VERMONT
LAND USE REVIEW BOARD
Application #:
RPC03-0001
Exhibit #: 086a
Date Received: 11-02-2026

STATE OF VERMONT

LAND USE REVIEW BOARD

Docket RPC03-0001 — Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission
Adopted 2026 Regional Plan and Future Land Use Map

SECOND OBJECTION AND THRESHOLD REQUEST
under 24 V.S.A. § 4348(h) and (i)

Stephen Whitaker, individually and on behalf of ASAP4CV (Accountable, Sustainable, Affordable Planning 4 Central Vermont)

Filed November 2, 2026

I. Introduction and Timeliness

1. CVRPC's Board of Commissioners adopted the 2026 Regional Plan on October 20, 2026, by a vote of 21 to 1. The fifteen-day objection period under 24 V.S.A. § 4348(i)(1) ends November 4, 2026. This is a separate, timely objection. It is not a supplement to the Formal Objection filed October 23, 2026, which Objector relies on and does not repeat.

2. This filing has two parts. Part II is a threshold request that the Board not deem the application complete, and examine the adoption process, before it reaches approval. It develops the request already made in the October 23 objection (Formal Objection, pp. 22–23) that the Board state which hearings it found to be hearings of the commission under § 4348(c), and why. Part III is one additional objection under § 4348(i)(3), on § 4348a(a)(8), that was not raised in the October 23 filing.

3. Objector does not contend that Part II is itself a ground for objection under § 4348(i)(3). It is a request that the Board exercise its own review authority under § 4348(h), consistent with the Board's statements at its August 31, 2026 meeting. Board Member Brooke Dingledine said that "the board will rule on all of the aspects of the plan" and that "we are not limited to just the elements in our final review." Chair Janet Hurley said the Board will have "jurisdiction to say … whether or not this Regional Plan was adopted with … meaningful participation" (Appendix A-9). Objector made the same point to the Board on September 8 (Board docket No. 052): the § 4348(i)(3) limit applies to objections, not to the Board's

determination under § 4348(h)(4), which independently reaches § 4302 and the purposes in § 4347, including participation.

4. Objector participated in the adoption process in writing and orally, including at the October 20 hearing. Objector spoke as an individual and for ASAP4CV, which gave CVRPC written notice under § 4348(d)(1)(D) on July 25, 2026.

5. Objector's standing is as stated in the Notice of Appearance and Statement of Interested-Party Status and the Petition Packet (32 signatures, with Representative's Statement of Participation) filed October 23, 2026 in this docket, which Objector incorporates by reference and does not repeat. Objector Whitaker is the representative designated by the petition signers, and ASAP4CV is a party entitled to notice under § 4348(d)(1)(D) (Appendix A-6).

II. Threshold Request

A. Relief requested

6. Objector asks the Board (1) not to deem CVRPC's application complete until CVRPC files the report documenting conformance required by § 4348(h)(1), and (2) in its § 4348(h)(4) determination, to evaluate expressly whether the plan was adopted through the process § 4348 requires, before reaching any approval.

B. The hearing record: no full-Board hearing at which changes could still be made

7. As amended by 2026 Acts and Resolves No. 152, Sec. 12, § 4348 provides: "(c) The regional planning commission shall hold two or more public hearings within the region after public notice on any proposed plan or amendment. The minimum number of required public hearings may be specified within the bylaws of the regional planning commission." "(d)(1) At least 30 days prior to the first hearing, a copy of the proposed plan or amendment, a report documenting conformance with the goals established in section 4302 of this chapter and the plan elements established in section 4348a of this chapter, and a description of any changes to the Regional Future Land Use Map … shall be delivered physically or electronically with proof of receipt or sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, to each of the following: …" "(f) The regional planning commission may make revisions to the

proposed plan or amendment at any time not less than 30 days prior to the final public hearing held under this section."

