

PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, December 10, 2025

The meeting of the Project Review Committee was held remotely. B. Irwin called the meeting to order at 6:01 PM.

ATTENDANCE:

Commission: Scholten, Marietta ☒ ; Demars, Howard ☒; Buermann, Robert ☒; Irwin, William; Julia Callan ☒; Yvon Dandurand ☒;

Staff: Emily Klofft.

Board: Peter Zamore (Chair, NRPC)

Guests: Jesse Woods (Town of Enosburgh), Philippa Dorfman, Sandra Bruhn, Victor Tirrito, Derek Jones

Changes or Additions to the Agenda:

None.

Public Comment

None.

Project Reviews:

Section 248a: Industrial Tower and Wireless, LLC

Project Details: A 60-day notice of a 120' telecommunications tower.

E. Klofft reviewed the project history, project site plan and draft project review sheet. The project is a new proposal on the same location as a previous proposal reviewed by the Committee. The previous proposal was 140' AGL, while this new proposal is 120' AGL. E. Klofft reviewed the draft project review sheet. The tower would provide a new telecommunications service which the applicant has an FCC license for, and according to the project documents appears to provide 1 opportunity to co-location. The project will require roughly 25,000 square foot in clearing, with roughly 6,000 square feet of permanent impervious surfaces. The project is located at the edge of a mid-priority forest block.

B. Irwin asked if all four whip antennas would be used by the applicant's service or if there would be opportunity for other whip antennas to be installed by other services. H. Demars asked if the applicant could clarify the number of co-location opportunities for panel antennas.

B. Irwin asked if the project would include a generator. E. Klofft stated that there was not one on the site map, or a battery storage option.

H. Demars asked about the siting of the access road and if the access road could be moved further south. The Committee noted presence of wetlands that may have been a reason for the location of the access road. The Committee reviewed the location of a stream on the parcel.

1 B. Irwin invited comment from the public in attendance on the project.

2
3 P. Dorfman stated she and her family live roughly 500' from the tower, as do four other families. She would
4 like the project to be sited further away from neighboring families. She stated she felt this application was not
5 sufficiently address the aesthetic impacts and encouraged the NRPC to intervene as a party. P. Dorfman
6 further stated she would like to see independent evidence that there are no other alternative options for
7 service. She stated she had not experienced issues calling 911 for emergencies.

8
9 B. Irwin noted that the Committee should request an analysis of alternative locations within the site and
10 alternative parcel sites the applicant considered to meet its service needs.

11
12 V. Tirrito stated that his property is located closest to the tower. He stated he had concerns about the tower's
13 impact on property values. He stated he did not feel that the service provided would provide public value, that
14 cellular service on the road is good currently and that the tower was not conducive to the character of the
15 area. He asked why the tower was not located deeper into the property.

16
17 B. Irwin note that the aesthetics analysis should include not only distance views but also the visibility of the
18 project from closer to the tower. B. Irwin further noted that the applicant should explain if they considered
19 alternative structures such as a monopole which may provide lesser aesthetic impacts.

20
21 S. Bruhn stated that she and Chris Bruhn were owners of property on Chester A. Arthur Road. She requested
22 that the public be aware of the date of the balloon test so residents and property owners can understand
23 views from their property.

24
25 B. Irwin agreed that ensuring the date of the balloon test was public is important.

26
27 D. Jones noted that the applicant's previous project had resulted in a federal court case, which recently
28 included a Second Appeals Court decision which affirmed the Vermont 248a Certificate of Public Good
29 process. He stated that he felt this was an important affirmation of local process and say.

30
31 J. Woods spoke on behalf of the Town of Enosburgh. J. Woods noted that the project would require a local
32 curb cut approval. J. Woods stated that emergency services communications problems in the area exist
33 between emergency service providers in the field. During a recent emergency Vermont State Police faced
34 significant communication challenges in West Enosburgh. He stated the Town is in favor of adding
35 communications capacity in the area.

36
37 V. Tirrito stated he felt there were other options for first responders.

38
39 P. Dorfman stated that the proposed tower was not at the highest point on the site. She stated that the
40 historic nature of the hamlet should be considered and that the Bordoville church is in the process of applying
41 for national historic register status.

42
43 E. Klofft asked J. Woods to clarify what the Town's relationship to the applicant is. J. Woods stated there was
44 no formal connection between the applicant and the Town. During the previous application, the applicant had
45 offered to place an emergency services antenna for dispatch on the tower at no cost to the Town.

1 V. Tirrito stated it was important to understand what the lifespan of the tower would be and what plans would
2 be for it to be removed at the end of its useful life.

3
4 B. Irwin noted to add a question to the list for the applicant regarding decommissioning.

5
6 B. Irwin thanked those attending for their feedback. E. Klofft stated she would send the list of questions
7 generated by the Committee to the applicant with an invitation to attend in January.

8
9 **Minutes**

10 Y. Dandurand motioned to approve the minutes of the November 2025 meeting. H. Demars seconded. The
11 motion carried.

12
13 **Updates**

14 E. Klofft provided an update on the oral argument held for the Howrigan wind project.

15
16 **Commissioner Announcements**

17 None.

18
19 **Adjourn**

20 *B. Burmann motioned to adjourn. H. Demars seconded. The motion carried. The Committee adjourned at 7:07*
21 *PM.*