

CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Regional Plan Committee

Draft Minutes

Tuesday, October 7, 2025 4:00 – 5:30 pm

29 Main Street, Suite 4, Montpelier, VT 05602

Remote Access Via Zoom

Committee Members:

x	Alice Peal, Waitsfield Representative (via Zoom)
x	Doug Greason, Waterbury Representative (via Zoom)
	John Brabant, Calais Representative
x	Rich Turner, Williamstown Representative

Staff: Brian Voigt, Lorraine Banbury, Christian Meyer (via Zoom)

Public: Thomas Weiss (Montpelier); James Craft (Warren, via Zoom)

A. Peal called the meeting to order at 4:01 PM.

Adjustments to the Agenda

No adjustments to the agenda.

Public Comment

No public comment.

Approval of Minutes

D. Greason moved to approve the draft of the August 19, 2025 and September 3, 2025 meeting minutes. R. Turner seconded, all in favor, the motion carried.

Aspiration, Goals, Strategies & Policies Review: Economy Chapter

A. Peal mentioned that Office Manager N. Chartrand is working on getting a fifth member for the group and that the Nominating Committee will meet tomorrow to discuss potential nominations.

A. Peal raised concerns about redundancies and unclear terminology in the draft chapter, suggesting the need for a more concise and accessible document. She proposed adding boxes to explain jargon and potentially referencing a new climate change document in the Natural Systems chapter.

B. Voigt shared that those terms will likely be covered in the full text of the chapter. D. Gleason suggested that all the Goals should be presented at the

beginning of each chapter. A. Peal brought up a climate change report that was soon to be presented to the legislature, and B. Voigt requested that any references to external documents be shared with the staff. The Committee acknowledged the need to review and tighten up the language to avoid wordiness and ensure clarity for readers.

The group discussed strategies for preserving traditional trades while preparing for economic transformation, focusing on partnerships with technical colleges and high schools to expand apprenticeships and training programs for emerging jobs like heat pump and solar installers. C. Meyer suggested reviewing the document to identify initiatives that align with the RPC's capabilities, proposing to use strikethroughs for strategies that may not be actionable or relevant, while maintaining broad language to support multiple goals simultaneously. A. Peal and D. Greason agreed that while the document contains valuable ideas, some strategies may need to be refined or combined to ensure practical implementation by the RPC.

C. Meyer suggested leaving the chapters intact, with the understanding that future refinements are possible through the revision process. B. Voigt explained that he based the revised Aspiration, Goals, Strategies of the Economy & Working Lands and Natural Systems chapters on the current draft of the Plan. He discouraged the creation of a crosswalk between the new and old plans due to time constraints. A. Peal offered to identify repetitive text in the draft, while the Committee agreed that cross-referencing between chapters would be done later, with staff and Committee help in determining where each Goal or Strategy best fits.

The Committee discussed feedback methods for reviewing documents, with A. Peal and D. Greason agreeing that a spreadsheet system would be more efficient for tracking comments by section number (S1.4, P3.2, etc.). L. Banbury offered to create and share a spreadsheet on SharePoint where committee members could input their feedback on specific strategies and policies. A. Peal expressed a preference for this organized approach. The group agreed this would help reduce redundancy in comments and make the review process more streamlined.

Aspiration, Goals, Strategies & Policies Review: Natural Systems Chapter

The group reviewed the Natural Systems chapter, with A. Peal expressing support for the document and its focus on safeguarding and sustaining clean

1 air and water. B. Voigt explained the use of "require" Policies as a way to set
2 thresholds for support, while D. Greason praised the specificity of the Goal 4
3 Policies. The discussion touched on the role of conservation commissions,
4 with A. Peal highlighting their importance in maintaining town-owned
5 properties, and B. Voigt noting that most municipalities in the region have
6 such commissions. The Committee agreed that the Goals, Strategies, and
7 Policies in the chapter were strong and well-represented, with a particular
8 emphasis on equity issues.

9 A. Peal discussed the Agency of Natural Resources Wetlands Program's
10 response to the Governor's Executive Order, noting that mapped wetlands
11 must still adhere to the 50-foot buffer rule, while unmapped wetlands may
12 qualify for a 25-foot buffer.

13 **Future Land Use Map Update**

14 B. Voigt provided an update on the Regional Future Land Use Map, noting
15 that staff have visited 17 of 23 municipalities in the region. He mentioned
16 that East Montpelier is interested in housing-related changes to their future
17 land use map, and Roxbury expressed interest in Act 250 while remaining
18 opposed to zoning. B. Voigt also noted that he met with staff from other
19 Regional Planning Commissions to discuss future land use class designation
20 along shared boundaries.

21 The discussion continued with a focus on regulatory concerns regarding
22 property zoning and development, particularly the interpretation of Tier 1B
23 requirements for water and wastewater systems. Staff explained that there
24 is conflicting information between the statutory language and legislative
25 summary for Act 181. The Land Use Review Board clarified that the statutory
26 language should be followed, which says that Tier 1B areas require only one
27 of the following – water supply system, wastewater system, or suitable soils
28 to be eligible. This could expand opportunities for designating centers and
29 neighborhoods, though it leaves unresolved concerns about the practicality
30 of meeting density requirements without both water and wastewater
31 infrastructure.

32 The Committee discussed concerns about legislation and future land use
33 maps, particularly regarding Act 181 and its implementation. C. Meyer
34 explained that the original Act 181 reports included deliberate decisions
35 about village areas and sewer systems and mentioned ongoing discussions
36 about revisions to Section 24.

1 **Adjourn**

2 R. Turner moved to adjourn the meeting, and D. Greason seconded. All in
3 favor, the motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 5:25 pm.

4 *Respectfully submitted by L. Banbury*