

1 PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

2 Wednesday, January 14, 2026

3  
4 The meeting of the Project Review Committee was held remotely. B. Irwin called the meeting to order at 6:01  
5 PM.

6  
7 ATTENDANCE:

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

10  
11 Staff: Emily Klofft.

12  
13  
14 Guests: Matt Hull (Bordoville Road Section 248a application property owner), Todd Cosgrove, Andrew Nicholls,  
15 Maria Salvaty, Mary Hull, Warren Hull, AJ La Rosa, Kevin Delancy (Industrial Tower and Wireless), Cooper  
16 Hayes (MSK), Eric Kallio (Industrial Tower and Wireless), David J. Pearsons, Kristen Burke

17  
18 **Changes or Additions to the Agenda:**

19 None.

20  
21 **Public Comment**

22 None.

23  
24 **Project Reviews:**

25  
26 **Section 248a: Industrial Tower and Wireless, LLC**

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

28  
29 E. Klofft reviewed the draft project review sheet and the written responses from Industrial Tower and Wireless  
30 to the Committee's questions (see attached document).

31  
32 B. Irwin asked the applicant to further elaborate on why the specific location on the parcel was chosen.

33  
34 K. Delancy stated that along the border with VT 108, elevation is too low to meet the service needs. Further  
35 into the parcel in the south the terrain and presence of wetlands make developing the tower there difficult.

36  
37 B Irwin asked if it was possible more than 1 panel antenna could co-locate on the tower. K. Delancy stated that  
38 while it was structurally possible, it was unlikely given the height of the tower that more than 1 co-located  
39 panel would be feasible. B. Irwin asked if there was any interest from the telecommunications provider. K.  
40 Delancy stated not yet, as typically providers do not like to make commitments until permitting is complete.

41  
42 B. Irwin asked if during the previous balloon test if any of the sites reviewed were from neighboring homes. K.  
43 Delancy stated they were not as all viewpoints reviewed were from public areas. He stated that the tower  
44 would primarily be visible along VT 108. Considering intervening vegetation, the tower is not visible in 97% of  
45 locations in a two mile radius.

1 B. Irwin asked if the neighboring property owners or municipal officials had expressed a preference on a  
2 monopole versus lattice tower. K. Delancy stated that they had not heard any preference, but are open to  
3 either design if there is a strong community preference. The lattice tower was proposed because it is easier to  
4 see through.

5  
6 H. Demars asked if the 140' had previously included the height of the whip antenna and if so, what was the  
7 actual reduction in tower height. K. Delancy stated that the 140' height of the previous proposed project had  
8 not included the whip antenna, so this tower is 20' lower with the same design.

9  
10 Y. Dandurand asked what the expected improvement in coverage was. K. Delancy stated there was a gap in  
11 coverage along VT 108, the full application will include a coverage map.

12  
13 B. Irwin asked for comments from the public in attendance.

14  
15 T. Cosgrove stated that he was a member of the Bakersfield Selectboard. The Selectboard support the project  
16 as it will improve public safety.

17  
18 Matt Hull stated that he is the property owner as well as the Fire Chief for the Town of Bakersfield. He stated  
19 he wanted to improve public safety and that he felt this should outweigh aesthetic concerns.

20  
21 Mary Hull stated that she lives close to the proposed tower and that accidents have occurred where cell  
22 service has not been accessible.

23  
24 G. Parent stated she was the Bakersfield Assistant Fire Chief. She stated that the Department responds to  
25 many types of hazards and that there have been calls where she has been concerned for her personal safety  
26 but was unable to connect to the Department's radio systems due to lack of service.

27  
28 B. Irwin asked the applicant if the project would have the capacity to support public safety antenna. K. Delancy  
29 stated that there would be capacity, one of the advantages of a lattice tower is that it does allow for more  
30 whip antenna. Likely an additional 3-4 whip antenna could be accommodated.

31  
32 B. Irwin what type of network Industrial Tower and Wireless provides. K. Delancy stated that the applicant is  
33 providing an ESMR two-way radio service. They are working on covering northern Vermont.

34  
35 B. Irwin asked if the applicant would provide information on radio frequency. K. Delancy stated they were not  
36 required to by the PUC but would include information showing compliance with federal standards.

37  
38 D. Persons stated he supported the project based on the public safety benefits.

