

State of Vermont
NATURAL RESOURCES BOARD
DISTRICT #3 ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION
100 Mineral Street, Suite 305, Springfield, VT 05156-3168

RE: Chelsea Fish and Game Club, Inc. Application #3R0818-1
P.O. Box 262 Findings of Fact, Conclusions
Chelsea, VT 05038 of Law, and Order
 10 V.S.A. §§ 6001-6093 (Act
 250)

I. INTRODUCTION

On August 8, 2014, Chelsea Fish & Game Club, Inc. (the Club) filed an application for an Act 250 permit for a project generally described as relocating and constructing a new shooting range consisting of a 10-foot by 50-foot shooting canopy with six shooting stations and the installation of a new granite sign. The project is located at 113 East Randolph Road in Chelsea.

A hearing was held on September 22, 2014, preceded by a site visit of the project site. The hearing was held at the Club house. The tract of land consists of 142 acres. The Applicant's legal interest is ownership in fee simple described in a deed recorded on July 1, 1959 in the land records of Chelsea, Vermont.

At the end of the hearing, the Commission recessed the proceeding pending the submittal of additional information. The Commission adjourned the hearing on July 6, 2015, after receipt of the additional information, an opportunity for parties to respond to that information, and the completion of Commission deliberations.

II. JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction attaches because the proposed changes to the shooting range constitute a material change to a permitted development, and thus requires a permit amendment pursuant to Act 250 Rule 34.

The sign installation is not a material change and can be installed without a permit amendment.

III. PARTY STATUS AND FRIENDS OF THE COMMISSION

A. Parties by Right

Parties by right to this application pursuant to 10 V.S.A. § 6085(c)(1)(A)-(D) are:

The Applicant by Rich Gilman, Theresa Gilman, Jeffrey Eastman, Evan Hughes, and Clint Gray.

The Municipality of Chelsea, not represented.

The Chelsea Planning Commission, not represented.

The Two Rivers-Ottawaquechee Regional Commission, through written testimony.
The State of Vermont Agency of Natural Resources (ANR).

B. Interested Parties

Any person who has a particularized interest protected by Act 250 that may be affected by an act or decision of the Commission is also entitled to party status. 10 V.S.A. § 6085(c)(1)(E).

i. Preliminary Party Status Determinations

Pursuant to Act 250 Rule 14(E), the District Commission made preliminary determinations concerning party status at the commencement of the hearing on this application. The following persons requested party status pursuant to 10 V.S.A. § 6085(c)(1)(E), and were admitted as parties, as indicated below:

1. Larry Allen resides at 5 Brook Road, Chelsea, adjacent to the project site, and is concerned with additional noise. The Commission granted preliminary party status under Criterion 8 Aesthetics as it relates to Noise.
2. Rory and Christine Allen reside at 37 Hook Road, Chelsea, approximately one mile from the project site. Their property is adjacent to the project site. They can hear the shooting activity at the current shooting range location and are concerned that the proposed improvements will increase the use and noise at the site. The Commission granted preliminary party status under Criterion 8 Aesthetics as it relates to Noise.

ii. Final Party Status Determinations

Prior to the close of hearings, the District Commission re-examined the preliminary party status determinations in accordance with 10 V.S.A. § 6086(c)(6) and Act 250 Rule 14(E) and found no reason to change its preliminary determinations.

IV. OFFICIAL NOTICE

Under 3 V.S.A. § 810(4) of the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), notice may be taken of judicially cognizable facts in contested cases. See 10 V.S.A. § 6007(c) and 3 V.S.A. § 801(b)(2). Under § 810(1) of the APA, “[t]he rules of evidence as applied in civil cases shall be followed” in contested cases. Under the Vermont Rules of Evidence, “(a) judicially noticed fact must be one not subject to reasonable dispute in that it is ... (2) capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.” V.R.E. 201(b); See *In re: Handy*, 144 Vt.601, 613 (1984).

