

CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Regional Plan Committee
Draft Meeting Minutes
September 1, 2026

29 Main Street, Suite 4, Montpelier, VT 05602
 Remote Access Via Zoom

Committee Members:	
	Alice Peal, Waitsfield Representative, Chairperson
X	Doug Greason, Waterbury Representative
X	John Brabant, Calais Representative
X	Brittany Butler, Cabot Representative
X	Alice Farrell, Berlin Representative

Staff: Christian Meyer, Brian Voigt, Lorraine Banbury

Public: Alan Goldman, Thomas Weiss, Steven Whittaker, all residents of Montpelier

D. Greason, presiding as Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm. Roll call was taken.

In Memoriam

D. Greason informed the Committee that Chair Alice Peal had passed away unexpectedly a few days prior, and invited members to share reflections. J. Brabant noted that her sudden passing was a shock, noting that several Committee members had spoken with A. Peal the day before. D. Greason stated that the Committee would miss her experience and her presence.

Adjustments to the Agenda

None.

Public Comment

A. Goldman, a Montpelier resident and housing developer, described several properties he owns or co-owns in Montpelier, among them Sabin's Pasture, the Crestview neighborhood off Terrace Street and land near Country Club Road. He explained that he stewards a 516-acre parcel with a single parcel ID that is only partially included in Montpelier's Growth Center. He asked the Commission to recognize the full 516-acre parcel in the Growth Center, citing walkability and wetland rule changes. He has submitted comments and supporting maps to the LURB. [Staff note: a link to the LURB database with Regional Plan filings was added

1 to the chat for commissioners to review these materials as well as all other
2 comments and documents submitted to the LURB as part of their review.
3 <https://anrweb.vt.gov/ANR/Act250/RPDetail.aspx?AppNum=RPC03-0001>]
4

5 S. Whittaker asked that his submissions to the LURB be considered as part of the
6 plan's working record. He raised an objection to the 8/4/2026 meeting which ended
7 on time at 5:30, without his being able to deliver public comment. Other concerns
8 from his LURB comments were that the LURB checklist of where statutory
9 requirements were met in the Regional Plan did not count as a conformance report
10 as required by statute; a placeholder table for Environmental Justice
11 (environmental benefits and burdens) data; lack of narrative about environmental
12 impacts of homelessness; and public outreach.
13

14 T. Weiss asked that the table of environmental burdens and benefits in Appendix V
15 be provided with sufficient time for public review. He questioned the schedule's plan
16 to adopt the plan on the same day as the second public hearing, which would not
17 allow for comments from that hearing to be considered. He was concerned that
18 some of the planned growth areas, particularly in Montpelier, do not conform to the
19 Tier 1B eligibility requirements. He has also submitted comments to the LURB, and
20 submitted a 6-page document for the Committee's consideration which was sent
21 the day before the meeting.
22

23 Staff confirmed that A. Goldman's and Montpelier's FLU map comments are being
24 considered, and that map change requests will be reviewed at the 8/8 Board of
25 Commissioners (BOC) meeting. Staff shared a link to the Act 250 LURB database
26 CVRPC Regional Plan application to view all documents:
27 <https://anrweb.vt.gov/ANR/Act250/RPDetail.aspx?AppNum=RPC03-0001>
28 to view all comments submitted to the LURB state agencies. Staff noted the
29 materials in the meeting packet included LURB comments received to date.
30

31 **Approval of Minutes – August 4, 2026**

32 D. Greason requested a correction to the discussion on the proposed Special Use
33 Resilience Future Land Use (FLU) classification, to reflect that the plan was to bring
34 additional information back to the Committee, rather than that there was consensus
35 supporting a broader version. Staff agreed to revise the minutes accordingly.

36 A. Farrell moved to approve the August 4, 2026 minutes as corrected. J. Brabant
37 seconded. The motion carried unanimously.
38

39 **Regional Plan Adoption and Approval Timeline**

40 Due to a clerical error in warning the September 8 Hearing at the Board of
41 Commissioners meeting, there will be an additional September 14th hearing.
42 Comments received on September 8 will be entered into the record at the

1 September 14 hearing, so no input will be lost. The September 14 hearing will be
2 held as part of a special committee meeting. B. Butler, J. Brabant, and A Farrell
3 confirmed they could attend a special Regional Plan Committee meeting, which
4 would ensure a quorum. Three of the four Executive Committee members have
5 confirmed availability, so dual special meetings of the Executive and Regional Plan
6 Committee will be warned.

