

CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Project Review Committee

October 23, 2025 4:00 pm

Remote Participation via Zoom

Minutes

Project Review Committee Members

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

1 Staff: Lorraine Banbury, Sam Lash, Christian Meyer

2 Public: Stephen Whitaker (Montpelier)

3

4 Call to Order

5 L. Cattaneo called the meeting to order at 4:02 pm. A quorum was confirmed with five members present
6 at the outset (L. Cattaneo, J. Brabant, B. Arrand, P. Carbee, and R. Wernecke), and later A. Peal joined.

7

8 Adjustments to the Agenda

9 None

10

11 Public Comment

12 During public comment, D. Whitaker expressed concern about developments in the Montpelier Country
13 Club Road property, citing transportation impacts, the Route 2 intersection, and unresolved
14 environmental and brownfield issues. Subsequent public comment was made on single-carrier towers
15 being a failed approach, and that the committee should push for towers co-hosting emergency planning.

16

17 Approval of Minutes

18 Motion: *Approve the September 25, 2025, minutes.*

19 J. Brabant moved, B. Arrand seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

20

21 Act 250 Case Updates

22 Staff presented the Act 250 case summary. There was a question about the status of the Plainfield
23 Expansion Project, where the jurisdictional opinion was that an Act 250 permit was **not** required. L
24 Banbury will share a copy of the spreadsheet with clickable links [This document is now available at
25 <https://centralvtplanning.org/about/minutes-agendas-staff-reports/project-review-committee/> and will
26 be posted there each month going forward.]

27

28 Section 248 and 248a Case Updates

29 **Berlin – Municipal Solar Canopy (Town Offices/Ice Rink).** Staff reported the resubmittal; as noted
30 above, the Committee authorized an updated staff letter reaffirming support, conditioned upon there

being no substantive changes made since the previous review. Action: *Authorize staff to issue an updated letter consistent with the previously approved position.*

P. Carbee moved, J. Brabant seconded, the motion passed unanimously.

GMP Irasville Substation Upgrade (Waitsfield/Fayston). Staff provided an update on the substation improvements and associated wetland constraints. Discussion focused on legacy infrastructure located within mapped wetland areas, the previous disturbance of the wetlands, and the pros and cons of that siting on resilience. Members expressed concern that supporting this project might set a precedent for future projects with wetland impacts. Action: *No action was taken.*

Washington Cell Tower. The case was marked closed on the PUC website. Previously, the committee submitted questions to which answers were not supplied. To revive the project, the applicant would have to issue a new advance notice. Action: *No action needed.*

Middlesex – Tower Co-location. Staff confirmed the comments, emphasizing the importance of co-location on existing infrastructure to minimize new impacts. The applicant filed the petition, indicating the project will move to the next stage. There were no comments from the town or the public other than those from CVRPC. Action: *No action was required or requested.*

There was a discussion of new FCC rules on telecommunications and a municipality's role in siting. S. Lash shared that the current PUC chair in Vermont seems to strongly support the status quo.

Marshfield – Cell Tower. Staff summarized the advance notice(s) (Sept. 2024; May 2025) and shared photos of the proposed visibility along the Route 2 corridor. The project is planned on an existing logging road, which allows for future co-location, and has no known resource constraints according to state mapping. Five residents have intervened, triggering a Public Utility Commission hearing. The Department of Public Service recommends the certificate be issued, and the Marshfield Selectboard has stated the project does not conflict with the town plan. Action: *Staff will continue to monitor.*

Moretown Tower (New filing). T-Mobile is seeking a CPG to add equipment to an existing 97-foot monopine tower. The project involves no new clearing, excavation, or expansion of impervious surface and uses existing access. Staff noted no significant environmental constraints and suggested submitting comments similar to those for recent co-location projects, supporting the use of existing towers for limited expansions. Action: *No action taken.*

Staff is continuing the investigation on the safety of the I Love Cows battery siting project and will bring updates as needed.

Letters of Compatibility Guidelines

The committee discussed developing formal guidelines for handling letters of compatibility over the next year. Staff provided a draft flowchart outlining when projects should come before the PRC based on factors such as grant type, project location in Tier 1 areas, and thresholds for housing or commercial development. Members suggested refining criteria, including accounting for differences between one-acre and ten-acre Act 250 towns and clarifying traffic thresholds. There was general support for the framework, and staff will draft formal language, potentially requiring bylaw and process updates, before bringing it to the full board. Action: *Staff will prepare a memo and policy language.*

1
2 The next meeting will be on Wednesday, November 26.

3 **Adjournment**

4 R. Wernecke moved to adjourn. J. Brabant seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

5
6 Respectfully submitted by L. Banbury

DRAFT