8. The sequence, from CVRPC's own records and correspondence:

   - July 25, 2026: ASAP4CV gave written notice under § 4348(d)(1)(D), before any hearing was warned. On July 27 CVRPC's Executive Director described it as a mailing-list request (Appendix A-6).
   - August 10, 2026: CVRPC transmitted the plan, map, checklist and energy form, but no separate report documenting conformance (Ex. 7, Excerpt A). That evening Objector flagged the gap, computing the 30-day deadline from the hearing date CVRPC had then stated, August 15; CVRPC answered on August 19 that it did not intend to submit another document (Ex. 3; Ex. 7, Excerpt A).
   - August 18, 2026: CVRPC's posted schedule had changed. September 8 was now described as an "additional public hearing, beyond what is statutorily required," and September 14 as the "first of two statutorily required public hearings." ASAP4CV asked in writing what that meant for participation rights. On August 19 CVRPC replied that comment at any hearing counts and that September 8 comments would be re-entered as written comments on September 14 (Ex. 4).
   - September 1, 2026: CVRPC's Regional Plan Committee minutes record the reason for the change as a "clerical error in warning the September 8 Hearing" (Ex. 50, minutes p. 3 of 6).
   - September 8, 2026: Board of Commissioners meeting with a regional plan hearing.
   - September 14, 2026: a Regional Plan Committee special meeting with a regional plan hearing, which CVRPC's calendar lists as "Regional Plan/Executive Committee w/ Regional Plan Public Hearing" (Ex. 59, packet p. 97 of 123).
   - September 19, 2026: the plan was warned and distributed for the final hearing.
   - October 20, 2026: Board of Commissioners hearing and adoption vote.

9. On October 20, 2026, CVRPC's staff gave this account on the record. The first hearing on September 8 "was not our first statutory hearing," because "materials need to be distributed to specific list of individuals 30 days prior" and for September 8 "those materials had only been distributed something like 26 days"

before; “That’s why we scheduled a second hearing on the 14th.” Staff added that once the final-hearing materials are sent, “we can make zero changes” (Appendix A-1).

10. On those statements and CVRPC’s own form, CVRPC treated September 14 as its first statutory hearing and October 20 as its second. CVRPC’s application lists those two dates (Board docket No. 055, p. 9). CVRPC is not consistent about this: on October 20 the Chair described September 8 as the first hearing, September 14 as the second, and October 20 as the “final” hearing (Appendix A-1), and the posted notice called September 14 the “first of two statutorily required public hearings” (Ex. 4) while CVRPC’s staff opening on September 14 called it “the second hearing” (Ex. 8).

10A. CVRPC has described its hearings inconsistently, in its own words:

- August 18 posting: September 8 is an “additional public hearing, beyond what is statutorily required”; September 14 is the “first of two statutorily required public hearings” (Ex. 4).
- September 1 (Regional Plan Committee): because of a “clerical error in warning the September 8 Hearing,” there will be “an additional September 14th hearing” (Ex. 50).
- September 8 (Board of Commissioners): CVRPC responded to Objector, “we are treating this as a full hearing. All comments received will be submitted as part of the statutory requirements,” and said CVRPC “will hold two hearings with the 30-day notice” (Appendix A-2). CVRPC’s minutes of September 8 (accepted by the Board on October 20) record that the Executive Director “clarified that according to statute, hearings do not need to be before the full board” and that each committee “is an instrumentality of it” (Oct 20 Board Packet, pp. 74–77 of 123, at p. 2 of the minutes; Appendix A-2).
- September 14: the hearing is called the “second hearing” (Ex. 8).
- October 20, Chair’s opening: the “First hearing” was September 8, “a second hearing was held on September 14th,” and October 20 is the “final public hearing” (Appendix A-1).

- October 20, staff: September 8 "was not our first statutory hearing," because the materials went out late; "That's why we scheduled a second hearing on the 14th" (Appendix A-1).
- Application form: the two hearings are September 14 and October 20 (Board docket No. 055, p. 9).

11. The consequence is that the only hearing held by the full Board of Commissioners as a statutory hearing was October 20. By then, § 4348(f) no longer allowed revisions: the plan had been warned on September 19, and staff told the Board on October 20 that no changes could be made. The Regional Plan Committee's October 6 minutes record that no map changes would be made before the October 20 vote. A public hearing is meant to let people persuade the body that decides to change the proposed plan. The first hearing is the opportunity to ask for changes. The second is held after the revision window closes. Here the only hearing at which changes were still possible was before a committee that cannot adopt the plan.

C. The committee had no delegated authority to hold the statutory hearing

12. CVRPC's Bylaws (amended December 10, 2019) give the Regional Plan Committee five members whose duties are to "oversee development and maintenance of the Regional Plan" and "other tasks … as assigned by the Board" (§ 404(D); Chronicle Ex. 52). The Bylaws and the Committee's Rules of Procedure (December 10, 2019; Chronicle Ex. 53) contain no provision delegating to the Committee the Board's statutory public hearing. Standing committees have only the duties the Bylaws and Board assign (§ 403).

