

1 **CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**  
2 **BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**  
3 **MINUTES**  
4 **September 13, 2022**

5 **Commissioners:**

<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Barre Town	George Clain	<input type="checkbox"/> Northfield	Laura Hill-Eubanks
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mike Gilbar, Alt	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Orange	Lee Cattaneo
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Berlin	Robert Wernecke	<input type="checkbox"/> Plainfield	Paula Emery
<input type="checkbox"/>	Karla Nuissl, Alt.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bob Atchinson, Alt.
<input type="checkbox"/> Cabot	Amy Hornblas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Roxbury	Jerry 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"/>	Vacant, Alt.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duxbury	Alan Quackenbush	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Warren	Alexis Leacock
<input type="checkbox"/>	David Wendt, Alt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vacant, Alt.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> E. Montpelier	Spencer Harding	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Washington	Peter Carbee
<input type="checkbox"/>	Clarice Cutler, Alt.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Waterbury	Steve Lotspeich, Chair
<input type="checkbox"/> Fayston	Vacant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Williamstown	Richard Turner
<input type="checkbox"/> Marshfield	Vacant	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jacqueline Higgins, Alt.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Middlesex	Ron Krauth	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Woodbury	Michael Gray
<input type="checkbox"/> Montpelier	Ariane Kissam	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Worcester	Bill Arrand
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mike Miller, Alt.		

6  
7 Staff: Bonnie Waninger, Nancy Chartrand, Clare Rock,  
8 Guests: Sandy Levine, Middlesex Planning Commission

9  
10 **Call to Order**

11 Chair Lotspeich called the meeting to order at 6:37 pm. Roll call was conducted. Quorum was present to conduct  
12 business.

13  
14 **Adjustments to the Agenda**

15 Chair Lotspeich advised he would like to add a personnel matter at the end of the meeting. There was a request  
16 for a headcount of Commissioners present and suggestion to move the Bylaws vote forward. It was concluded  
17 to keep it where it was as there was quorum, and no one was planning to depart early.

18  
19 **Public Comments**

20 None

21  
22 **West Central Vermont Strategic Economic Development Strategy**

23 B. Waninger advised the goal of tonight's presentation was to identify comments for the draft plan from the  
24 Board. She provided an overview of what a comprehensive economic development strategy was and the focus  
25 of the draft plan being shared which is economic recovery following the pandemic.

1  
2 Following the presentation the Board was asked for comments on the plan.

3  
4 Significant discussion ensued which resulted in a request for a full transcript of the Board discussion (attached)  
5 to be submitted as comments on behalf of the Board.

6  
7 After significant discussion as outlined in the transcription, *J. Brabant moved that “The CVRPC Board does not*  
8 *support the West Central Vermont Economic Development Strategy as currently drafted”*; *B. Arrand seconded.*  
9 The vote was called, and resulted in a roll call.

10  
11 Roll Call: *Barre City – no; Barre Town – yes; Berlin – yes (but believed the motion out of order); Cabot – not*  
12 *present; Calais – yes; Duxbury – yes; East Montpelier – yes ; Fayston – vacant; Marshfield – vacant; Middlesex –*  
13 *yes; Montpelier – not present; Moretown – no; Northfield – not present; Orange –yes ; Plainfield – yes; Roxbury –*  
14 *no; Waitsfield – no; Warren – abstain; Washington – yes (agrees out of order); Waterbury – no; Williamstown –*  
15 *yes; Woodbury – yes; Worcester –yes. The motion passes with 14 ayes, 5 nays, and 1 abstention.*

16  
17 It was confirmed that B. Waninger would take the transcribed comments (attached) to the CEDS group.

### 18 19 **Bylaw Amendment Adoption**

20 Chair Lotspeich provided an overview of the status of the Bylaw amendment. He noted that if additional  
21 amendments are to be made, it would postpone the vote to adopt.

22  
23 *J. Brabant moved to adopt the Bylaws as amended; P. Carbee seconded.* Discussion: A. Quackenbush thanked  
24 the Bylaw Committee for their work. B. Atchison suggested that a comma be inserted on page 42, line 25 so  
25 Worcester and Woodbury don’t look like one town. He also made note that the role of alternates is not  
26 succinct, and it doesn’t cover long-term departures of Commissioners. It was confirmed that if a Commissioner  
27 made the Executive Director aware of an issue of needing to be away for a period of time it would suffice. The  
28 only time there might be follow-up would be if someone is not notifying the organization that they will not be  
29 available multiple times, then contact might be made to determine their interest in continuing as a  
30 Commissioner. It was also confirmed that this was a discussion of the motion and if further amendments were  
31 recommended we would not be able to adopt. The vote was called and resulted in a roll call.

