

1 **PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

2 **Wednesday, April 8, 2026**

3
4 The meeting of the Project Review Committee was held remotely. B. Irwin called the meeting to order at 6:04
5 PM.

6
7 **ATTENDANCE:**

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

10
11 Staff: Emily Klofft.

12
13
14 Guests: Cooper Hayes (MSK), Kevin Delancy (Industrial Tower and Wireless), Eric Kallio (Industrial Tower and
15 Wireless), Jesse Woods (Town of Enosburgh), Philippa Fourie, Sandra Bruhn, Alice Foote, Lisa Maynard,
16 Garrett Wolski, Peter Hind, Mary Marie, Charles Fourie, Victor Tirrito, Ginger Parent, Matthew Hull, Kyle Ovitt,
17 Andrew Nichols, Derek Jones, Hobbie Gates, Sam Keeper, Amber Foote, Robert Willey, Katelyn Keeper, John
18 West, Chris Bruhn, Raya Salvati, T. Cosgrove

19
20 **Changes or Additions to the Agenda:**

21 None.

22
23 **Welcome and Committee Introductions**

24 B. Irwin welcomed attendees and members introduced themselves.

25
26 **Public Comment**

27 None.

28
29 **Project Reviews:**

30 **Section 248a: Verizon Wireless/248a-54 Woods Hill Road**

31 *Project Details:* Addition of new telecommunications equipment on an existing silo antenna. New equipment
32 will extend beyond existing equipment at 65' AGL. This is above the base portion of the silo (60') but below
33 the height of the silo cap (70').

34
35 E. Klofft reviewed the site plan. The proposed equipment is co-located on an existing silo which has existing
36 telecommunications infrastructure. The new equipment is located higher than the existing, extending above
37 the wall of the silo but below the top of the silo cap.

38
39 C. Hayes stated that the panel antennas were replacing panel antennas of roughly the same size, along with an
40 additional antenna being added.

41
42 B. Irwin noted that there was a slight aesthetic impact of extending the structure beyond the wall of the silo,
43 but the project did use existing infrastructure and is co-located.

44
45 B. Buermann asked if there were going to be changes to infrastructure on the ground. C. Hayes stated there
46 would not be any changes on the ground infrastructure.

1
2 H. Demars asked if the project would improve coverage or reliability, C. Hayes stated that the project would
3 primarily increase the capacity of the service so it can accommodate more users. C. Hayes stated that these
4 types of micro-sites are generally intended to improve bandwidth.
5

6 B. Irwin asked about decommissioning. C. Hayes noted that decommissioning plans were not required by the
7 Public Utility Commission but are usually addressed in the lease with the property-owner.
8

9 *M. Scholten motioned to find the project in conformance with the Regional Plan and not of a substantial*
10 *regional impact. H. Demars seconded. The motion carried.*
11

12 **Section 248a:Industrial Tower and Wireless, LLC/248a-off of Bordoville Road-Enosburgh**

13 *Project Details: 120' telecommunications tower.*
14

15 E. Klofft reviewed the history of the project and draft project review sheet. E. Klofft reviewed the updated
16 photosimulations for the 120' tower. E. Klofft confirmed with the applicant that the photosimulations are
17 updated. They are based on the balloon test conducted for the previous 140' tower proposal in 2022 but
18 account for the reduced 120' height.
19

20 C. Hayes presented additional information on the project. The applicant's new 120' proposal is intended to be
21 responsive to the feedback that the 140' was not in conformance with the plan. The project would play a vital
22 role for ITW's connectivity, the majority of surrounding facilities are silo-based and do not meet ITW's needs.
23 ITW looked at existing cellular coverage maps and all providers see coverage gaps in this area.
24

25 B. Irwin asked if a cellular company has an agreement with ITW for co-location. C. Hayes stated that carriers
26 will not commit until the project is permitted.
27