13. CVRPC planned and described September 14 as a pair of "dual special meetings of the Executive and Regional Plan Committee" (Ex. 50, minutes p. 3 of 6), and its calendar lists "Regional Plan/Executive Committee w/ Regional Plan Public Hearing" (Ex. 59, packet p. 97 of 123). But the notice and agenda for September 14 are those of a Regional Plan Committee special meeting (Chronicle Ex. 51; Appendix A-3), and the minutes are Regional Plan Committee minutes with three committee members recorded present (Appendix A-3). CVRPC's posted Executive Committee archive for 2026 lists meetings on August 3, August 31, October 5 and November 2, and no September 14 meeting, agenda, packet or minutes (Appendix A-5). CVRPC's September committee report to the Board credits only the Regional Plan Committee with having "hosted a Public Hearing" (Oct 20 Board Packet, pp.

81–82 of 123; Appendix A-5). The Executive Committee has seven members and a quorum is a majority (Executive Committee Rules of Procedure, June 9, 2020, Appendix A-5; Bylaws § 607(B), Chronicle Ex. 52); the September 1 minutes record only that three Executive Committee members had confirmed availability. No record shows that a quorum of the Executive Committee met on September 14, or that it met at all. The transcript of the September 14 meeting shows it was called to order as a Regional Plan Committee meeting ("we have a quorum of our regional plan committee so I can call the meeting to order"), with a roll call "for the Regional plan committee" answered by the Berlin, Cabot and Calais representatives, and no call to order or roll call of the Executive Committee (Appendix A-3).

13A. Even if it had, the Executive Committee could not hold the hearing. Its "General Activities" are budgets, dues, contracts, personnel, policies and Board agendas. The Bylaws let it "act on behalf of the Board in the absence of a quorum of the Board when time precludes the delay of decision or action until the next regular meeting of the Board" (Bylaws § 404(B)(2)(k), Chronicle Ex. 52) and, "if timing requires," act on certain policy issues (§ 404(B)(2)(j)). Neither applies. The Board was not without a quorum: it met with a quorum on September 8 and October 20. Nothing precluded waiting, since CVRPC chose the dates. A statutory hearing is not an "action" on a policy issue. And the Board did not delegate this hearing by resolution.

14. The Rules of Meeting Conduct and Public Participation amended September 8 and ratified October 20 address public comment. The pages Objector has reviewed contain no delegation of statutory hearings, and they describe CVRPC meetings as "working meetings, not meetings of the public (e.g., public forums or public hearings)."

15. Objector raised this on the record at each stage. On September 8, Objector told the Board that the statute requires two hearings before the full commission with 30 days' notice, that September 8 "didn't work" because the plan was not sent to participants in time, and that a September 14 hearing without the full commission would not make a compliant two-hearing process. CVRPC's Executive Director answered, as CVRPC's own minutes of that meeting record, that each committee "is an instrumentality of it" and may "undertake its business, so long as the full Board of Commissioners is who moves to adopt the plan" (Appendix A-2). On

September 14, Objector "renew[ed] the objection I raised on September 8th to this hearing being conducted by the regional plan committee rather than the full Board of Commissioners," stated CVRPC's position as being that a committee may act as the Commission's instrumentality so long as the full Board ultimately adopts the plan, said "I don't concede that reading," and reserved all rights (Ex. 8). On October 20, Objector stated that the September 8 materials were not delivered 30 days ahead and that October 20 was the first meeting of the Board of Commissioners on this plan under the statute (Appendix A-1). Whatever the merit of the instrumentality theory as to adoption, it does not answer § 4348(f): a hearing before an instrumentality cannot persuade the body that decides, once the revision window has closed before that body hears anyone.

D. Maps and plans were not accessible to interested parties

16. Parcel-level maps were not available to the public in readable form before the hearings and the adoption vote. Objector surveyed the Kellogg-Hubbard Library on August 10: six of the region's 23 towns had large-format future land use maps on display, and the maps for the other 17 towns, delivered later, had been reduced to 11x17 tabloid size at a scale that makes parcel-level detail unreadable (Appendix A-7). Objector had asked on August 10 for paper copies and large-format maps for those 17 towns (Ex. 3). At the Board's August 31 meeting CVRPC's Program Manager said that a large-format map of the entire region had been placed at the Library. When Objector asked on September 1 for any delivery or display record, CVRPC answered "No such records exist," said a large-scale regionwide map had been available at CVRPC's own offices, and said it could not yet respond to the request for large-format maps of each municipality at the Library (Appendix A-7). On October 26 Objector asked whether the individual town maps could be downloaded. On October 27 CVRPC replied that copies of each town's map "have been provided to you as part of previous records requests" and that they "are not currently available on the CVRPC web site for download" (Appendix A-7). Objector could not open the SharePoint materials CVRPC referred him to. Objector does not contend that no town maps exist; CVRPC says it delivered one to each municipality. The point is that readable parcel-level maps were not available to the public, which impaired Objector's ability to prepare comments.

