the other areas: enterprise, transition, village center, town center, etc. it could come to the committee for review. If something unique requires the Committee’s attention, staff could always bring those as well. The Committee cannot remember ever reviewing a conservation easement, but it is conceivable to have a conflict of uses to review. A. Peal asked how the new Tier 3 overlay identifying pinch points and critical forest blocks and if the Committee should weigh in on those considerations? Those areas will likely be designated as rural conservation in the FLU Map. R. Wernecke asked if the Committee should weigh in at all? Currently, the state is notifying CVRPC, likely due to

1 statute. Staff will draft language to amend into process on conservation easements that are contrary to  
2 the regional plan and bring it back to the committee.

3  
4 **Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items**

5  
6 Currently the Project Review Committee meetings are on an “as needed” basis. L. Cattaneo said that  
7 having them as a standing meeting that is cancelled when not needed would make it easier to plan  
8 around. A. Peal and R. Wernecke said this is how they currently treat the meetings. C. Meyer  
9 determined that there may need to be a resolution change for this to take effect, which is something  
10 staff will take care of. Going forward Project Review Committee will be a standing meeting on the 4<sup>th</sup>  
11 Thursday of each month at 4:00. The next meeting will be Thursday, August 28.

12  
13 R. Wernecke moved to adjourn, A. Peal seconded, all in favor, motion carried. Meeting adjourned 2:56  
14 pm.

15  
16 Respectfully submitted, L. Banbury  
17

Content

**Topic 2**

**Adjournment**

R. Wernecke moved to adjourn, A. Peal seconded, all in favor, motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 2:56 pm.

Minutes taken by L. Banbury