7
8 C. Meyer explained revisions to the timeline, with a proposed special Board of
9 Commissioners meeting and final Plan/Map Public Hearing on October 15th. Per
10 statute, no substantial changes to the Plan/FLU map may be made once the second
11 hearing is warned 30 days in advance. At the September hearings, it will be
12 important to identify any significant issues not already identified and addressed that
13 could delay adoption beyond October. [Staff note: see Regional Plan Feedback
14 agenda item, below.]

15
16 J. Brabant raised concern that the interval between the September 14 hearing and
17 September 15th final submission to the LURB needed to achieve the October 15th
18 final hearing deadline was too short and suggested public comment close on Friday,
19 September 18 to allow comments to be incorporated. C. Meyer acknowledged the
20 concern and clarified that public comment will be accepted through and at the mid-
21 October hearing. The compressed schedule is to meet the deadline to have the plan
22 approved by December 31, 2026 to maintain all the benefits of the legacy state
23 designations program. The October 15th final hearing date accounts for the LURB's
24 75-day statutory review and approval process. This does not include the
25 undetermined interval between Plan submission and its determination of
26 completeness. Closing comment on September 18 and warning the final CVRPC
27 hearing on September 21 would move the final CVRPC hearing and Board Adoption
28 to October 20 or 21 would likely move the LURB's hearing to late December, after
29 which they have 15 days to deliberate.

30
31 D. Greason asked what the practical consequences would be of missing the
32 December 31 deadline by a short period. C. Meyer responded that the effect would
33 be a lapse in state designation program benefits, but that the extent of that impact
34 would vary by municipality. D. Greason suggested asking the LURB if they had
35 authority to grant an extension. Staff will follow up with the LURB, which has
36 indicated willingness to work with us, but also noted they are busy with the
37 Regional Plan applications submitted ahead of CVRPC, and there are several
38 holidays in November and December during their review window. As part of the
39 final submission, staff will prepare the required summary of changes made between
40 the preapplication and the revisions. J. Brabant expressed hope that with the
41 LURB's familiarity with the pre-application and the change summary document, a
42 decision could be returned in a few days.

1
2 A. Farrell raised concerns about the original compressed timeline creating
3 opportunities for mistakes. She noted that mistakes are especially likely in
4 situations with quick turnarounds. J. Brabant stated that the Plan being finalized
5 after the second hearing could make the hearing appear a formality. He urged the
6 Commission to consider new information that can surface in public hearings as
7 stewards of the process. He expressed frustration that the Regional Plan revision
8 process has been ongoing for 3 years, and feels that the Committee is now being
9 rushed. He added that the Commission's role was not to preserve grant eligibility
10 for any one community.

11
12 After discussion, the Committee decided to recommend the following to the Board
13 of Commissioners: Receive additional public comment through 9/18, warn the final
14 CVRPC hearing and adoption for 10/21, and direct staff to seek LURB feedback on
15 whether they could return their decision within a compressed timeframe.

16
17 Staff reiterated that the 2026 Draft Plan is regarded internally as an interim plan
18 intended to meet current statutory requirements and preserve the region's existing
19 designations, with a full rewrite to begin in 2027.

20 21 **Land Use Review Board Required Changes**

22 Staff reviewed the LURB's required changes to the plan, and noted that a
23 determination that part of the plan "does not conform" can reflect missing
24 information showing conformity, rather than a substantive conflict with state
25 planning goals. Staff have been making revisions since receiving the LURB's initial
26 draft feedback several weeks earlier

27
28 Staff provided updates on the analysis of the compatibility of the CVPRC draft plan
29 with adjacent regions, including inter-regional planning efforts such as
30 transportation, identifying possible impacts on housing and economic growth in
31 neighboring communities, and review of FLU classifications across all borders. LURB
32 feedback about the age of data in the maps has already been addressed, and new
33 maps have been created using state-available data.

