

**CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**  
**Draft MINUTES**  
**December 14, 2021**

**Commissioners:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barre City	Janet Shatney, Sec/Treas	<input type="checkbox"/> Moretown	Dara Torre
<input type="checkbox"/>	Vacant, Alt.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joyce Manchester, Alt
<input type="checkbox"/> Barre Town	Byron Atwood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Northfield	Laura Hill-Eubanks
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	George Clain, Alt	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Orange	Lee Cattaneo
<input type="checkbox"/> Berlin	Robert Wernecke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plainfield	Paula Emery
<input type="checkbox"/>	Karla Nuissl, Alt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bob Atchinson, Alt.
<input type="checkbox"/> Cabot	Amy Hornblas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Roxbury	Gerry D'Amico, Vice-Chair
<input type="checkbox"/> Calais	John Brabant	<input type="checkbox"/> Waitsfield	Don La Haye
<input type="checkbox"/>	Jan Ohlsson, Alt.	<input type="checkbox"/> Warren	Harrison Snapp, Alt.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duxbury	Alan Quackenbush	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vacant
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E. Montpelier	Clarice Cutler (Interim)	<input type="checkbox"/>	J. Michael Bridgewater, Alt.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Vacant, Alt.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Washington	Peter Carbee
<input type="checkbox"/> Fayston	Russ Bowen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Waterbury	Steve Lotspeich, Chair
<input type="checkbox"/> Marshfield	Robin Schunk	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Williamstown	Richard Turner
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Middlesex	Ron Krauth	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jacqueline Higgins, Alt.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Montpelier	Marcella Dent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Woodbury	Michael Gray
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mike Miller, Alt.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Worcester	Bill Arrand

Staff: Bonnie Waninger, Nancy Chartrand, Christian Meyer, Grace Vinson, Clare Rock

Guests: Jamie Stewart, CVEDC

**Call to Order**

Chair Lotspeich called the meeting to order at 6:33 pm. Quorum was present to conduct business.

**Adjustments to the Agenda**

None

**Public Comments**

None

**American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA)**

Chair Lotspeich introduced Grace Vinson who proceeded to share a presentation on the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) outlining what items can be spent on: Pandemic Response; Premium Pay; Lost Revenue; Water, Sewer, and Broadband Infrastructure and providing examples in each category. For Pandemic Response she noted it is important to think about what is an impact of COVID you want your ARPA funding to address and how to make the connection. For Premium Pay – it is important to note that to be eligible to receive premium pay they have to be an eligible worker and have to be doing essential work. The full definition for this work is provided here:

<https://www.vlct.org/resources/american-rescue-plan-information#faq-What-types-of-positions-are->

1 [considered-%22eligible-workers%22-performing-%22essential-work%22-for-premium-pay?](#)

2  
3 Vinson also outlined what you cannot spend funds on - federal match; pensions; infrastructure that isn't  
4 directly addressed in ARPA; rainy day funds, financial reserves or outstanding debt.

5  
6 Best Practices were also outlined for using/obligating the ARPA funds. It was noted that obligation of  
7 funds is to have a contract in place for the funds. Funds must be obligated by the end of 2024. Staff at  
8 CVRPC is available to help towns work through the best practices.

9  
10 Vinson advised the State is also getting ARPA funds such as DEC Water and Wastewater funding.  
11 Municipalities should consider if there are programs that have State ARPA funds to do their projects so  
12 they can apply their own ARPA funds to other projects. It was also noted that funds can be transferred  
13 to nonprofits or other 3<sup>rd</sup> party organizations; and that they can be pooled with other municipalities to  
14 achieve scale for deeper impact.

15  
16 Also reviewed was ARPA reporting, with the 1<sup>st</sup> report being due April 30, 2022. The Treasury has set up  
17 a reporting portal that all municipalities will report through and they will contact all municipalities to  
18 provide information on how to access their reporting portal. Vinson noted it is very important to think  
19 about the expenditure categories noted earlier in the presentation because that is how municipalities  
20 will be reporting on the projects.

