



Supplement — Which findings to withdraw

Finding 1 — Section C (§ 4348(a) outreach review)

“The draft regional plan appears to have been developed with the participation of its member municipalities, and the RPC appears to have provided for meaningful participation to communities throughout the region.”

This is the factual outreach claim. It's directly contradicted by the six-item record: missed notice deadline, omitted conformance report, illegible paper maps, no parcel-level criteria record, the hearing recharacterization sequence, and the conflicting August 28 flyer deadline. This is the sharper, easier target if only one can be raised today.

Finding 2 — Section A.2 (§ 4302(b) general goals)

“The draft regional plan appears to conform with 24 V.S.A. § 4302(b).”

This bundles the citizen-participation goal, § 4302(b)(2), together with three other general goals in one unexamined sentence. It matters more over time: the Board's post-adoption § 4348(h)(4) review of the adopted plan can still reach § 4302(b) as a state planning goal, while Section C's § 4348(a) outreach review does not carry forward past adoption at all. Leaving this finding untouched today lets the participation question survive under a different label, in the one forum that still matters later.

Bottom line

I ask for both. Section C because it is factually wrong on this record. § 4302(b) because it is the finding with the longer legal life. Both are already named together in the written comment's requested actions.