The Commission may take official notice of a judicially cognizable fact whether requested or not, and may do so at any stage of the proceeding. See V.R.E. 201(c) and (f). Under 3 V.S.A. § 809(g), the Commission may make findings of fact based on matters officially noticed. A party is entitled, upon timely request, to an opportunity to be heard as to the propriety of taking official notice and the tenor of the matter noticed. See V.R.E. 201(e). Accordingly, official notice is hereby taken of the Two Rivers-Ottauquechee Regional Plan, the Chelsea Town, and Land Use Permit #3R0818 (Chelsea Fish & Game Club), and Land Use Permit #3R0722 (Allenville Ledge Quarry). The Commission takes official notice of these documents subject to the filing of an objection on or before thirty days from the date of this decision pursuant to Act 250 Rule 6.

V. FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The District Commission initiated the review process on this application as a Minor application under Act 250 Rule 51 on August 8, 2014. The Commission distributed a notice and proposed permit establishing a deadline of September 8, 2014, by which parties, or the Commission on its own motion, could request a hearing on this matter. The Commission received timely requests for a public hearing from Larry Allen and Rory and Christine Allen under Criterion 8 as it relates to Noise. On September 10, 2014, the Commission issued an Act 250 Notice and Hearing indicating that a public hearing would be held because substantive issues were raised on Criterion 8 (Noise). Pursuant to Act 250 Board Rule 51(F), the Commission need only prepare Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law on those criteria or subcriteria at issue during the hearing. Therefore, the following Findings of Fact are limited to Criteria 1 Air Pollution and 8 Aesthetics as it relates to Noise.

The findings of fact are based on the application, Exhibits # 1 - 33 and other evidence in the record.

Under Act 250, projects are reviewed for compliance with the ten criteria of Act 250, 10 V.S.A. § 6086(a)(1)-(10). Before granting a permit, the District Commission must find that the Project complies with these criteria and, therefore, is not detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare. The burden of proof under Criteria 1 through 4 and 9 and 10 is on the applicant, and on the opponent under Criteria 5 through 8, and 9A if the municipality does not have a duly adopted capital improvement program.

General Findings:

1. Act 250 permit #3R0818, issued on July 20, 1999, authorized the construction of the Club House with parking lot for 30 cars. Exhibit 1.
2. The Club maintains a range and trap management plan that monitors the pH of the soil. Exhibit 1.

Criterion 8 - Aesthetics

3. The existing shooting range is located on a 142-acre tract of land that is bordered by the East Randolph Road along the north and east sides and adjacent to wooded parcels on the other sides. Approximately 20% is open agricultural land and is the location of the existing shooting range and Club House. The wooded areas that comprise the remaining 80% of the tract include a mix of hardwood and softwood trees. The wooded areas have slopes ranging from 3-25%. There are some seasonal streams throughout the parcel discharging to a small wet area along the southeasterly end of the property. Exhibits 1, 4, 7, and 14.
4. A farm and farmhouse is located opposite the existing shooting range with access off Brook Road and the East Randolph Road. A sawmill with access off the East Randolph Road is located southeast of the shooting range. A permitted rock quarry (Land Use Permit #3R0722 and amendments) is located on property belonging to Lawrence and Agnes Allen, operated by McCullough Crushing, Inc., opposite the shooting range with access off the East Randolph Road. Trucking operations end at 5:00 P.M. and there is no trucking on weekends or holidays. Exhibit 14, 33 and Testimony.
5. The permitted Club House and an existing barn are situated on the property near the access to the shooting range across from the Brook Road intersection with the East Randolph Road. Exhibits 4 and 16.
6. The proposed project is to relocate the existing shooting range by shifting it north with the proposed covered shooting canopy located near the existing barn. Exhibits 4, 9 and 16.
7. The Club's existing shooting range is considered a single station facility because it has only one shooting station; however, Club members occasionally shoot two or more at one time. Targets are located at both 50 and 100 yards. These targets were constructed in 1960 with dirt backdrops and wood-homasote frames. Exhibits 1 and 32.
8. The new shooting range will restrict the number of shooters to the number of stations available. The Club states "[t]he caliber of firearm used and the duration of use will remain unrestricted. As a private club, it retains the right and ability to self-regulate the conditions-of-use associated with the facility." Exhibit 32.
9. The Club originally proposed a shooting lane of 60 feet wide with six shooting stations. They have revised the plans to a 40-foot wide lane with four shooting stations. The 20 feet would be shifted away from the Club House. Also, drivable access to the range floor will be relocated along the northwest berm and will be gated. The height and width of the berms will