32  
33 *Roll Call: Barre City – yes; Barre Town – no; Berlin – yes; Cabot – not present; Calais – yes; Duxbury – yes; East*  
34 *Montpelier – yes ; Fayston – vacant; Marshfield – vacant; Middlesex – yes ; Montpelier – not present; Moretown*  
35 *– yes ; Northfield – not present; Orange – yes ; Plainfield – no; Roxbury – yes; Waitsfield – yes; Warren – yes ;*  
36 *Washington – yes ; Waterbury – yes; Williamstown – yes; Woodbury – yes; Worcester – yes. The bylaw*  
37 *amendments were adopted with 16 ayes and 2 nays.*

### 38 39 **Municipal Plan Approval & Confirmation of Planning Process & Certificate of Energy Compliance**

40 B. Arrand provided an overview of the Municipal Plan Review Committee hearing and meeting held on August  
41 30, 2022. Tom Badowski from Berlin and Sandy Levine from Middlesex were present at that meeting to  
42 represent their towns.

### 43 44 Town of Berlin – plan approval, confirmation

1 Arrand advised the committee recommends the Board approve Berlin’s Town Plan and confirm the Town’s  
2 planning process.

3  
4 *P. Carbee moved to approve the Berlin Town Plan Amendment; G. Clain seconded.* Discussion: There was a  
5 request that the document be shared. There was brief discussion on the documents and notation the resolution  
6 is the third motion. The vote was called, and the *motion carried.*

7  
8 *J. Shatney moved to confirm the Town of Berlin planning process per 24 VSA § 4350(a) B. Arrand seconded.*  
9 *Motion carried.*

10  
11 *P. Carbee moved to adopt the resolution documenting the Berlin Plan approval and planning process*  
12 *confirmation by CVRPC; J. Shatney seconded.* Discussion ensued regarding the wording of the resolution. No  
13 changes were made, and the vote wall called. *Motion carried.*

14  
15 Town of Middlesex – plan approval, confirmation, energy certification

16 B. Arrand advised the Committee recommends the Board approve the Middlesex Town Plan and Energy Plan.

17  
18 *P. Carbee moved to approve the 2022 Middlesex Town Plan & Energy Plan per statute; J. Shatney seconded.*  
19 *Motion carried.*

20  
21 *P. Carbee moved to confirm the Town of Middlesex planning process under statute; B. Arrand seconded. Motion*  
22 *carried.*

23  
24 *B. Atchinson moved to adopt the resolution documenting the Middlesex Plan approval and planning process*  
25 *confirmation by CVRPC; J. Brabant seconded.* Discussion again ensued regarding the wording. No changes were  
26 made, and the vote was called. *Motion carried.*

27  
28 *P. Carbee moved to issue an affirmative determination of energy compliance for the 2022 Middlesex Town Plan*  
29 *& Energy Plan per statute; R. Wernecke seconded. Motion carried.*

30  
31 Chair Lotspeich thanked Sandy Levine for joining.

32  
33 **VAPDA Relationship**

34 Waninger advised the acronym represents the Vermont Association of Planning and Development agencies;  
35 VAPDA essentially is the RPCs working together. The Executive Directors meet monthly and every 2-3 months  
36 State agency representatives meet with them and exchange information. If they are asked by the Legislature for  
37 comments, they work to frame up a shared position regarding RPCs. It is not always unanimous; when not  
38 unanimous, VAPDA shares what dissenting opinions were. Generally, VAPDA is the RPC’s working collectively  
39 and talking about issues.

