

**CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**  
**Draft MINUTES**  
**February 8, 2022**

**Commissioners:**

<input type="checkbox"/> Barre City	Janet Shatney, Sec/Treas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Moretown	Dara Torre
<input type="checkbox"/>	Vacant, Alt.	<input 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Calais	John Brabant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Waitsfield	Don La Haye
<input type="checkbox"/>	Jan Ohlsson, Alt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Harrison Snapp, Alt.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duxbury	Alan Quackenbush	<input type="checkbox"/> Warren	Vacant
<input type="checkbox"/> E. Montpelier	Clarice Cutler (Interim)	<input type="checkbox"/>	J. Michael Bridgewater, Alt.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Vacant, Alt.	<input type="checkbox"/> Washington	Peter Carbee
<input type="checkbox"/> Fayston	Vacant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Waterbury	Steve Lotspeich, Chair
<input checked="" 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, Grace Vinson, Clare Rock

Guests: Stepen Falbel, Steadman Hill Consulting, Inc.; Marshall Distel, Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission

**Call to Order**

Chair Lotspeich called the meeting to order at 6:31 pm. Quorum was present to conduct business.

**Adjustments to the Agenda**

None.

**Public Comments**

None.

**Transit Financing Study**

Chair Lotspeich welcomed Stephen Falbel of Steadman Hill Consulting and Marshall Distel of Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) who shared an overview on the study to be presented. CCRPC in partnership with GMT and VTrans requested Falbel complete a study analyzing innovative approaches to financing public transit in Vermont as the current system for funding public transit is heavily reliant on local property taxes

1 In Falbel's presentation he provided an overview of the goal, scope and principles of the transit study:  
2 statewide transit access; potential funding replacement alternatives; and an evaluation of the funding  
3 alternatives that were identified.

4  
5 Details on the above were provided and expanded upon (video of the presentation along with slides  
6 available on CVRPC website @ [https://centralvtplanning.org/about/minutes-agendas-staff-](https://centralvtplanning.org/about/minutes-agendas-staff-reports/board-of-commissioners/)  
7 [reports/board-of-commissioners/.](https://centralvtplanning.org/about/minutes-agendas-staff-reports/board-of-commissioners/))

8  
9 Following Falbel's presentation, the floor was opened to discussion and questions. Distel of CCRPC  
10 noted that they recently shared this presentation with their Transportation Advisory Committee and are  
11 planning to share with their Board at their next meeting.

12  
13 Discussion continued including concerns about inclusion of Medicaid statistics and not including fare  
14 increase as an alternative. There was also comment regarding the type of funding the proposed  
15 Transportation Climate Initiative was supposed to bring into the state to address this type of issue, and  
16 it was concluded that it currently is not moving forward. Discussion also continued on how increased  
17 use of solar may affect the outlined utility fee and the inequities a utility fee may or may not impose, as  
18 well as concerns on raising of property taxes. It was suggested that perhaps a mix of revenue sources  
19 would help to address income sensitivity.

20  
21 Waninger advised the Board that she wanted to bring the discussion away from alternatives under  
22 consideration and back to why a different revenue stream is needed. She provided an overview of how  
23 GMT is funded and the differences between urban and rural area contributions. She commented that  
24 ultimately, the service currently provided isn't going to continue with the current structure and that  
25 Vermont will eventually face a question of whether or not to reduce service or to change the funding  
26 stream. Waninger advised she would like to hear the Board's opinion on these choices (reduce services  
27 or change funding stream). Do we believe, as a region, we can support that there should be alternative  
28 funding?

29  
30 Quackenbush inquired if a motion was needed. The motion in the agenda packet was referenced –  
31 "Urge the Vermont Legislature to replace the current, inequitable funding structure for public  
32 transportation with a replacement revenue source so that transit services can effectively operate  
33 statewide." *Quackenbush moved the motion as outlined in the agenda, seconded by Brabant.*  
34 Discussion ensued regarding an energy fuel tax and a request for more discussion from the Board and  
35 providing comments to Waninger before moving the motion. *The motion was read again for*  
36 *clarification and the vote called. As the vote was not unanimous, a roll call vote was conducted as*  
37 *follows: (Barre City – Not present, Barre Town – No, Berlin – No, Cabot – Not present, Calais – Yes,*  
38 *Duxbury – Yes, East Montpelier – Not present, Fayston – Not present, Marshfield – Abstain, Middlesex –*  
39 *Yes, Montpelier – Yes, Moretown – Yes, Northfield – Yes, Orange – Yes, Plainfield – Yes, Roxbury –Yes,*  
40 *Waitsfield – Yes, Warren – seat vacant, Washington – Not present, Waterbury – Yes, Williamstown – Yes,*  
41 *Woodbury – Yes, Worcester – Yes. Motion carried with 14 in favor, 1 abstaining, and 2 opposing.*

