

1 PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

2 Wednesday, May 13, 2026

3  
4 The meeting of the Project Review Committee was held remotely. B. Irwin called the meeting to order at 6:02  
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: Kamran Hassan (Green Mountain Power)

15  
16 **Changes or Additions to the Agenda:**

17 None.

18  
19 **Welcome and Committee Introductions**

20 B. Irwin welcomed attendees and members introduced themselves.

21  
22 **Public Comment**

23 None.

24  
25 **Project Reviews:**

26 **Section 248: GMP/request for CPG for rebuild of Georgia substation-Georgia**

27 *Project Details:* Upgrade and expansion of Georgia substation. Substation yard will be increased from  
28 6,040 square feet to 13,862 square feet.

29  
30 K. Hassan provided an overview of the project site plan. The project will improve reliability of the substation.

31  
32 B. Buermann noted that Commissioner Kirk Waite had sent over questions about the screening plan and the  
33 planned removal of vegetation. K. Hassan noted that the consultant had prepared a landscaping plan. The  
34 Committee reviewed the landscaping plan and asked clarifying questions. K. Hassan explained that the taller  
35 trees had to be removed for safety and reliability reasons, but that new lower growing vegetation would be  
36 installed to screen views.

37  
38 B. Irwin asked about the site grading. K. Hassan stated that they are grading the site to ensure that runoff  
39 continues to flow as it does currently and make the site level.

40  
41 H. Demars asked if a municipal permit is required. K. Hassan stated one would be required for the control  
42 building.

43  
44 H. Demars asked what the impacts to prime agricultural soils are. K. Hassan stated that the impacts were  
45 expected to be temporary and that GMP would manage it as requested by the Agency of Agriculture.

1 H. Demars asked how the old material would be disposed. K. Hassan stated that they would either keep as  
2 spares or dispose appropriately including salvage and recycling.

3  
4 B. Irwin asked about the lighting on site. K. Hassan stated that lighting would be used only in emergencies.

5  
6 E. Klofft reviewed the definition of substantial regional impact.

7  
8 *H. Demars motioned to find the project in conformance with the Regional Plan and of a substantial regional*  
9 *impact. J. Callan seconded. The motion carried.*

10  
11 **Staff Reviews:**

12  
13 **Section 248a: Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems LLC (353 US Route 2, South Hero, VT)**

14 *Project Details:* New telecommunications equipment on an existing silo tower, no equipment increases  
15 above the height of the silo, ~5 sq. ft. increase in surface area of equipment.

16  
17 E. Klofft reviewed the site plan review. B. Irwin noted that it was positive that the applicant was seeking co-  
18 location on existing structures.

19  
20 **Act 250- David Garfinkle**

21 *Project Details:* (1) installation of a 6-foot-wide paved pathway from the existing single-family residence  
22 to the shoreline, and (2) construction of a new mound wastewater disposal system to accommodate an  
23 increase to a 7-bedroom residence. Disturbances are within 250' of shoreline but are within an existing grass  
24 lawn area.

25  
26 E. Klofft reviewed the site plan. All improvements were in the existing grass area. The project is subject to Act  
27 250 due to it being part of a subdivision required to go through Act 250.

28  
29 *H. Demars motioned to find the two staff review projects in conformance with the Regional Plan and not of*  
30 *substantial regional impact.*

31  
32 *B. Buermann proposed a friendly amendment to the motion.*

33  
34 *H. Demars motioned to confirm that the Committee supported the staff reviews. Y. Dandurand seconded. The*  
35 *motion carried.*

36  
37  
38 **Updates**

39 E. Klofft stated that the Public Utility Commission had approved the Howrigan project. The final decision  
40 granted due consideration to the comments of the RPC but did not find them to be sufficient to deny the CPG.

41  
42 **Minutes**

43 *Y. Dandurand motioned to approve the April meeting minutes. H. Demars seconded. The motion carried.*  
44  
45  
46

1 **Commissioner Announcements**

2 None.

3

4 **Adjourn**

5 *H. Demars motioned to adjourn. B. Buermann seconded. The motion carried. The Committee adjourned at*

6 *6:57 PM.*

DRAFT