40  
41 G. Clain asked for this to be on the agenda and provided an overview of a situation that involved a letter being  
42 brought before the Board at its March 8, 2022 meeting for their support of S.148. He went on to outline  
43 research he performed following the meeting and concerns related to how the letter was completed and  
44 distributed, initially on VPIRG’s website as being ‘endorsed’ by VAPDA, as well as follow-up with Tasha Wallis,

1 Chair of VAPDA, who explained she took a straw poll of members of the group and 3 declined to support the  
2 letter. She also explained VAPDA was a non-profit and did not have to abide by open meeting laws. Clain stated  
3 that he believes VAPDA did not need Board approval; that they already did it without the Board's approval. He  
4 believes this type of action needs to be addressed as it diminishes a municipality's power. He also believes  
5 VAPDA needs to incorporate an open meeting requirement and record their meetings. Chair Lotspeich  
6 confirmed that VAPDA is a non-profit, it lobbies with legislature, is not required to operate under open meeting  
7 law, and the Board does not have an oversight role as it is an association of the RPCs. B. Waninger further  
8 advised VAPDA cannot control what VPIRG does with information. When Clain brought up the type of  
9 representation that was on the VPIRG website, VAPDA requested VPIRG remove it as it misrepresented what  
10 happened at the meeting. Waninger noted that she did abstain from the vote (which was a straw poll) at the  
11 meeting because she was not sure how the CVRPC Board would weigh in on the issue. It was represented to the  
12 Legislature that not all members of VAPDA supported it. The Legislature moved on with discussion of the bill,  
13 which was passed in another form. She described how VAPDA operates and noted there is a very brief  
14 window to weigh in on legislation. Waninger said the Legislature values the opinions of RPCs, and the RPCs work  
15 together to provide a statewide perspective about proposed legislation. VAPDA does post minutes as a result of  
16 Clain's questions although it is not required to under open meeting law. Chair Lotspeich proposed further  
17 discussion happen at a subsequent meeting. G. Clain stated he was not implying Waninger did anything wrong  
18 with the Board, but rather implying that VAPDA carried a yes vote without the Board's consent. He believes it  
19 diminishes the regional planning commission's vote.

20

## 21 **FY23 Work Plan & Budget**

22 *J. D'Amico moved to table the discussion of FY23 work plan and budget; D. Torre seconded. Motion passed.*

23

## 24 **Minutes**

25 *J. Shatney moved to accept the July 12, 2022 minutes; A. Leacock seconded. Vote was called. B. Atchinson noted*  
26 *neither he nor the Town's Commissioner were at the meeting, so he abstained. A roll call vote was held because*  
27 *the vote was not unanimous.*

28

29 *Roll Call: Barre City –yes; Barre Town – yes; Berlin –yes; Cabot –not present; Calais – yes; Duxbury –yes; East*  
30 *Montpelier –yes; Fayston – vacant; Marshfield – vacant; Middlesex –yes ; Montpelier – not present; Moretown –*  
31 *yes; Northfield – not present; Orange –yes ; Plainfield –abstained; Roxbury – yes; Waitsfield yes– ; Warren –yes;*  
32 *Washington –yes; Waterbury - yes; Williamstown - yes; Woodbury – no longer present; Worcester – yes. The*  
33 *motion passes with 16 ayes and 1 abstention.*

34

## 35 **Reports**

36 B. Waninger advised a new temporary planner started this week. Jon Ignatowski, who currently is Planning and  
37 Zoning Administrator in Bolton and was previously Economic Development Director in Northfield, is now  
38 working for CVRPC temporarily and entirely remotely from New York.

39

40 There was discussion on the current number of vacancies in the organization. Waninger confirmed CVRPC is in  
41 the process of trying to hire four total positions. Jon is providing temporary capacity for the land use program,  
42 and CVRPC is building capacity in land use planning, GIS/natural resources, and transportation. There is a  
43 challenge of filling positions statewide at this time.

44

1 B. Waninger also confirmed CVRPC was awarded the USDA Rural Development grant to provide assistance to the  
2 Plainfield Co-op. She noted it is one of the projects Jon Ignatowski will work on.

3

4 **Personnel Matter**

5 B. Waninger advised that she tendered her resignation to the Chair on Friday. She has accepted a position at the  
6 Vermont League of Cities & Towns. She noted it has truly been a pleasure to work with the Board and that she  
7 will be departing on October 12. In the interim, staff is looking at what must absolutely keep going, noting they  
8 are an outstanding team. The Executive Committee will meet with Bonnie about the process to secure a new  
9 Executive Director.