28 C. Hayes noted that during the 2022 application, the Department of Public Service had conducted an
29 independent aesthetics analysis paid for by the applicant. That study had looked at the viewshed impacts of a
30 140' and 120' tower. E. Klofft reviewed the map of potential visibility generated in that study, the 120' tower
31 had slightly less visibility. C. Hayes noted that Viewpoint 3 in the applicant's new simulation is an example of
32 an area where visibility was reduced by decreasing the height 20'.
33

34 B. Irwin asked for more information on the co-location and why there is only 1 space available for co-location.
35 C. Hayes stated that the highest height available for co-location is 102', with the tree-line at 60' this provides
36 only one location. K. Delancy clarified that the tower can structurally accommodate additional panel antenna
37 but they are unlikely to provide significant coverage.
38

39 B. Irwin asked for the applicant to clarify what service they provide. K. Delancy stated that it was a radio
40 communication service used by businesses.
41

42 Y. Dandurand asked the applicant for additional information on why this project location had been chosen. C.
43 Hayes stated that it was located along a major corridor where ITW is looking to fill a service need. ITW
44 considers connectivity, landowner interest and natural resources when making siting decisions. K. Delancy
45 stated that topography of the area made finding a location for providing service difficult, as well as other
46 landowners not being interested.

1
2 J. Woods spoke on behalf of the Town of Enosburgh. The Town is in the process of updating its emergency
3 communication equipment and has been looking for more coverage. The project could support in an increase
4 in coverage for the Town. This is important from a safety perspective as the Town has experienced
5 communications challenges in two serious emergency situations.
6

7 L. McMorrow stated that she lived in the area and was concerned about emergency services as she has no cell
8 service currently and has had emergency situations happen before. She stated she felt the minimal aesthetics
9 impacts were worth the safety improvements.
10

11 J. West stated he had recently been involved in a car accident on VT 108 where there was no service and
12 people had to run to nearby houses to contact emergency services.
13

14 P. Hind asked what cellular service would be expanded. C. Hayes clarified that no cellular service was
15 associated with the project but there would be opportunities for co-location.
16

17 C. Bruhn stated that he disagreed that a 20' reduction in height was sufficient, his property will be negatively
18 impacted. He stated there should be a second balloon test so community members can see the height.
19

20 S. Bruhn stated that the project, if located on the property, could be located further from the road. There will
21 be impacts to historic sites that should be protected by the Regional Plan.
22

23 C. Fourie stated that he felt emergency responses could be addressed via co-location or other options such as
24 satellite communications. The tower will be there for many generations, even after new technologies may be
25 available. He stated they have not had issues contacting emergency services at their location.
26

27 P. Fourie stated that while everyone wants better emergency services, it is important to be done in the least
28 obstructive way possible. She stated there is a need for independent assessment on the best way to provide
29 emergency services. She stated there could be impacts on tourism to historic sites such as the Chester A.
30 Arthur home and the historic Seven Day Adventist church.
31

32 C. Hayes stated that different facilities serve different purposes. The proposed tower would provide macro-
33 scale coverage that could not be provided by co-location on existing structures. There are only 2 existing
34 facilities in 10 miles of the site, with the nearest 5 miles away.
35

36 G. Wolski stated that he was the Director of Operations for Enosburgh Ambulance. The Ambulance has been
37 studying upgrades to its services, radio is a key for safety and communication of crew and residents. Existing
38 coverage is not sufficient.
39

40 V. Tirrito asked for additional information on the coverage provided by the service and possible cellular
41 service. E. Klofft displayed the propagation map included in the application. C. Hayes stated that there was no
42 estimation of cell coverage as any co-location would be subject to separate permitting.
43

44 G. Parent stated that she was the second assistant Chief of Bakersfield Fire. She stated that communications
45 have been a major challenge for the Department to address on a limited budget. This project could improve
46 connectivity to dispatch.