34 **Mandatory Language**

35 In the first draft preapplication response, the LURB identified several potential areas
36 of concern with mandatory language. Their second draft included only Rural
37 Conservation Policy 2. The requirement to mitigate impacts on critical resource
38 areas does not have a standard for mitigation. Staff have drafted revised language
39 showing that impacts cannot be avoided and a demonstration of how impacts are
40 being mitigated.

Future Land Use Map and Tier 1 Requests

Staff reviewed municipal requests to change Tier 1-eligible area designations. In Berlin, the developed area along Route 302 currently mapped as Rural Conservation will be reclassified to Transition/Infill, a non-Tier 1 designation, rather than left in its current classification; staff noted this will not visibly change what the town has already been shown, since it does not create Tier 1 eligibility. In Cabot, the LURB has requested additional documentation supporting the Lower Village neighborhood's inclusion as a Village Center, which staff will follow up on; similar follow-up items were noted for Middlesex and the Putnamville area.

State Partner Comments

Staff reviewed comments submitted to the LURB from state agencies and partners. The Agency of Transportation identified map elements that were missing. Out of date maps, which were also noted by the LURB, have been updated and missing maps generated, with 3 still being revised. Topics included classifications of highways, and rail yards. All map comments are being reviewed against the VAPDA methodology.

Municipal Partner Comments

Three municipalities submitted comments: Barre Town, Montpelier, and Waterbury. Barre Town's zoning administrator, with input from the town's Planning Commission, submitted map change requests directly to CVRPC, and their the Select Board has adopted a resolution supporting Tier 1B for Village Centers and Village Areas, with possible future additions. Montpelier submitted comments to the LURB with several change requests, including comments on issues A. Goldman raised. Waterbury submitted a joint letter from its Select Board, Planning Commission, and Housing Committee to CVRPC. Staff noted a community member concern about a specific parcel in Waterbury, and that in addition to CVRPC review, suggested the community member connect with the Waterbury Planning Commission and Select Board to discuss excluding it from the Tier 1 enrolled area. All municipal change requests, as well as those from individuals, are being reviewed against the VAPDA methodology, and will be reviewed at the September 8th BOC meeting.

Public Comments

D. Greason asked whether commenters are notified that their comments were received; staff confirmed that all comments are cataloged with responses in a shared spreadsheet, and commenters are informed of the hearing schedule so they have the opportunity to be entered into the formal record.

Public Outreach Summary

Staff summarized outreach conducted to date, which will be submitted to the LURB

1 as a memo and included as an appendix to the plan. In addition to supplying
2 statutorily required materials, staff met with 20+ Planning Commissions and Select
3 Boards/City Councils. Staff delivered large-scale future land use maps of their
4 community to every municipality showing parcel-level details, and a hard copy of
5 the draft Regional Plan. Public libraries also received copies of the draft Plan, and
6 full-size maps for each municipality they serve. Copies of a two-sided flyer
7 explained the future land use classifications and invited comment by August 28 so
8 feedback could be incorporated into revisions. Public Hearing Warnings distributed
9 early in July specified that public comment would be taken up to and through the
10 Hearings.

11
12 In response to recurring questions, staff held seven public question-and-answer
13 sessions, which were well-attended by local planning commissioners, select board
14 and city council members, the state representative from Washington and Orange
15 Counties, a commissioner from another RPC and community members. [Staff note:
16 several CVRPC Commissioners also attended]. Materials were posted online and
17 the sessions were promoted through Front Porch Forum and CVRPC's newsletter
18 distribution list, as well as posts on Rural Vermont Rising's facebook page, which
19 brought several community members. D. Greason thanked staff for the effort.
20

21 **Committee Review of Comments Outside the LURB's Purview**

22 There was discussion of comments received by both the LURB and CVRPC. D.
23 Greason stated that Commissioners have received and reviewed the public
24 comments and are considering them alongside the LURB's comments.
25

26 **Adjournment**

27 A. Farrell moved to adjourn. J. Brabant seconded. The motion carried unanimously.
28 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:36 pm.
29

30 Respectfully submitted by L. Banbury
31