### 42 43 **Municipal Plan Approval & Confirmation of Planning Process & Certificate of Energy**

44 Chair Lotspeich introduced Bill Arrand, Municipal Plan Review Committee (MPRC) Chair. Arrand advised  
45 the MPRC met on January 20 to review the Municipal Plan Approval & Confirmation of Planning Process  
46 and Certificate of Energy for the Town of Calais. He noted two changes to their Town Plan to update the  
47 village center designation to make a new designation for North Calais and to update the Natural

1 Resources section to confirm with the 2018 statutory requirements to address Forest Integrity. It was  
2 noted that changes were consistent with state goals and the regional plan and the MPRC voted to  
3 approve the planning process and recommend that the Board approve the amendment as presented  
4 and also approve their town process.

5  
6 Rock clarified that there was not a request for a determination of energy compliance.

7  
8 Brabant spoke about the current initiative to restore Memorial Hall in North Calais and approval of an  
9 amendment to the Town Plan will allow the village to leverage village center tax credits to continue with  
10 the initiative of restoring this historic building.

11  
12 *D'Amico moved to approve the 2016 Calais Town Plan as amended, Quackenbush seconded. It was*  
13 *confirmed that the amendment went through the local public hearing process and was now coming for*  
14 *regional approval. Vote called and motion carried.*

15  
16 *Hill-Eubanks moved to confirm the planning process for the Town of Calais, seconded by Wernecke.*  
17 *Motion carried.*

18  
19 *Wernecke moved to adopt the Resolution that is provided in the agenda packet; Turner seconded.*  
20 Question raised by Clain as to where the last paragraph in resolution comes from. Waninger advised she  
21 would locate the statute and share. Arrand pointed out the date the plan expires is the same because it  
22 is a minor amendment. The following was shared in the chat to address the language question.

23 <https://legislature.vermont.gov/statutes/section/24/117/04402> *Vote was called and motion carried.*

## 24 25 **Winooski Basin Water Quality Council**

26 Chair Lotspeich introduced Grace Vinson to provide an outline regarding additional appointments to the  
27 Basin Water Quality Council (BWCQ). It was confirmed that three actions are requested.

28  
29 Vinson advised the first action is to appoint one or two alternates for the municipal BWCQ seats from  
30 the pool of applications previously received, Clark Amadon, Alice Peal, and Darlene Palola; and Vinson  
31 provided a brief overview of their experience. Vinson also reviewed the benefits that were outlined in  
32 the packet of having two alternates vs. one alternate.

33  
34 *Clain moved to appoint two alternates for the municipal Basin Water Quality Council seats; Brabant*  
35 *seconded. It was recommended that with two alternates that they be elected as alternate for the*  
36 *specific seats i.e. Alternate A for Candidate A. Vote called and motion carried.*

37  
38 *Brabant moved that we appoint Darlene Palola as alternate to Annie Costandi and Alice Peel as alternate*  
39 *to Nigel Hicks-Tibbles; seconded by Hill-Eubanks. As the vote was not unanimous, a roll call vote was*  
40 *conducted as follows: Barre City – Not present, Barre Town – No, Berlin – Yes, Cabot – Not present,*  
41 *Calais – Yes, Duxbury – Yes, East Montpelier – Not present, Fayston – Not present, Marshfield – Yes,*  
42 *Middlesex – Yes, Montpelier – Yes, Moretown – Abstain, Northfield – Yes, Orange – Yes, Plainfield –*  
43 *Abstain, Roxbury – Yes, Waitsfield – Yes, Warren – seat vacant, Washington – Not present, Waterbury –*  
44 *Yes, Williamstown – Yes, Woodbury – Yes, Worcester – Yes. Motion carried with 14 in favor, 1 opposing*  
45 *and 2 abstaining.*

1 Vinson advised the second action is to appoint an alternate for the CVRPC representative to the BWQC.  
2 Emery advised she was happy to defer to Wernecke. Lotspeich inquired if Wernecke was still interested  
3 and he confirmed in the affirmative.  
4

5 *Arrand moved to appoint Robert Wernecke as alternate for Alan Quackenbush. Brabant seconded.*  
6 *Motion carried.*  
7

8 Vinson advised the third action is to appoint two watershed protection organization seats as outlined in  
9 the packet. It was noted that interest has been expressed by Friends of the Mad River (FMR), Friends of  
10 the Winooski River (FWR) and Lake Champlain International (LCI). Watershed United Vermont (WUV)  
11 advised they did not believe LCI was qualified as a watershed protection organization. CVRPC advised  
12 LCI that they concurred with WUV's opinion. It was confirmed that FMR and FWR meet the definition of  
13 watershed organization and have been recommended by WUV.  
14