21  
22 It was noted that CVRPC is available to assist with project prioritization and eligibility consideration;  
23 meet with Selectboard or municipal stakeholders to discuss ARPA, host public forums, develop surveys  
24 or assist with other outreach. Vinson is available to come to meetings, discuss ideas via phone, etc.

25  
26 Discussion ensued related pooling of funds, digitation of land records, as well as lost revenue thresholds.  
27 There was a request that the Board receive regular updates on ARPA going into the future and the  
28 presentation will be shared on our website.

29  
30 Municipalities can use ARPA funds to pay someone to assist with project management (RPC's,  
31 consultants, own project manager). CVRPC is available to provide project management services.

### 32 **Capital Improvement Planning**

33 Chair Lotspeich introduced Christian Meyer to talk about Capital Improvement Programming (CIP). He  
34 outlined why a municipality would engage in CIP and what a CIP is. A CIP is, at minimum, a six-year  
35 document: the capital budget for the upcoming fiscal year, plus the following five years of anticipated  
36 investments. There is a lot of flexibility in how to make CIP work for a municipality based on how  
37 capital projects are defined as part of State statute (Section 4430 of Chapter 117). A list of projects,  
38 what they would cost and the year of the expected expenditure is a simple outline of what a CIP could  
39 be, however it should be paired with a clear process that municipal staff, municipal committees and  
40 residents have access to. Meyer provided examples of what might be included in an inventory and  
41 what the process might entail.

42  
43  
44 L. Cattaneo noted that the Town of Orange just received a Municipal Planning Grant to do their CIP and

1 will be working with Christian as grant manager and they appreciate the help received so far.

2  
3 Financing mechanisms were briefly discussed. In addition, the following examples of CIP were shared:  
4 The Town of Warren has a CIP and uses it as a municipal tax stabilization tool to plan out capital  
5 expenditures and determine their ability to bond or put funds in a project. This has allowed them to  
6 create a stable tax rate for residents that increases gradually instead of steep increases to fund capital  
7 improvements. Waterbury initially used their CIP for trucks and equipment that allows a stable  
8 contributions towards these items.

9  
10 Capital Investment Programming is a very interactive process and helps stabilize town budgets from  
11 year to year, especially for smaller municipalities.

### 12 13 **Ivy Computers Letter of Support**

14 Chair Lotspeich directed the Board to the information in the packet and the need for this project to  
15 come before the full Board. It was noted that the project is in the planning stage and has not gone  
16 through the permit process yet. Ivy Computers is looking for financing help through the Vermont  
17 Employment Growth Incentive Program (VEGI). Jamie Stewart of CVEDC confirmed the details of the  
18 project as outlined in the packet. He noted that VEGI financing incentive supports significant business  
19 expansions in Vermont, and he outlined how the program works over a multi-year period with regard to  
20 awards, and advised that if company projections are not met, that no award is given, confirming that the  
21 work must be done as promised in order to maintain the incentive.

22  
23 It was noted that statutorily, the Regional Planning Commissions and the Regional Development  
24 Corporations are provided seats on the VEGI council to review and comment on applications in their  
25 region. This project is required to have a letter of support from the RPC regarding conformity with the  
26 Regional Plan, from the RDC and also from the Town of Waterbury to ensure the project is supported by  
27 the community.

28  
29 Significant discussion ensued with concern being raised that a support letter may compromise future  
30 comments our Project Review Committee may have during that permitting phase based on the issues of  
31 transportation, prime agricultural soils, etc. as outlined in the support letter. Waninger noted that with  
32 regard to project review, we detail in our letter a right to comment when the project goes through the  
33 Act 250 process. There was also concern about additional employees given our current issues with  
34 employee and housing shortages, as well as the Route 100 corridor traffic impacts and sprawl  
35 development.

36  
37 It was noted that this is an existing developed site in an area with a lot of existing development, and that  
38 there is public transportation that travels on the Route 100 corridor. It was noted the soils are not  
39 agricultural soils as they were disturbed for airport use in the past. It was also noted it was a huge  
40 economic driver for the Town of Waterbury.