39  
40 J. Callan asked if the St. Albans Dispatch was a customer of ITW. K. Delancy clarified that they would have a  
41 separately installed antenna and equipment. J. Callan asked what the typical customer of ITW is. K. Delancy  
42 stated that customers included public safety agencies, construction and delivery companies.

43  
44 E. Klofft read written comments submitted by Jesse Woods on behalf of the Enosburgh Selectboard. The  
45 comment supported the project for its public safety benefits.

1 E. Klofft noted that there had been some questions from the public about visibility in leaf-off conditions. K.  
2 Delancy confirmed that the balloon test was conducted in the winter and represented the “worst case”  
3 scenario.  
4

5 H. Demars asked if the applicant’s service would provide any improvements in cellular service. K. Delancy  
6 stated that ITW does not provide cellular service. However, he stated that they expected a cellular provider  
7 would be interested in co-location given the cost savings.  
8

9 B. Irwin asked if reducing this coverage gap would improve connections to other nearby towers. K. Delancy  
10 stated that it could create unbroken connectivity to the north, to the south there are still likely more towers  
11 needed for adequate service levels.  
12

### 13 **Section 248a: 189 South Street-South Hero**

14 *Project Details:* 60 day notice for construction of a new telecommunications tower. The proposed project will  
15 involve construction of a new 64.5’ silo adjacent to an existing silo and installation of 9 antennas on the new  
16 silo with associated infrastructure.  
17

18 E. Klofft reviewed the site plan and draft project review sheet. The project will expand cellular service,  
19 although specifics were not included in the 60 day notice. The project will not have any expected natural  
20 resources impacts as it is located immediately adjacent to a developed farm building.  
21

22 B. Irwin asked if the new silo would be a working farm silo. C. Hayes stated that it likely wouldn’t be given  
23 structural concerns.  
24

25 B. Irwin asked about the relative cost of this type of construction versus a typical tower. C. Hayes stated that it  
26 was more expensive but that given the flat topography of this area there is substantial visibility and this design  
27 ensures it blends into the existing landscape.  
28

29 H. Demars asked how long the construction would take and noted that there is significant bicycle traffic along  
30 South Street during the summer months. C. Hayes notes that it depended on the permitting timeline, but  
31 noted that unlike a monopole tower there is no large oversized items that need to be transported.  
32

33 B. Irwin asked for additional information on the generator and equipment shed and whether there would be a  
34 sound study. C. Hayes stated there would not be a sound study, the impacts are expected to be minimal given  
35 that the generator only runs tests for a few hours a week and during power outages.  
36

37 B. Irwin asked if there was a decommissioning plan. C. Hayes stated that it would depend on if it was required  
38 by the PUC. Likely if the telecommunications equipment were removed, the farmer would use the silo for  
39 farming purposes.  
40

41 M. Scholten asked if there had been any negative feedback from the community. C. Hayes stated that there  
42 was no public comment to date.  
43

### 44 **Staff Reviews**

45 Section 248a: Verizon Wireless/248a-at 567 E. Sheldon Road-Sheldon

46 *Project Details:* Add 3 antennas with total 4.68 sq. ft. added at 110’ AGL on an 140.01’ AGL tower

1 E. Klofft reviewed the site plan. The project does not increase the AGL of the existing tower.  
2

3 Section 248a: 248a-at 4653 Ethan Allen Highway-Georgia

4 E. Klofft reviewed the site plan. The new equipment is mounted at the same AGL as the existing equipment on  
5 a silo with a smaller equipment footprint.  
6

7 E. Klofft noted since both projects do not increase AGL and are co-located on existing infrastructure they meet  
8 the staff review requirements of not of substantial regional impact and in conformance with the Regional Plan.  
9

10 C. Hayes noted that Verizon is in the process of updating much of its infrastructure and therefore the  
11 Committee can expect more similar projects.  
12

13 **Minutes**

14 E. Klofft noted she forgot to include the minutes in the Committee packet. The Committee agreed to move  
15 approval of the minutes to February.  
16

17 **Updates**

18 E. Klofft noted there was a site visit for the Howrigan Wind Project, staff did not attend.  
19

20 **Commissioner Announcements**

21 None.  
22

23 **Adjourn**

24 *B. Buermann motioned to adjourn. H. Demars seconded. The motion carried. The Committee adjourned at 7:29*  
25 *PM.*