10

11 Multiple board members offered congratulations and shared their gratitude for Bonnie's work.

12

13 **Adjournment**

14 *D. La Haye moved to adjourn at 8:46 pm; R. Wernecke seconded. Motion carried.*

15

16 Respectfully submitted,

17 Nancy Chartrand, Office Manager

18

1 **West Central Vermont Strategic Economic Development Strategy** - Board Comments from 9/13/2022 CVRPC  
2 Board Meeting

3  
4 A request for a full transcriptions of the comments was made.  
5

6 John Brabant: Yeah, I must say I'm just playing catch up on actually reading this plan. So goal number 6 is what  
7 caught my eye and made me curious. So again, I'm the rep from Calais and if you go into the actual plan, not the  
8 summary that Bonnie provided it on page 57 they advocate in the plan for a specific actions and action Number  
9 2 is advocate for remove the Act 250 permitting jurisdiction and release existing Act 250 permits existing  
10 permits within State designated centers and existing industrial parks. So does this, then, create an expectation  
11 that our regional planning commission will work side by side with the development interests when they're  
12 advocating at the legislature for weakening, and it is weakening, reform as it is being proposed here is  
13 weakening, reducing jurisdiction of Act 250.

14 In my town, for instance, our town planning and zoning has an incorporated expectation that when projects get  
15 larger and they move to the realm of triggering Act 250 jurisdiction, that Act 250 will be assisting us in evaluating  
16 those projects. For us to start supporting plans that are talking about removing jurisdiction that are outside our  
17 regional plan, it begs a question for me about whether our towns need to be further engaged in this, and see if  
18 we all agree with this, number one, and number 2, does this at any level like, either the local level that the  
19 municipal level or at the regional level, does this plan set/establish conflicts, and how are those conflicts  
20 resolved, if they are in fact in place? Do we...does it muzzle us? Do we go in hand in hand at the legislature  
21 when there's advocacy for bills to gut or eliminate Act 250?

22 It goes on to say in item 3 in goal 6, advocate for removal of duplicative federal, state, and local development  
23 review permitting jurisdiction and processes. I was at the Legislature when I heard this rhetoric spewed, and a  
24 lot of it is not true. For instance, there was a case, and I'm gonna get off my podium here, but I'm really  
25 concerned about this, there was a testimony provided that said Act 250 is duplicative when reviewing  
26 development in downtowns. ANR does all the review, and we're okay. Well ANR has not issued permits, for  
27 instance, Montpelier's permits were expired at the time of this this testimony for a number of years. Rutland's  
28 permit for the wastewater plant, I'm sorry, had been expired for over 10 years, 15 years, no 20 years. I mean  
29 the benefit of Act 250 in those instances is Act 250 says developer, does this existing sewage treatment  
30 infrastructure have the capacity to accept the new discharges from your development? Is the water supply,  
31 adequate? Municipalities larger ones, like Montpelier's and stuff, they like the economic development dollars,  
32 but if their wastewater treatment facilities are overflowing like Montpelier's does on a regular basis, that stuff  
33 runs downstream to Middlesex to Waterbury to all the downstream towns. I'm on the CWAC, on the Clean  
34 Water Advisory Committee. Here we are trying to clean up Winooski river and come up with strategies for  
35 eliminating the current pollution sources, which include waste water treatment facilities, and at the same time,  
36 now we're gonna be advocating for a plan that reduces regulatory oversight at the state, federal and local level. I  
37 think this is really broad brush, I think it's inconsistent with our regional plan, not doing a side by side. It's  
38 certainly inconsistent with my Town's plan and vision of the future.

39 I don't like this. I don't like that it's full of broad brush language, and it's going to be used to advocate in the  
40 name of my municipality and the region that we are part of, CVRPC region, to say that we agree with this and  
41 this strategy, and there's no specific language for us to shoot at. You know there's no...there's...commonly  
42 legislation has trade off language. Well, we'll give up this jurisdiction, but we gain jurisdiction and greater

1 protections here. There's no trade; there's no specific language to look at. Yet we are accepting these policies,  
2 these platitudes. I think it's bad policy...just, number 6 is bad. I'm just gonna leave it at that, and I'm not  
3 supporting this at all.

4 Not Identified: Thank you John. I'm glad you said all of that I love it. I totally agree.

5 Steve Lotspeich: We'll move on to the next comment here in a minute. I would encourage you to submit your  
6 comments, in writing, before tomorrow if you can. I mean you just gave us a lot.

7 John Brabant: Before tomorrow?

8 Steve Lotspeich: I don't know. That's the deadline. That is, tomorrow for written comments.

9 John Brabant: I thought it was the thirtieth of September.

10 Bonnie Waninger: No. By the thirtieth of September, we have to have our final document to the US EDA.  
11 Comments were actually due in August. They extended for us since our board meeting with later, and for a few  
12 other groups.