15 *Hill-Eubanks moved to appoint Friends of the Winooski and Friends of the Mad River as the BWQC*  
16 *watershed organization seats. La Haye seconded.* There was discussion on an appearance of a conflict  
17 of interest with these organizations voting on prioritizing projects they may be working on. Vinson  
18 advised that the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) is currently creating guidance to  
19 address the inherent conflict of interest and that with the current conflict of interest policy they would  
20 recuse themselves from any vote that is being put forward for a project they are working on, but she  
21 anticipates there will be more complete guidance from DEC forthcoming. *Vote called and motion*  
22 *carried.*  
23

#### 24 **USDA Grant Application**

25 Chair Lotspeich directed the Committee to the information in the packet and requested Waninger  
26 provide an overview. She noted we are the applicant because the entity benefiting from the study is  
27 not allowed to apply for the grant, they need someone to apply for the grant and manage the grant.  
28 Waninger described the USDA grant application process and what the role of Plainfield Cooperative and  
29 CVRPC would be. USDA requires the Board's authorization to apply for the grant and administrate it.  
30

31 *Clain moved to authorize the Chair to sign the resolution for the USDA Rural Business Development Grant*  
32 *for the Plainfield Cooperative, seconded by Emery.* Discussion ensued related to abstention vs. recusal  
33 for those members of the Board who are members of the Plainfield Coop. As a result of discussion,  
34 Emery withdrew her second and Emery, Cattaneo, and Schunk advised they would recuse. *Motion*  
35 *seconded by Arrand after the recusals.* Waninger advised it need to be a motion to adopt the resolution  
36 or a motion to authorize CVRPC to apply for and administer the grant and authorize to sign the grant  
37 documents. Clain confirmed his motion was for the Chair to sign the resolution. *Vote called and motion*  
38 *carried.*  
39

#### 40 **Resolution on Complying the Vermont Open Meeting Law**

41 Waninger advised the resolution needs to be updated again to comply with the recent change in Open  
42 Meeting Law allowing public bodies to meet remotely with electronic meeting technology through  
43 January 15, 2023; and provided an overview of resolution details.  
44

1 *Wernecke moved to adopt the resolution; Brabant seconded.* Emery inquired as to whether or not the  
2 word “will” was necessary in paragraph 2 of item 2 as it sounds like a mandate and requested that it be  
3 changed to “may”. Waninger advised if we change will to may, then staff will be required to host a  
4 physical location. If Board decides to start meeting with a physical location before January 15, 2023,  
5 they can update the resolution. Clain stated he would vote against the resolution as it is currently  
6 worded with the January 15, 2023 date and suggested the resolution states “until further notice”. It was  
7 clarified that the date corresponds to the legislation and that another resolution could be approved  
8 when we want to go back to physical locations. It was also noted that wording in the resolution allows  
9 hosting with a physical location if the agenda lists a location. Hill-Eubanks advised she would like to  
10 support the resolution to keep staff safe go back to in person when the Board feels strongly to do so. It  
11 was suggested we do the vote by roll call and a roll call vote was conducted as follows: *Barre City – Not*  
12 *present, Barre Town – No, Berlin – Yes, Cabot – Not present, Calais – Yes, Duxbury – Yes, East Montpelier*  
13 *– Not present, Fayston – Not present, Marshfield – Yes, Middlesex – Yes, Montpelier – No longer present,*  
14 *Moretown – Yes, Northfield – Yes, Orange – Yes, Plainfield – Yes, Roxbury – Yes, Waitsfield – Yes, Warren*  
15 *– seat vacant, Washington – Not present, Waterbury – Yes, Williamstown – Yes, Woodbury – Yes,*  
16 *Worcester – Yes. Motion carried with 15 in favor and 1 opposing.*

#### 18 **Minutes (December 14, 2021 & January 11, 2022)**

19 *Clain moved to accept December 14, 2021 minutes; seconded by Cattaneo. Motion carried.*

20 *La Haye moved to accept January 11, 2022 minutes, seconded by Arrand. Motion carried.*

#### 22 **Reports**

23 Chair Lotspeich inquired if there were any questions regarding the reports. Waninger provided an  
24 update on GMT negotiations. Lotspeich noted the Executive Committee special meetings are making  
25 good progress reviewing the draft bylaws and are trying to get clarification regarding elections,  
26 whistleblower protections and bonding before they bring the update to the Board.

#### 28 **Adjournment**

29 *La Haye moved to adjourn at 8:44 pm; Krauth seconded. Motion carried.*

31 Respectfully submitted,  
32 Nancy Chartrand, Office Manager