1
2 M. Hull introduced himself as the chief of Bakersfield Fire and the landowner. He stated that his intention with
3 leasing his land was to protect public and improve safety.
4

5 D. Jones stated that public safety was important but that there are also compelling concerns about aesthetic
6 and natural resource impacts. It is important to determine if this is the best siting or if alternative siting on the
7 site could meet the public safety objectives. The area has had a historic district since the 1990s and this
8 deserves special protection.
9

10 C. Hayes noted that the State Historic Preservation Office had signed off on the applicant's finding that the
11 project would not negatively impact historic resources. Moving the project on the site may change locations
12 the tower is visible from but would not likely reduce total visibility and would impact more natural resources.
13

14 R. Willey stated he was a volunteer firefighter and EMT in Bakersfield. He stated that the section of Vermont
15 108 is a dead zone for service and safety is negatively impacted by this.
16

17 G. Wolski provided additional detail on Enosburgh's study of communications. Improvements to the system
18 are extremely expensive compared to overall budget.
19

20 C. Fourie stated that in Fairfax, the applicant's tower had not had antenna installed in 3 years. He asked if the
21 applicant's service would cost taxpayer money for the emergency antenna.
22

23 C. Hayes stated that construction timelines are different for each project. He stated that the dispatch services
24 would be a separate antenna installed on the tower not part of the applicant's paid service. K. Delancy stated
25 that what Enosburgh and Bakersfield are studying is co-locating an additional antenna for their
26 communications.
27

28 B. Irwin asked if there would be co-location space for that antenna. C. Hayes stated that there would be space;
29 the one co-location space is for a panel antenna but there is additional space for whip antennas.
30

31 R. Salvati spoke as a Bakersfield volunteer firefighter and a young person in the community. She has concerns
32 about the lack of service and emergency communications in the area.
33

34 H. Demars stated that this was a very challenging decision to balance the needs of communications services
35 with those that will be negatively impacted by living close to this tower.
36

37 *H. Demars motioned to find that the project conforms to the Regional Plan and does have substantial regional*
38 *impact. Y. Dandurand seconded.*
39

40 B. Irwin stated that he felt given his role as a firefighter in Bakersfield he should abstain from the vote.
41

42 *The motion carried with one abstention.*
43

44 **Act 250: Vermont Agency of Transportation**

45 *Project Details:* Installation of fencing around the Franklin County State Airport, including replacing some areas
46 of inadequate fencing and new fencing in areas not currently fenced.

1
2 E. Klofft reviewed the site plan and draft project review sheet. The project involved improving some areas of
3 fencing and adding additional fencing where there is none currently to prevent animal access and meet FAA
4 guidelines.

5
6 H. Demars questioned the use of barbed wire on the fencing. E. Klofft stated there was nothing in the
7 application that noted security from human access, but it may be part of the FAA standards.

8
9 *B. Buermann motioned that the project conforms to the Regional Plan and does not have a substantial regional*
10 *impact. M. Scholten seconded.*

11
12 H. Demars stated he was opposed to increased investment into the facility.

13
14 *The motion carried 4 in favor, 1 opposed.*

15
16
17 **Staff Reviews:**

18
19 **Section 248a: Verizon Wireless/248a-at 79 Walnut Street Extension-Saint Albans City**

20 *Project Details:* Project is addition of new telecommunications equipment on existing structure at the same
21 centerlines as existing equipment with a net increase of roughly 10 sq. ft. Some portions of the equipment are
22 above the primary roofline of the building, but well below structural elements of the existing building (95.2'
23 AGL versus 132' AGL of existing structure).

24
25 E. Klofft reviewed the project. The project is addition of telecommunications equipment on an industrial
26 building, with equipment not rising above existing structural portions of the building.

27
28 *M. Scholten motioned to confirm the staff review was in conformance with the Regional Plan and not of*
29 *substantial regional impact. Y. Dandurand seconded. The motion carried.*

30
31 **Minutes**

32 *Y. Dandurand motioned to approve the March meeting minutes. M. Scholten seconded. The motion carried.*

33
34 **Updates**

35 E. Klofft noted no new schedule for the Howrigan wind project and that she would be presenting on the
36 Committee's work at its April Board meeting.

37
38 **Commissioner Announcements**

39 None.

40
41 **Adjourn**

42 *H. Demars motioned to adjourn. B. Buermann seconded. The motion carried. The Committee adjourned at*
43 *8:58 PM.*