13 John Brabant: How do I coordinate that with my planning commission and my Selectboard and my Conservation  
14 Commission? This is not practical.

15 Steve Lotspeich: You could submit individual comments as an individual. I think any of us can submit  
16 comments.

17 John Brabant: That's totally undemocratic; that's totally inappropriate.

18 Steve Lotspeich: That's totally...that's an option. Okay, Alright, Well, thanks for your comments that's good.  
19 Does anybody else have any comments that they'd like to add? George, go ahead.

20 I think you're on mute George; we're not hearing anything anyway? Can you get yourself off mute?

21 George Clain: There we go. Good. Yeah, John, could you just forward this video to them for your comments  
22 section? That'd be great. The video of this meeting.

23 Steve Lotspeich: I don't think...I don't know that a video could be transmitted. Bonnie's taking notes, and I think  
24 the notes of this meeting.

25 John Brabant: I would like my statements transcribed and submitted, remitted. This is, I agree with George.

26 Steve Lotspeich: Okay. Alright, are there more comments? Mike, go ahead.

27 Mike Gilbar: Apart from the comments that I that I previously made, I agree with John. I'm not happy with this  
28 for a variety of reasons, and one of them is you know just the fact that, that it, it seems like this, even though  
29 this has been a 2 year enterprise, I'm not sure this that the CVRPC Board really has had an understanding of  
30 what this strategic plan entailed right from the beginning. And I could be wrong about that because I've only  
31 been on the Board as an alternate for a short time. But, but it seemed like there just wasn't enough time to  
32 really grasp what was in this report, and or just the concept of the CEDS and, you know, the fact that that we're  
33 looking at creating another layer of a multi-district that's going to be a layer on top of the State and RPC and  
34 our...over and above our town plans. And so I guess...so I'm not really crazy about that and I'm fairly certain that  
35 Barre Town Selectboard would not be happy with it. And you know my biggest question, I guess, is what's the

1 benefit that we get from this? I understand that there'd be some grant funding available, but the grant funding  
2 is always available with some sort of strings attached, and some of those strings, from what I can see would not  
3 be palatable to the, to our planning commission in Barre Town or to the Barre Town Selectboard.

4 So I know as an alternate I don't have a vote, but I would, you know, strongly encourage George to vote "no" on  
5 this at this point unless there's some way to really get into this a little bit more and have more discussion, so  
6 that the RPC Board of Commissioners all have, you know, get a chance to comment and absorb this thing and  
7 get all their questions answered.

8 Steve Lotspeich: That's fine. Okay, thanks Mike for those comments. Does anybody else having comments? Go  
9 ahead, Jerry.

10 Jerry D'Amico: I think what we're missing is the gorillas in the room, Rutland and Chittenden, and yeah, all the  
11 economic development they can be do doubled up...(unable to hear comment)

12 Bonnie Waninger: Can you guys hear Jerry's comments?

13 Steve Lotspeich: Jerry, you have to project a little more to the owl. I don't think it's picking up your voice.

14 Jerry D'Amico: Alright, hey, it was just what I want to note it is heavily in favor of those who, oh, this one is  
15 from Chittenden County, but the other one has already been done in Rutland, and I haven't seen theirs but  
16 knowing, having worked with the Rutland people before, I know that everything tends to focus in their direction.  
17 I don't want to go any further. Okay, anyway. I just wanna actually I believe those are the gorillas in the room,  
18 and we have to watch out.

19 Steve Lotspeich: Okay, good. Good thanks. Lee go ahead.

20 Lee Cattaneo: Yes, my concern is that the equity portion isn't fully developed, and...I'm sure under the  
21 impression with this that it favors the built-up municipalities more than the more rural communities. And  
22 coming from a very rural community, that that's the concern. So I'll leave it at that. I wish it was developed a  
23 little bit more than it is.

24 Steve Lotspeich: Bonnie can you just speak to the equity? How is that gonna get finished in time.

25 Bonnie Waninger: Because it's being written right now. Between the time we released the draft, so folks would  
26 have some time to review it and now, essentially, in addition to talking with specific groups, we worked with a  
27 particular consultant who did one on one...who did focus groups with under represented businesses. They just  
28 gave us their reports so we're trying to write all that up. Taylor at Chittenden is the lead on that part. He's  
29 trying to create the synopsis of that, and those groups have asked if they can see that information before they  
30 give their comments. So they asked for additional time as well. So I can't tell you what it will say yet, except  
31 that, in reviewing the consultant report in some of the focus groups, many of the comments they're sharing are  
32 the same comments as other traditionally represented businesses are sharing. It's workforce it's housing, it's  
33 childcare, it's transportation, all of those things are greatly impacting, it's access to capital, are greatly impacting  
34 their businesses. They do have some more specific comments, especially women-owned businesses, about what  
35 would be useful for helping those businesses start up, thrive, and grow. So, we've got to get the synopsis  
36 together. I will bring that back to you when it's ready.