41  
42 Chair Lotspeich requested Rock's perspective with regard to conformance to the Regional Plan. Rock  
43 noted that one of the key aspects is that it is an already developed site and the proposed development  
44 is on the current footprint; which helps to tip the scale towards conformance vs. non-conformance.

1 Because site is already developed it is put in a different context and the Regional Plan indicates that  
2 small scale office and business uses in this district are compatible based on existing use. She noted that  
3 support of a concept vs. support of a concrete development proposal are two separate pieces. Once  
4 there is a concrete development proposal the Project Review Committee can dig into more of the details  
5 and specific impacts of how that proposal relates to the Regional Plan and we reserve the right to make  
6 more specific comments when we get the development proposal.

7  
8 *G. Clain moved to accept the draft letter of conformance for Ivy Computers. Seconded by B. Arrand.*

9 Discussion continued that the issue of Route 100 traffic is a regional conversation between CVRPC,  
10 Lamoille County RPC, Waterbury, Morrisville, and Stowe, and VTrans. With the Regional Plan update,  
11 we might want to spend time thinking about what should the corridor look like regionally in addition to  
12 what towns believe it should look like locally and VTrans thinks it should look like from a state level. P.  
13 Carbee commented his daughter works for Ivy Computer and it is a very responsible company. L.  
14 Cattaneo noted he's not against the project itself, but is concerned if this is going to happen the Town  
15 Plan and Regional Plan should be changed and plan for the area to not be a rural area. *The vote was*  
16 *called with what appeared to be 11 in favor, one opposition and one abstention. Discussion ensued as to*  
17 *whether a majority of votes was reached. A roll call vote was called to approve the letter of support in*  
18 *the packet for Ivy Computer, which was completed as follows: (Barre City – Yes, Barre Town – Yes, Berlin*  
19 *– not present, Cabot – not present, Duxbury – Yes, East Montpelier – Yes, Fayston – not present,*  
20 *Marshfield – not present, Middlesex – Yes, Montpelier – Yes, Moretown – Yes, Northfield – Abstain,*  
21 *Orange – Yes, Plainfield – Yes, Roxbury – No, Waitsfield – not present, Warren – seat vacant, Washington*  
22 *– Yes, Waterbury – Yes, Williamstown – Yes, Woodbury – no longer present, Worcester – Yes. The*  
23 *motion carries with 13 in favor, 1 abstaining, and 1 opposing.*

## 24 25 **Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan**

26 Chair Lotspeich introduced Clare Rock who presented on the content of the comment letter drafted for  
27 the Draft 2022 State Comprehensive Energy Plan.

28  
29 Rock discussed the overlap between the Comprehensive Energy Plan (CED) and the Climate Action Plan  
30 (CAP), noting our focus is on the CEP and that both plans look at how to reduce greenhouse gas  
31 emissions. Rock outlined the purpose and goals of the CEP and advised that the Department of Public  
32 Service is seeking comment on the draft plan by December 20<sup>th</sup>. She noted that the comments in the  
33 presentation are broad and overarching and through the perspective of how the CEP relates to land use  
34 planning and the work done at the regional level and local level.

35  
36 The following comments were outlined:

37  
38 With regard to Grid Constraints, it is CVRPC's recommendation that the State take a leadership role to  
39 coordinate the various stakeholders (i.e. VELCO, utility companies, RPCs, renewable energy developers)  
40 and that a specific policy should be presented in the CEP which prioritizes the development of a planning  
41 framework to effectively address the recognized grid constraints.

42  
43 With regard to Transportation and Land Use, CVRPC noted it supports CEP strategy (5.7.1 and 5.7.1.1) to  
44 integrate planning into transportation decision making frame work and alignment of planning across

1 ACCD, VTrans, PSD, and ANR which will result in a more effective, unified approach to smart growth  
2 implementation.

3  
4 With regard to Siting Energy Resources, CVRPC recommends the CEP include a more expansive  
5 discussion of environmental constraints; include explanation and rationale for the environmental  
6 constraints (“known” and “possible”) contained within current and proposed Act 174 standards, and  
7 that the State define “natural areas”.

