

From: [Stephen Whitaker](#)
To: [Christian Meyer](#)
Cc: [atpeal](#); [Dingledine, Brooke](#); [Act250 - Board](#); asap.centralvermont@gmail.com
Subject: Correction to my August 12, 2026 letter regarding the § 4348(d)(1) written description of Regional Future Land Use Map changes — Docket RPC03-0001
Date: Wednesday, August 12, 2026 12:12:39 PM

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Date: August 12, 2026

To: Christian Meyer, Executive Director, Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission

Cc: Alice Peal, Regional Plan Committee Chair; Brooke Dingledine, Land Use Review Board; Act250.Board@vermont.gov

From: Stephen Whitaker, ASAP4CV, Montpelier, Vermont

Re: Correction to my August 12, 2026 letter regarding the § 4348(d)(1) written description of Regional Future Land Use Map changes — Docket RPC03-0001

Christian,

I am writing to correct two statements in my letter to you earlier today. On review, I had not more thoroughly read the Draft Regional Plan Review Checklist (Exhibit 005) in full before writing that letter, and two things I said in it are inaccurate as a result. I want the record to reflect the correction promptly and plainly.

What was inaccurate

My letter stated that I “could not find the current proposed Planned Growth Area acreage stated as a single, clear number anywhere in CVRPC’s or the City’s materials.” That is incorrect. The Draft Regional Plan Review Checklist states, under the Planned Growth Area table for Montpelier, a Total Area of 1,995 acres, and separately states a Downtown Center Total Area of 204 acres. Both figures are stated plainly.

My letter also characterized a single sentence in the August 6, 2026 Future Land Use Areas Map Change Memo as effectively the whole of the justification CVRPC has offered for Montpelier’s Planned Growth Area designation. That was incomplete.

The Draft Regional Plan Review Checklist contains a separate, five-sentence narrative for Montpelier’s Planned Growth Area, addressing service, flood

hazard exclusion, zoning consistency, and municipal future land use map alignment in general terms.

What still stands

Correcting these two points changes the specifics but not the underlying concern. Using CVRPC's own stated figures rather than my earlier estimate: 1,995 acres for the Planned Growth Area alone, or 2,199 acres combined with the Downtown Center, against a legacy Growth Center boundary of 1,054.93 acres per the State's Planning Atlas, is a designation roughly 1.9 to 2.1 times the size of the boundary the August 6 memo says it "largely aligns with." That comparison is now based on CVRPC's own numbers, not mine, and it still does not support the map change memo's characterization.

On the second point, I want to be precise about what five sentences actually adds over one.

Taken in turn: the first sentence describes the designation's location relative to the Downtown Center and asserts nothing.

The second states that "mostly" the area is served by water and wastewater without stating capacity, the same presence-versus-capacity gap I have raised elsewhere in this docket for criterion (ii).

The third states that unserved locations are "generally close enough" for "future connections" to be "possible," without a distance, a cost, or a citation to any adopted capital program — the showing criterion (vii) actually requires for planned infrastructure to count. These are the criteria compliance factors that should be displayed in the map as attributes, parcel by parcel.

The fourth, that flood hazard areas were excluded, is the one sentence that states an actual method, though without figures.

The fifth states that the designation is consistent with high-density zoning and that the municipal future land use map prioritizes the area for growth because the municipal future land use map prioritizes the area for growth — which is not independent support, it is the same conclusion stated twice.

So while I was wrong to describe the record as containing only one sentence, the correction does not change my basic point.

Four of the five sentences are description, an unsupported presence claim, an unsupported possibility, or a circular reference back to the same map under review. Only one states a method. Five sentences of that kind are not

meaningfully more informative than one, and I do not think the correction should be read as resolving the underlying concern this letter and my earlier one both raise.

Why I am sending this correction

I would rather correct my own errors quickly and plainly than have them stand uncorrected in a docket now before the Land Use Review Board. I ask that this letter be read together with, and as a correction to, my earlier letter of today's date.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Stephen Whitaker

ASAP4CV, Montpelier, Vermont