37 Steve Lotspeich: Okay, thanks. Peter, do you have a comment?



1 Peter Carbee: Okay, Yeah. Finally, get off mute. Basically my comment echoes a lot of what Lee was...I mean  
2 what Lee Cattaneo was saying. Mine in particular, is both Lee and I live in very rural towns, and we're in Orange  
3 County, and we are the red headed stepchildren of this organization, as it is and really when you add it in with  
4 all of Chittenden County, and all Rutland County, or Chittenden and Rutland areas. I fear that our little town will  
5 get lost, and I had submitted that comment prior, and it stands. Thank you.

6 Steve Lotspeich: Thank you. Alright, Thanks, thanks, Peter. Are there other comments? George, you still have  
7 your hand up. Did you have another comment?

8 George Clain: Yes, I do. I'd like...I don't know what the governance of this regional committee is. I'd like to know  
9 that. I don't know what they're filed with with the Secretary of State, even under what auspice they'll have as  
10 far as open meeting rules. Oh, and then again, I don't know Mr. Chairman, if it would require a motion, to get  
11 the transcript of all these comments made and filed within the deadline. Is that going to require motion to have  
12 that done, or is it going to be done?

13 Steve Lotspeich: No, I think the request has been made to, for staff to make a transcript. I think that's fine. I  
14 don't think we need to have a motion. I think we can trust staff to take care of getting these comments.

15 George Clain: The other thing...I thought I saw Orange in two regional districts. Can you explain that? Talk  
16 about getting lost.

17 Bonnie Waninger: Well actually, they get double attention. Orange County does. But in reality Orange County  
18 for regional development corporations and regional planning commissions is divided. The county and its  
19 municipalities are divided among 3 regional planning commissions. Because when regional commissions first  
20 started, we were regional planning and development commissions, and we were all organized around  
21 economics. And so the Towns of Orange, Washington, and Williamstown, their workforce, primarily not  
22 exclusively, but primarily goes towards Barre City and Montpelier and Barre Town for work, so they were  
23 brought into the Central Vermont region as their economic tie. There's one town, I'm trying to remember who it  
24 is at the north of the Orange County, that actually goes, I think, to NVDA, I could be wrong, (background noise)  
25 and then the rest of them are affiliated with the Two Rivers Ottaquechee RPC region and I think it's the Green  
26 Mountain Economic Development Corporation. So Orange County economically looks to three different  
27 directions for the basis of its economics. So when the Two Rivers and Southern Windsor regions are called the  
28 Central Vermont regions, East Central Vermont their called. When they wrote their CEDS they pulled in the  
29 Orange County statistics, but they named their member towns as included in the CEDS. So when this CEDS was  
30 created for West Central Vermont, the initial proposal from the other regions was, let's just do Washington  
31 County. We said, well and Jamie raised his hand too, these towns, these three Orange County towns are part of  
32 our economy, so we tried to incorporate their statistics in. We could have done it at the county level, but when  
33 Zach, for those who don't know Zach Maia was a planner here, when he looked at that information, those three  
34 towns, their economics statistics don't match the rest of Orange County. They're different than the rest of  
35 Orange County. So he tried to pull them in as best he could, understanding that you're looking at Washington  
36 County statistics and the statistics of three towns. Those towns also have different statistics than Washington  
37 County, and as we move into the regional plan, that's a... our regional plan, the Central Vermont Regional Plan,  
38 that's a great place to start sussing that out because it's focused on that area whereas this plan is focused on the  
39 four counties or four region area.

40 Steve Lotspeich: Good thanks. So we need to wrap this up. Do you have a final comment Lee before we move  
41 on here?

1 Lee Cattaneo: I guess my comment goes to what was brought up by George before the governance. The  
2 economic development commission, whatever it is, it doesn't have any municipal representatives on it. It's all  
3 business representatives, and...I think they you should really look at how this is going to be implemented  
4 without having the government for municipal representatives involved in it. That's another concern that I have  
5 with it.

