

CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Regional Plan Committee
Minutes

April 4, 2023 4:00 – 5:30 pm

Via Zoom; physical location: Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission
29 Main Street, Suite 4, Montpelier, VT 05602

Committee Members:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	M. Gilbar, Barre Town Alternate
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	J. Ohlsson, Calais Alternate
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	M. Gray, Woodbury
<input type="checkbox"/>	vacant
<input type="checkbox"/>	vacant

Members of the Public: Alice Peal, Waitsfield Alternate Rep; Rich Turner, Williamstown Rep; Mike Miller, Montpelier Alt Rep.; John Brabant, Calais Rep.

Staff: Clare Rock

Attendees introduced themselves. C Rock stated that there are 2 vacant seats on the committee as Laura Hill Eubanks, Northfield, and Dara Torre, Moretown both recently resigned from the CVRPC Board and from this committee. Annual appointments to the committee will be held in June and other Representatives which have expressed interest in serving on the Regional Plan Committee (RPC/committee) were invited to join this meeting as this is the beginning of the regional plan project.

Adjustments to the Agenda

C Rock stated that M Gilbar would be arriving late and until his arrival quorum would not be met. Committee attendees agreed to move voting items (Election of Officers and Adoption of ROP) to the end of the meeting.

Public Comments

J Ohlsson asked if it was ok for one town to have 2 representatives on the committee as there are 2 participants from Calais present. C Rock stated that only 1 is a voting member at this time.

New Regional Plan

C Rock lead the committee through the orientation to regional plan process and went through the items in the materials packet (which included: purpose and statutory authority and requirements; key components of the plan; draft Vision and Aspirations; structure and organization of the plan; stakeholder groups; general timeline.)

A question was raised about whether our SRI definition could be located in a standalone policy document vs being in our region plan. C Rock stated that upon review of other regional plans these are located within the plan, but that this might be an interesting clarification to pursue.

Questions about the proposed changes to Act 250 and SRI definition were raised – discussion followed. The SRI definition is independent from the Act 250 criteria. The Natural Resources Board administers the Act 250 criteria, the SRI definition is used by the RPC to define hats types of projects the RPC may weigh

1 in on when a project is going through the Act 250 permit process.

2
3 Mike Gilbar joined the meeting.

4
5 J Brabant made comment about using the terms “shall” and “must” and if the plan is to carry weight in
6 the state permitting processes (Act 250/Section 248) we may want to consider use of these terms.
7 Otherwise the overall intent of the plan is for it to be a visionary document.

8
9 On the topic of “Vision and Aspirations” some committee members would prefer not to use the terms
10 ‘aspirations’ as it is to wishy-washy and the term goals should be used instead.

11
12 Discussion followed about the wording of the “Vision and Aspirations” statements and included:

- 13 • Doesn’t like the way the first one is written, would like to see the term ‘sustainable’ added
- 14 • on the housing one: doesn’t understand what “stimulate” means; cannot talk about housing
15 without talking about transportation and proximity to jobs; rather than “a range” want to make
16 sure that we understanding the demographics to target the needs; we should look more into
17 this language in light of shared some recent housing statistics and the need to respond to
18 today’s materials and consider affordability with incomes.
- 19 • on the “healthy and active and connected population.”

20
21 A couple committee members suggested these aspirations/goals to viewed more as concepts and that
22 at this point we shouldn’t get caught up too much in the wordsmithing as they could evolve over the
23 course of writing the plan.

24
25 On the structure of the plan, there is recognition for brevity. The question was raised if we could make
26 links to data and maps so the information would be more dynamic? Staff indicated that this maybe a
27 challenge of capacity, we could address it by building check-ins into the implementation program to
28 annually or semi regularly review recent data to check policies still make sense.

29
30 A couple of members feel the chapter heading should be more generic (i.e. just “housing” rather than “a
31 range of housing”) so we don’t get pigeon holed into a policy-like statement if we need to update the
32 direction of the chapter into the future.

33 34 **Election of Officers**

35 M Gray would like to withdraw as a future member and asked not be appointed to this committee for
36 another term. He recognized the valuable contribution the interested members can bring to the process.
37 M Gibar stated that the May meeting would be his last meeting .As the committee will be made up of
38 many new members in June the voting members agreed it would be best to postpone elections so the
39 new board can start fresh.

40
41 M Gilbar made a motion to postpone the election of officers, seconded by J Ohlsson. All in favor. Motion
42 carried.

43 44 **Rules of Procedure**

45 Staff has some additional changes to this draft and will share at the next meeting for approval.

46 47 **Adjournment at 5:45 pm**

48 M Gilbar made a motion to adjourn, seconded by J Ohlsson. All in favor. Motion carried.