E. The § 4348(h)(1) conformance report

17. Section 4348(h)(1) requires CVRPC, within 15 days after adoption (by November 4, 2026), to submit the adopted plan to the Board with a conformance report. Objector's October 24 letter to the Board explained that the Regional Plan Review Checklist is not a substitute, citing the Board's Application Guidelines §§ 1.003, 1.106(A) and 1.302(A)(3). Board staff acknowledged receipt on October 26. Objector asks the Board not to deem the application complete until the report is filed.

F. The October 20 draft minutes omit the hearing record

18. The draft minutes of October 20 (still unapproved) record only that the Chair explained the order of comment and opened and closed the hearing. They omit all testimony from the public, from five or more speakers, including Objector's three element-based points (the implementation program and capacity study, correlation with the land use element, and transportation priorities, costs and financing), the correction to the Commissioner list, and Objector's express reservation of all grounds for objection. They also omit the Chair's opening description of the hearing sequence and staff's statements quoted in ¶ 9. They describe Objector's request on the East Montpelier plan as one for "a deferred hearing with full approval," which is not what Objector said, and misspell his name (Appendix A-4).

19. Section 4348 ties objector standing to comment "for consideration at a public hearing." A hearing record that omits the comments cannot show they were considered. Objector asks the Board to require CVRPC to produce the recording and a corrected record.

G. Burden

20. The Board's Application Guidelines place the burden on the commission: "It is the RPC's burden to establish that the statutory standards are met" (Guidelines § 1.008; Formal Objection, p. 5). The Board's determination under § 4348(h)(4) turns on statutory standards, including consistency with § 4302 and § 4347. Objector asks the Board to apply § 1.008 to Part II and to treat the hearing and participation record as CVRPC's burden to establish.

III. Additional Objection: 24 V.S.A. § 4348a(a)(8)

21. Section 4348a(a)(8) requires "a statement indicating how the regional plan relates to development trends, needs, and plans and regional plans for adjacent municipalities and regions." Objector asserts that the adopted plan is not consistent with this element. Objector pleads this under § 4348a(a)(8) only, and separately asks the Board to consider compatibility with adjacent regions in its § 4348(h)(4) determination.

A. The Board required specific content, and the adopted plan does not supply it

22. The Board's Preapplication Response found that the plan "appears not to conform" and required CVRPC to "include an evaluation of compatibility with adjacent regional plans including level of coordination and description of similarities and differences between regions, particularly at the borders." (RPC03-0001, Preapplication Response, September 8, 2026, p. 14 of 33, Required Revision under § 4348a(a)(8).) CVRPC's Summary of Substantial Changes – Narrative says the Compatibility Statement "was expanded to include a more thorough evaluation of compatibility with adjacent regional planning commissions" (Introduction and Statement of Policy, item 1, p. 1).

23. The adopted plan's treatment is at Chapter 1, pp. 19–23. It states generally that "the goals and policies that guide rural development across the regions are compatible" and that CVRPC "engaged in collaborative discussions with adjoining RPCs during the drafting process." It then describes each neighboring region in a paragraph. It does not do what the Board required:

    - It identifies no similarity or difference between this plan and any adjacent regional plan, by name, adoption date or future land use category.
    - Its border descriptions are narrative and some note contrasts without analyzing them. For example, Warren's side is "used intensively for resource-based recreation with Sugarbush North and South Ski areas" while the Lincoln side is "a single 1,000+ acre rural conservation parcel"; parts of Mad River Glen's ski area cross the Fayston town line into Buell's Gore; and Bolton's resource-based recreation ski trails "come close to the Waterbury town line." The plan never says how its own future land use categories relate to the neighboring categories at these places.

- It does not describe the "level of coordination" beyond a general statement. It gives no dates, participants or records of the collaboration it claims.
- It states that neighboring plans are compatible and that copies of the proposed plan were sent to neighboring commissions "to solicit feedback," but records no response from any neighbor.