6 Steve Lotspeich: Oh, okay, thanks. So let's move on, Bonnie.

7 John Brabant: I have a hand raised.

8 Steve Lotspeich: Hold on please John, hold on. So we...we represent municipalities, so I think that's part of the  
9 voice here; it's...that's our job representing municipalities. So I'm cognizant of the time, so John do you have a  
10 brief comment so we can move on.

11 John Brabant: Yeah, I'd like to put a motion on the floor.

12 Steve Lotspeich: We're not gonna hold on, John. We're not gonna take action on this plan until October. So the  
13 plan is not been finalized as Bonnie mentioned earlier. We're going to be taking action on this plan later. The  
14 purpose of this evening is for us to provide comments, and we've had a lot of really good comments.

15 John Brabant: So I would like to provide a comment from the entire board *that the Central Vermont Regional  
16 Planning Commission Board does not support the West Central Vermont Strategic Economic Development  
17 Strategy as currently drafted.*

18 Steve Lotspeich: Well John, I'm gonna call that out of order because we're not taking action on the plan at this  
19 point. It's not finalized.

20 John Brabant: This is how we send our collective position on it before it becomes final so we don't have to kill  
21 the plan. I'm looking for a second.

22 Bill Arrand: *I will second it.*

23 Steve Lotspeich: Okay, so it was seconded by Bill.

24 Bill Arrand: I'm in trouble, too. I'll second it.

25 Steve Lotspeich: So what is your motion John?

26 John Brabant: The motion is *the CVRPC Board does not support the draft West Central Vermont Strategic  
27 Economic Development Strategy as it currently reads.*

28 Steve Lotspeich: Okay, so I just like to caution everybody, were not, we don't have any action warned in in this  
29 on our agenda...so I just like to caution everybody about that we're not at the point of approving or denying our  
30 support for the plan based on how this meeting was warned, but I understand we have a motion and a second  
31 on the table. So is there any discussion on the motion?

32 John Brabant: The reason for my motion, if I may, is to communicate a collective message that (sound) be which  
33 I'm unclear of as many have already stated, because there's no time to put together a message of any level of  
34 detail or quality, so I think there's a lot of concern raised with the current draft, and we can communicate that  
35 while it's still a draft, and hopefully slow this thing down and get us all up to speed and maybe get the bad..the  
36 plan improved.

1 Steve Lotspeich: Okay, Bonnie

2 Bonnie Waninger: So I understand your motion. What the group will want to know, and I will send out an email  
3 tomorrow to answer that question about governance. There isn't governance, we're a partnership, um, but  
4 taking that motion back to them will simply be the Board saying, "no". The question they're going to ask is what  
5 specific changes do you want in order to say yes. I heard some comments tonight from individuals. I heard some  
6 of them echoed multiple times. What are the Board's comments versus individual comments? That's what  
7 would be helpful.

8 The plan was available earlier. The Board has been working on bylaws. You were going to have a presentation in  
9 July on the plan. The Board, and I was very clear, the Board moved that off the agenda to talk about bylaws, so  
10 time is very short now.

11 Steve Lotspeich: Okay, so we have a motion second, let's go ahead. Is there any more discussion on the motion?  
12 So that...so...George go ahead.

13 George Clain: Yeah I think this motion allows just for what Bonnie is asking; it allows us time to really flush this  
14 thing out amongst ourselves and not be expeditious about what's going on here, and I think, John's comment  
15 exactly voiced that and I totally agree.

16 Bonnie Waninger: I do need to state that you're assuming the four region area will wait further for the Board's  
17 comments...

18 Unidentified: Well, that's the...

19 Bonnie Waninger: The rest of the group may simply vote to move forward.

20 John Brabant: They can do that.

21 Bonnie Waninger: ...so please don't expect that fleshing out your comments will make them incorporated...and  
22 I'm not meaning to pressure you, I just want you to understand they've already waited it.

23 John Brabant: Well they can do that, but it won't be in our name, and when they go to the legislature to change  
24 substantial statewide policy and environmental policy and planning policy, they won't be able to say that we are  
25 on board with this, and we will be able to advocate our own interests purely, which is what we can do right now.  
26 I don't like this is good government at all, this thing.