remain the same size and fencing with sound absorption barrier will remain the same. This change will reduce the “open ends” of the range and the number of potential shooters at one time. Exhibit 32.

10. The new shooting range will be constructed utilizing the guidelines of the National Rifle Association’s “The Range Source Book;” including the construction of 8-foot high side berms. Using the natural terrain, the new range will be constructed into an uphill slope allowing for a 25-foot (+/-) high backstop. The berms will provide a visual buffer for motorists traveling along the town highway. The berms and range will be grassed and a future perimeter fence (e.g. woven wire, chain-link or similar) is planned. Exhibits 4, 17, 18, 19 and 26.
11. The Club’s current posted hours of operation are one half hour before sunrise to one half hour after sunset. The hours for the new facility will be the same except that the range will not be open until 8:00 a.m. on Saturdays and Sundays. The current shooting range is “unrestricted” on the caliber of firearm used, the duration of the use and on the number of individuals shooting at one time. Exhibits 4 and 32.
12. The new shooting range will have a 10-foot by 50-foot covered shooting canopy constructed on a concrete pad. The natural wooden structure will have a metal or asphalt shingled roof in a color to complement the adjacent structures. Exhibits 4 and 20.
13. The Club has grown from approximately 150 members in 1957 to 450 members in 2014. The shooting range has hosted programs such as “Women On Target” and “Vermont Hunter Safety Education” programs. The Orange County Sheriff’s Department has used the shooting range for training activities. The number of trainings varies annually. Exhibits 1 and 32.
14. The neighbors are concerned that with the improvements and expansion of the shooting range, usage and the noise levels will increase to an intolerable level. They note this has happened after the improvements were made at Hammonds Cove Shooting Range and the Upper Valley Fish and Game Club. They further note that the complaints about noise at these facilities are coming from neighbors located “at a much greater distance away and with more vegetation than our location with Chelsea’s club.” Exhibit 33.
15. The new range will be closer to Lawrence and Agnes Allen’s house and farm than the existing shooting range. The Allens also own another residence across the road from the existing range that they rent to others. The Allen’s house and farm is in the line-of-sight of the proposed shooting range and they will be able to see the backstop of the new range. The new shooting shelter is less than 300 feet from the rental house and about 300 feet to the farm buildings and the Allen’s house. Exhibit 33.