24. Neighboring regions' filings show the comparison was feasible, was done before CVRPC adopted its plan, and used CVRPC's own draft map:
    - The Addison County Regional Planning Commission's compatibility chapter compares "CVRPC's proposed Future Land Use plan" and finds its border lands designated "similarly, classifying most as 'Rural Conservation' and the remainder as 'Resource-based Recreation'" (RPC01-0001, Ex. 013, Ch. 9, p. 3, received January 26, 2026).
    - The Northeastern Vermont Development Association's filing describes one-on-one GIS meetings with CVRPC and compares "CVRPC's 2024 regional plan and future land use map — as well as its proposed 2026 plan and map" (RPC07-0001, Ex. 023, pp. 26–28, dated August 28, 2026).
    - The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission states that it reviewed the plans of adjoining commissions, and "to the extent possible" their drafts, and found that CVRPC's 2024 Future Land Use Map designates the areas bordering Chittenden County "as Resource and Rural areas," compatible with ECOS Plan rural areas (RPC04-0001, Ex. 039, ECOS Regional Plan, Statement of Compatibility and Consistency, pp. 77–78, adopted May 20, 2026).

25. The Board has applied the same requirement to other commissions. It told NVDA that its adjacent-regions section was addressed "only in a cursory fashion," "should be expanded to meet the statutory requirement," and should focus "on how the plan relates to the plans for adjacent regions" (RPC07-0001, Preapplication Response, July 29, 2026, p. 14). It found TRORC "unable to determine" and required additional information (RPC10-0001, Preapplication Response, pp. 22–23). The Board also noted that Addison "highlights areas of compatibility and cooperation and potential points of divergence" (RPC01-0001, Preapplication Response, March 30, 2026).

26. Objector does not contend that CVRPC's neighbors consider the plans incompatible; the filings cited above say the opposite. The objection is that the plan does not contain the evaluation and the description of similarities and differences, particularly at the borders, that the Board itself said § 4348a(a)(8) requires of this plan, and that other commissions have supplied.

IV. Request for Relief

Objector respectfully asks the Board to:

1. Not deem the application complete until CVRPC files the § 4348(h)(1) conformance report, and not treat the Regional Plan Review Checklist as that report.

2. Examine, in its § 4348(h)(4) determination, whether CVRPC held two public hearings before the full Board of Commissioners at which the proposed plan could still be changed, and whether Objector and other interested parties were given the plan and maps in time to participate.

3. Require CVRPC to produce the recording of its October 20, 2026 hearing and a corrected record of the hearing, and to produce any Board action delegating the September 14, 2026 hearing and any Executive Committee notice, agenda or minutes for that date.

4. Find that the plan is not consistent with § 4348a(a)(8), and require the revision described in the Board's Preapplication Response.

5. Address each objection in writing as § 4348(i)(4) requires, and, to the extent any objection is upheld, suggest modifications.

6. State in its § 4348(i)(4) written evaluation whether it treats the prerequisites described in Section V as conditions of approval.

7. Reserve all other grounds, including those in the October 23 Formal Objection and the Chronicle of Deficiencies, and any ground that the Board's review under § 4348(h)(4) reaches.

V. Closing: The Record as a Whole

The deficiencies above are not isolated. Taken together they show a process that was compressed to meet the 2026 deadline, with each missing prerequisite excused by the next.

27. The Objection filed October 23 shows that CVRPC applied the Statewide Future Land Use Methodology as the test for its map, "as we've been instructed to implement it" (Formal Objection, Count IX, pp. 93–94; Ex. 7). The record shows no body that adopted it. On September 10, 2026, Objector asked CVRPC for any record that its Board of Commissioners, with or without a Regional Plan Committee recommendation, voted to adopt or formally approve the methodology (any version), including any record that the Board delegated the decision to staff or a committee. On September 15, 2026, CVRPC's Executive Director answered: "No such records exist" (Appendix A-8). The Board of Commissioners' vote on October 20 did not adopt it either (Appendix A-4). The Land Use Review Board's website, where the methodology is posted, states: "The Land Use Review Board is not the owner of this document, it is posted on our website as a courtesy," and directs questions to the Vermont Association of Planning & Development Agencies, "who maintains this document" (Appendix A-8). The methodology is also not a rule. It was not adopted by rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act, 3 V.S.A. ch. 25, and § 4348a(e) directs the association of regional commissions to develop it, not any commission to follow it (Formal Objection, Count IX, p. 94). On this record the instrument CVRPC used to draw the map was adopted by no one with authority to adopt it, and the Board disclaims it.