27 Bonnie Waninger: Understood, John. Thank you.

28 Steve Lotspeich: Could we hear the motion again? Nancy if you can repeat it.

29 Nancy Chartrand: Steve, I'm sorry, but I was trying to deal with an audio issue when that motion was made  
30 stepping into your room, so I did not hear it.

31 Steve Lotspeich: Bonnie, do you have it?

32 Bonnie Waninger: Sure. The motion, as I heard it, was *the CVRPC Board does not support the West Central*  
33 *Vermont Economic Development Strategy as currently drafted.*

1 Steve Lotspeich: Okay, so we have a motion and a second, let's go ahead and have a vote. All those in favor of  
2 the motion say aye (*the ayes were heard*); all those opposed say nay (*the nays were heard*). Okay, so we're  
3 gonna need a roll call vote because we have ayes and nays. Are there any abstentions?

4 Alexis Leacock: This is Alexis Leacock, Warren. I abstain.

5 Steve Lotspeich: Okay, so alright, so let's go down... I'll do a roll call and if you could say whether your vote  
6 is...what your vote is, "yes" or "no".

7 Barre City – Nay; Barre Town – Yes; Berlin - I think the motion is out of order, but I vote Yes; Cabot - I  
8 don't think Amy's on yet; Calais – Yes; Duxbury – Yes; East Montpelier – Yes; Fayston – not present,  
9 Marshfield – not present; Middlesex – Yes; Montpelier – not present; Moretown – No; Northfield – I  
10 don't think Laura's here; Orange – Yes; Roxbury – No; Waitsfield – No; Warren – abstain; Plainfield – yes;  
11 Washington – Yes and I agree with Bob Wernecke, I think it's out of order, but I'm voting yes; Waterbury  
12 – No; Williamstown – Yes; Woodbury – Yes; Worcester – Yes.

13 Steve Lotspeich: Okay so give us a minute. We'll get a tally here for yeses and abstentions.

14 Bonnie Waninger: Nancy, when you are ready I have my count.

15 Steve Lotspeich: Did you just count 12?

16 Nancy Chartrand: Sorry, I had a technical issue here. I need a confirmation of Orange, Roxbury, and Waitsfield  
17 to give a count.

18 Bonnie Waninger: I had Orange as Yes, Roxbury as No, and Waitsfield as No.

19 Nancy Chartrand: OK (counting) I have 12 yeas, does that match with you, Bonnie?

20 Bonnie Waninger: It does.

21 Nancy Chartrand: (counting) four nos and one abstention...no, that's not right

22 Bonnie Waninger: I have five nos.

23 Nancy Chartrand: Five nos...yes, that's right.

24 Steve Lotspeich: So we have 23 seats so the motion passes.

25 Nancy Chartrand: Yes, five "nos". I'm sorry.

26 Steve Lotspeich: Okay, so the motion passes. Alright, so we'll communicate that.

27 Bonnie Waninger: So I will take that information back. And then my question for the Board is, I heard that you  
28 want to talk about it more and talk specifically about things. How would you like to move forward with that?

29 Steve Lotspeich: Well, I don't know if we really know, Bonnie. If the plan is being finalized at the end of the  
30 month, we're not going to have another opportunity...unless we have a special meeting.

31 Bonnie Waninger: So then what I'm hearing for that is, I will take the comments back that you brought, and we'll  
32 enter those in. If there's no addressing on those comments or if the Board doesn't feel like they have been  
33 addressed adequately, that we can expect when it comes up for adoption, the Board would vote "no"?

1 Steve Lotspeich: Well, I don't think we can predict that, Bonnie. I think we need...I think we have to wait. Let's  
2 not go there, okay? I just don't think we know. So, it may be true, but...okay, I'd like to move on with the rest of  
3 our agenda, please.

4 John Brabant: Steve, just to help out. Bonnie, you could always from your notes communicate some of the  
5 comments or the comments that were raised in specific as at least the beginning, so they could maybe attempt  
6 to amend the plan to provide some redress. Thank you.

7 Steve Lotspeich: Yeah, I think that'll be the transcription of the comments that will go. So, okay, Peter, I'd like,  
8 to wrap this up. If you have a final comment.

9 Peter Carbee: Just very briefly, I think, with this vote and the comments, I think Bonnie can pass onto them that  
10 we just do not feel it's ready at this time. If it's fleshed out, but we did not like the draft. Thank you.

11 Bonnie Waninger: Thank you, Peter.

12 Steve Lotspeich: Thank you. Good point. Okay. Sounds good. Thanks, everybody. Good discussion.