8  
9 With regard to Act 174 Standards, CVRPC welcomes the opportunity to work with VELCO and the PSD to  
10 explore “additional planning scenarios that should be considered by land use planners from a grid  
11 perspective” as identified in the draft CEP and to explore storage siting criteria to ensure this critical  
12 component of grid organization is deployed in a manner which does not exacerbate grid constraints.

13  
14 Lastly she noted that CVRPC supports the development of a revised guidance document and echoes the  
15 CEP’s recommendation of aligning planning frameworks across ACCD, VTrans, PSD, and ANR. CVRPC  
16 additionally recommends the integration of enhanced energy planning guidance and standards into the  
17 framework of the ACCD planning manual and reconciling data and mapping requirements and planning  
18 approaches. CVRPC also recommends that a framework considers: a unified expectation of the role of  
19 the regional and municipal plan (visionary or regulatory), and a more consistent approach to data,  
20 mapping and inventory level expectations between Act 174 Standards, Act 171 Guidance, 24 VSA,  
21 §4302, State Planning Goals; 24 VSA, §4347, regional planning requirements, and 24 VSA, §4382,  
22 municipal plan requirements.

23  
24 Discussion ensued with a suggestion that Economic Development should be an agency that is involved.

25  
26 G. Clain shared comments on the impact on rural Vermont that were recently made by Shane Brown,  
27 Commissioner of Department of Children & Families on the CAP and inquired if there was a way to get  
28 the comments of the Climate Action Council members who voted no. It was clarified our comment  
29 letter is specifically on CEP not CAP. It was suggested that we set an agenda item to get more well  
30 versed in the CAP in the future.

31  
32 R. Krauth suggested an analysis of where the energy is coming from and its impact on native lands, how  
33 extra facilities are going to affect the climate, and noted that storage should also be included.

34  
35 Waninger added that throughout the CED it notes roles for municipalities and RPCs, and she requests a  
36 comment that addresses capacity constraints and the needs for necessary funding and technical  
37 assistance to accomplish our roles in implementing the CED.

38  
39 *L. Cattaneo moved that Bonnie and Clare send a letter based on the comments that we have heard*  
40 *tonight, comments Bonnie made, comments about incorporating references to economic development,*  
41 *and addressing some of the concerns Ron raised, seconded by R. Krauth; the vote was initially called,*  
42 *however, as there was opposition, a roll call vote was completed as follows: (Barre City – Yes, Barre Town*  
43 *–No, Berlin – not present, Cabot – not present, Duxbury – No, East Montpelier – Yes, Fayston – not*  
44 *present, Marshfield – not present, Middlesex – Yes, Montpelier – Yes, Moretown – Yes, Northfield – Yes,*

1 Orange – Yes, Plainfield –no longer present, Roxbury – Yes, Waitsfield – not present, Warren – seat  
2 vacant, Washington – Yes, Waterbury – Yes, Williamstown – Yes, Woodbury – no longer present,  
3 Worcester – Yes. **The motion carries with 12 in favor and 2 opposing.**

4  
5 There was confirmation by the Chair that a quorum was present and that the 12 yeses was a majority of  
6 the 23 seats.

## 8 **Meeting Minutes**

9 *L. Hill-Eubanks moved to approve the minutes for November 9, 2021; R. Krauth seconded. Motion*  
10 *carried.*

## 12 **Reports**

13 Rock congratulated Orange and Northfield on their MPG awards. Waninger advised members that we  
14 are in the process of hiring a Climate and Energy Planner and a Natural Resources Planner, and to please  
15 share our job announcement if they know any prospective candidates.

16  
17 Clain asked how to access information that is in the reports, such as Ash Borer reforestation grant. It  
18 was confirmed he could contact staff regarding any information in those reports. Cattaneo noted that  
19 the January 31<sup>st</sup> Executive Committee meeting was omitted on the calendar in the report.

## 21 **Adjournment**

22 *L. Cattaneo moved to adjourn at 8:39 pm; R. Krauth seconded. Motion carried.*

23  
24 Respectfully submitted,  
25 Nancy Chartrand, Office Manager