16. The Allens note the type of gun use has changed from the past and “[i]t is not just sighting in your deer rifle anymore, there is more assault weapons, machine guns and larger magazines so that shots can be fired more rapidly. This should be addressed.” Exhibit 33.
17. The Applicant has not submitted any data related to the use of the existing shooting range. There is no record of how many people use the range, when they use the range, what caliber of firearms are used, or any other information related to the use of the shooting range. The Commission recognizes that the existing shooting range has existed since before Act 250 was enacted (1970), however, there is no evidence establishing a “grandfathered” level of noise and/or activity to form a basis from which to measure or compare new activity and/or noise levels. Exhibit 32 and Testimony.
18. As a condition of the grant awarded to the club for construction of the new range it will be obligated to offer a minimum of 20 hours of public shooting a month with ten hours occurring on weekends for ten years. Exhibit 32.
19. No professional noise study has been completed by the Applicant of baseline noise, noise levels from the different types of firearms allowed or used on the site, or the expected noise as a result of the changes requested. Neva Noise Solutions (Neva), a company that provides products and services for controlling noise, recommends that the Club install an eight-foot high chain link fence, or other appropriate substrate wall, with an exterior grade noise barrier/sound absorber composite attached along the open ends between the barn and the new berms (sound curtain) to reduce noise levels. Exhibits 23, 24, and 25.
20. Sound barriers have been installed at the Hammond Cove Shooting Range in Hartland, Vermont. The installation was completed *after* and *as a result of* a professional noise study conducted by Resource Systems Group, Inc. Exhibit 28.
21. At the Chelsea shooting range, instantaneous sound was measured at four locations by Department of Fish and Wildlife personnel using shots from a .22LR rifle (21 grain), a .30-30 rifle (150 grain), a 9mm handgun (115 grain) and a .243 rifle (100 grain). The sound meter was set to log C-weighted sound pressure levels and was equipped with a wind screen. The Department personnel then extrapolated from experience with sound barriers at the Hammond Cove Shooting Range in Hartland, to make some predictions as to noise levels after the installation of noise barriers at the Chelsea site. Although the Department of Fish and Wildlife acknowledges that the acoustic environments of the two sites are different they opined that the results of proposed noise mitigation is “likely to be similar.” Exhibit 28.

22. On September 10, 2014, the Chelsea Development Review Board found that the shooting range redevelopment with new shooting shelter satisfies the conditional use criteria for Commercial Outdoor Recreation within the Rural Residential District and a zoning permit was issued.
23. The Chelsea shooting range is located within the Rural Area as designated by the Two Rivers-Ottauquechee Regional (TROR) Plan. The Plan indicates that within the Rural Areas, development must reflect the principle of "balancing of landowners' rights to use their land, with the corresponding rights of abutting and neighboring landowners to live without undue disturbance (e.g., noise, smoke, fumes, dust, odor, glare, stormwater runoff, etc.). Exhibits 12 and 22 (page 37, TROR Plan).

Conclusions of Law

AESTHETICS

Prior to granting a permit, the Commission must find that the project development under Criterion 8 will not have an undue adverse effect on aesthetics" 10 V.S.A. § 6086(a)(8).

The Commission uses a two-part test to determine whether a Project meets the portion of Criterion 8 relating to aesthetics. First, it determines whether the Project will have an adverse effect. Second, it determines whether the adverse effect, if any, is undue. *In re Rinkers, Inc.*, No. 302-12-08 Vtec, Decision and Order at 12 (Vt. Env'tl. Ct. May 17, 2010)(citations omitted); see also, *Re: Quechee Lakes Corporation, #3W0411-EB and #3W0439-EB*, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 18-20 (Vt. Env'tl. Bd. Nov. 4, 1985); *In re Halnon*, 174 Vt. 514 (mem.)(applying Quechee test in Section 248 context).

The burden of proof under Criterion 8 is on any party opposing the Project, 10 V.S.A. § 6088(b), but the applicant must provide sufficient information for the Commission to make affirmative findings. *In re Rinkers*, No. 302-12-08 Vtec, Decision and Order at 10-11 (Vt. Env'tl. Ct. May 17, 2010)(citing *Re: Susan Dollenmaier, #3W0125-5-EB*, Findings, Conclusions and Order at 8 (Vt Env'tl. Bd. Feb. 7, 2005); *In re Eastview at Middlebury, Inc.*, No. 256-11-06 Vtec, slip op. at 5 (Vt. Env'tl. Ct. Feb. 15, 2008), aff'd, 2009 VT 98. "Either party's burden, however, may be satisfied by evidence introduced by any of the parties or witnesses" *In re McShinsky*, 153 Vt. 586, 589 (1990) (quoting *In re Quechee Lakes Corp.*, 154 Vt. 543, 553-54 (1990)).

1. Adverse Effect

To determine whether the Project will have an adverse aesthetic effect, the Commission looks to whether the Project will "fit" the context in which it will be located. In making this evaluation, the Commission examines a number of specific factors, including: the nature of the project's surroundings; the compatibility of the

project's design with those surroundings and the potential impact of the project. *Quechee Lakes Corp et al. #3W0411-EB and #3W0439-EB Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order at 18 (Vt. Env'tl. Bd., Nov. 4, 1985)*(cited in *Rinkers*, No. 302-12-08 Vtec, Decision and Order at 12-13).

The Project is in an area that has mixed rural uses, including residences, the shooting range, a farm, and an active quarry with associated crushing and trucking. Neighbors have been able to co-exist with the shooting range in its current configuration and usage level. The changes in the facility which would alter the direction, frequency and volume of noise have the potential for significant adverse impacts to neighbors. Also, the improvements have the potential to increase usage and, in fact, part of the grant requires access by the public whereas, heretofore, it has been a members only club with some special events/education programs. The Applicant has failed to meet its burden of production that such changes will not be adverse.

2. Undue Adverse Effect

An adverse aesthetic impact is undue if any of the following is true: (1) the Project violates a clear, written community standard intended to preserve the aesthetics or scenic beauty of the area; (2) the Project offends the sensibilities of the average person, or is offensive or shocking because it is out of character with its surroundings or significantly diminishes the scenic qualities of the area; or (3) the Applicant failed to take generally available mitigating steps which a reasonable person would take to improve the harmony of the Project with its surroundings. *In re Rinkers*, 302-12-08 Vtec, Decision and Order at 15 (May 22, 2010)(citing *In re: Times & Seasons, LLC*, 2008 VT 7, ¶ 8; *In re McShinsky*, 153 Vt. at 592).

(a) Clear, Written Community Standard

In evaluating whether a project violates a clear written community standard, the Commission looks to town plans, open land studies, and other municipal documents to discern whether a clear, written community standard exists to be applied in review of aesthetic impacts of a project. *Hannaford Brothers Co. and Southland Enterprises, Inc.*, #4C0238-5-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 18 (Vt. Env'tl. Bd., April 9, 2002). A clear, written community standard must be intended to preserve the aesthetics or scenic beauty of the area" where the project is located. *Re: Green Meadows Center, LLC, The Community Alliance and Southeastern Vermont Community Action*, #2WO694-I-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 36 (Vt. Env'tl. Bd., Dec. 21, 2000).

A plan which states "consideration should be made . . ." is not a clear, written community standard. *Barre Granite Quarries, LLC and William and Margaret Dyott*, #7C1079(Revised)-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order at 81 (Vt. Env'tl. Bd., Dec. 8, 2000). Although the proposed Project does not meet the specific

goals or objectives cited above there are no clear community standards relevant to the proposed Project's impacts on aesthetics.

The Commission has reviewed relevant portions of the municipal and regional plan, and does not find either plan has a clear, written community standard intended to preserve the aesthetics of the area with respect to noise. The regional plan does include the following language regarding "balancing of landowners' rights to use their land, with the corresponding rights of abutting and neighboring landowners to live without undue disturbance (e.g., noise, smoke, fumes, dust, odor, glare, stormwater runoff, etc.)." Although the intent is present to protect the interests of both parties the language is standardless as it does not define what would constitute "undue" noise or provide guidance as to how to balance competing interests. The Vermont Supreme Court in *In re Appeal of JAM Golf, LLC*, 2008 VT 110 stated:

The city plan also lays out a general policy of promoting growth and residential development in the Quadrant that is at odds with the notion of complete preservation of the status quo. This growth-oriented policy is in tension with the goal of protecting natural resources, and the city plan *provides insufficient guidance as to how the Board or a landowner should balance these competing concerns when applying for or evaluating a permit application*. As a result, this aspect of the city plan is too ambiguous to be enforceable. (Emphasis added).

(b) Offensive or Shocking Character

Criterion 8 "was not intended to prevent all change to the landscape of Vermont or to guarantee that the view a person sees from their property will remain the same forever." *Re: Okemo Mountain, Inc. #2S0351-S-EB* Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order (Dec. 18, 1986). Criterion 8 was intended to ensure that as development occurs, reasonable consideration will be given to visual impacts on neighboring landowners, the local community, and on the special scenic resources of Vermont. *Rinkers*, No. 302-12-08 Vtec, Decision and Order at 11-12; *Horizon Development Corp.*, #4C0841-EB, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order (Vt. Env'tl. Bd. Aug. 21, 1992).

Without more specific information we do not know if the results of the new project will be shocking or offensive. Although the Applicant does not want restrictions on the caliber of firearms or the duration of firing, without identifying restrictions it is impossible to know whether the facility will or won't be offensive or shocking.

(c) Generally Available Mitigating steps

The question under this factor of the aesthetics analysis is whether the Applicant has "failed to take generally available mitigating steps that a reasonable person would take to improve the harmony of the proposed project with its surroundings." *In re Times & Seasons*, 2008 VT 7, ¶ 8. If a project does have an adverse aesthetic

effect, the applicant must “take generally available mitigating steps to reduce the negative aesthetic impact of a particular project,” otherwise, “[f]ailure to take advantage of available alternatives may render an aesthetic impact unduly adverse.” *In re Stokes Communications Corp.*, 164 Vt. 30, 39 (1995)(quoted in *In re Rinkers*, 302-12-08 Vtec, Decision and Order at 19 (May 22, 2010). A generally available mitigating step “is one that is reasonably feasible and does not frustrate [either] the project's purpose or Act 250's goals.”

To mitigate the aesthetic impacts of the Project, the Applicant has engaged the assistance of both the Department of Fish and Wildlife and a company that provides products and services for controlling noise. These steps are helpful, but insufficient to meet the burden of production. For this type of project the Commission needs an accurate and professional noise evaluation. Some crucial factors need to be addressed as follows:

1. Identification of all potential noise sources. This means that the Club will have to identify which firearms will be allowed to be used and which will not as there is a difference in noise between different type of firearms. It will also need to identify rules for usage.
2. The noise assessment needs to be specific to the conditions and topography on the site and not extrapolated from another property. Modelling noise and topography can provide guidance as to how to design range improvements that not only improve safety, but can reduce noise for residents.
3. Clear description of the noise levels that can occur, including the number of shooters and frequency of shots. An assessment as to whether noise is undue is not just a matter of the instantaneous decibel levels, but the types and frequency of the noise.
4. It is also necessary to identify what the noise levels will be at all residences and areas of frequent use.

In terms of mitigation of the noise, the Applicant has not provided persuasive evidence that the project has been planned to “take generally available mitigating steps to reduce the negative aesthetic impacts.” There needs to be some thought as to what is a reasonable level of activity for the facility and how to ensure that level of activity can be successfully managed. Many clubs have rules for the type of firearms and usage; to say that there have been no complaints in the past does not assure that the status quo will remain. The grant anticipates there will be additional users as it mandates a minimum of 20 hours of public shooting a month with ten hours occurring on weekends for ten years. Depending on how and when this public shooting occurs, this alone, may be a significant difference for neighbors. It is incumbent on the Applicant to identify how this requirement can be met without creating undue impacts for neighbors. Discussion with neighbors about when the

ten hours on weekends should occur would be a good way to begin planning for this change.

Based on the above, the Commission concludes that the Applicant has not met its burden of production and the project does not comply with Criterion 8.

V. SUMMARY CONCLUSION OF LAW

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Commission concludes that the Project does not comply with 10 V.S.A. § 6086(a) Criterion 8 Aesthetics

VI. ORDER

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, Land Use Permit #3R0818-1 is denied.

Dated at Springfield, Vermont, this 7th day of July, 2015.



By _____
Tim Taylor, Chair
District 3 Environmental Commission
Natural Resources Board

Commissioners participating in this decision: Clotilde Hryshko
Linda Gray

Any party may file a motion to alter with the District Commission within 15 days from the date of this decision, pursuant to Act 250 Rule 31(A).

The applicant may file an application for reconsideration with the District Commission within six months of this decision, pursuant to Act 250 Rule 31(B).

Any appeal of this decision must be filed with the Superior Court, Environmental Division within 30 days of the date of this decision, pursuant to 10 V.S.A. Chapter 220. The Notice of Appeal must comply with the Vermont Rules for Environmental Court Proceedings (VRECP). The appellant must file with the Notice of Appeal the \$265.00 entry fee required by 32 V.S.A. § 1431.

The appellant must also serve a copy of the Notice of Appeal on the Natural Resources Board, National Life Dewey Building, Montpelier, VT 05620-3201, and on other parties in accordance with VRECP 5(b)(4)(B).

For additional information on filing appeals, see the Court's website at: <http://www.vermontjudiciary.org/GTC/environmental/default.aspx> or call (802) 828-1660. The Court's mailing address is: Vermont Superior Court, Environmental Division, 32 Cherry Street, 2nd Floor, Suite 303, Burlington, VT 05401.

E-Notification CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE #3R0818-1

I hereby certify that I sent a copy of the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law on July 7, 2015, by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, to the individuals without email addresses and by electronic mail, to the following with email addresses: **Note: Any recipient may change its preferred method of receiving notices and other documents by contacting the District Office staff at the mailing address or email below. If you have elected to receive notices and other documents by email, it is your responsibility to notify our office of any email address changes.** All email replies should be sent to nrb-act250springfield@state.vt.us

Chelsea Fish & Game Club, Inc.
Att: Richard Gilman and Theresa Gilman
P.O. Box 262
Chelsea, VT 05038
TheresaGilman15@gmail.com

Jeffrey Eastman, President
Chelsea Fish & Game
150 Corinth Rd.
Chelsea, VT 05038
Jleastman78@gmail.com

Chelsea Selectboard
Carol Olsen, Chair
3 Vershire Center Rd, Chelsea, VT 05038
carololsen685@gmail.com

Chelsea Town Planning
Stanley Brinkman, Chair
P.O. Box 266, Chelsea, VT 05038
stanbrinkman@brinkmanlaw.org

Two Rivers-Ottauquechee
Regional Commission
128 King Farm Rd, Woodstock, VT 05091
dgish@trorc.org

Laurence Allen
5 Brook Road
Chelsea, VT 05038

Rory and Chris Allen
37 Hook Road, Chelsea, VT 05038
RCSAAllen@myfairpoint.net

Elizabeth Lord, Esq. / Land Use Attorney
ANR Office of Planning & Legal Affairs
1 National Life Dr., Davis 2
Montpelier, VT 05602-3901
anr.act250@state.vt.us
elizabeth.lord@state.vt.us
jennifer.mojo@state.vt.us

FOR INFORMATION ONLY
District 3 Environmental Commission
100 Mineral Street, Suite 305
Springfield, VT 05156
NRB-Act250Springfield@state.vt.us

Chelsea Town Clerk, Karen Lathrop
P.O. Box 266, Chelsea, VT 05038
town.clerk@chelseavt.us

Dick Drysdale - for FYI only
The Herald of Randolph
editor@ourherald.com

Evan Hughes
VT Federation Sportsman Club
16 Millstone Blvd.
Barre, VT 05641

Clint Gray
VT Federation Sportsman Club
P.O. Box 225
Lyndonville, VT 0-5851
clintgrayvt@yahoo.com

Tim Roberge
32 Whitney Lyman Drive.
Chelsea, VT 05038

David Grayck, Esq.
dgrayck@hcsmlaw.com

By: 
Susan Precourt
NRB Technician