28. The Board's draft guidance, as Objector explained in his October 24 letter, would let a review checklist stand in for the conformance report that § 4348(d)(1) and (h)(1) require. A guidance document cannot displace the statute.

29. Section II above shows that the notice, hearing and committee-authority requirements were not met either.

30. If a map drawn with a methodology no body adopted, reviewed against a checklist that is not the statutory report, after hearings that did not meet the statute, can be approved, then the 2026 deadline has replaced the statute's prerequisites. That includes the designation of growth areas and Complete Streets planning, where the public's ability to see, understand and contest the map is the point of the

process. Objector asks the Board to state in its written evaluation under § 4348(i)(4) whether it treats these prerequisites as conditions of approval and, if it does not, on what authority.

VI. Exhibits and Appendix

Previously filed with the October 23 objection: Ex. 3 (Meyer reply, August 19, 2026, to Objector's August 10 request); Ex. 4 (Meyer reply, August 19, 2026, with Objector's August 18 request on hearing status); Ex. 7 (Sept 8 hearing transcript excerpts); Ex. 8 (Sept 14 hearing transcript excerpts); Ex. 50 (Regional Plan Committee draft minutes, Sept 1); Ex. 59 (Oct 20 Board Packet excerpts, including packet p. 97); Chronicle of Deficiencies Exs. 51 (Sept 14 notice), 52 (Bylaws) and 53 (Regional Plan Committee Rules of Procedure). Board docket No. 052 (Objector's comments at the Sept 8 LURB meeting). Documents cited by docket and exhibit number are already in the Board's database.

Appendix A, below, quotes the additional passages relied on. It is included in this filing; no separate exhibit volume is filed.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen Whitaker
individually and on behalf of ASAP4CV
Montpelier, Vermont
whitaker.stephen@gmail.com

APPENDIX A — Quoted Excerpts

Transcripts below are Objector's automatically generated live-caption transcripts, quoted exactly as generated, including caption errors. CVRPC recorded each meeting; Objector asks that CVRPC's recordings control and be produced.

A-1. October 20, 2026 hearing (transcript)

Chair's opening:

> *"This is the final public hearing on the draft 2026 CBRC plan held pursuant to 24 BSA 4348. First hearing cells on September 8th. A second hearing was held on September 14th."*

Staff presentation:

> *"Those comments were returned to us September 8th. I'm gonna be the same day as our first hearing, which was not our first statutory hearing as as Stephen pointed out. We have to have two statutory required hearings. Um, Materials need to be distributed to specific list of individuals 30 days prior. Our first hearing on the 8th, those materials had only been distributed something like 26 days and trying to 23rd. That's why we scheduled a second hearing on the 14. That said, all comments were recorded as part of that second. Here. All comets received on the 8th were reported as part of the area on the 14th."*

> *"Part of the statute states that between the time we noted, or we time to send out the materials for that final plan, in this case September 19th, And when we submit it to the land use review board, we can make zero changes."*

Objector's comment:

> *"First, I want to correct something that the chairman said September 8th meeting was not With this 30 days required notice per statute. [...] So this is the first meeting of the board Of commissioners on this plan Pursuant to Statue."*

A-2. September 8, 2026 Board of Commissioners hearing (transcript)

> *Objector: "The meeting This September 4th [sic; September 14th] meeting would be with the regional plan subcommittee. That's not what statute requires. Statute requires two hearings before the full commission With 30 days notice, and the reason that the tonights didn't work is because they didn't get the plan sent out to the participants in time, which is why they're trying to call this an early hearing or a*

half hearing or whatever they're trying to call it. But having the next hearing on the 14th without the full commission is not going to have a a statutory compliant two hearing process."

CVRPC presiding officer: "I, we are treating this as a full hearing. All comments received will be submitted as part of the statutory requirements, Uh, to the question of whether or not they need to be. The hearings need to be for the full board Is not in statutes. As a regional planning commission will hold two hearings with the 30-day notice as Steve Outline. However, each of our our committees as public bodies serve as an instrumentality of this Regional planning Commission and can represent and hold the business, and it undertake the business of This Regional planning Commission, so long as It is the full Board of commissioners who adopts to who moves to adopt the plan on the On its contents and merits, and the public input received to that date."

CVRPC draft minutes of September 8, 2026 (Oct 20 Board Packet, pp. 74–77 of 123, p. 2 of the minutes; accepted by the Board October 20): "Christian also clarified that according to statute, hearings do not need to be before the full board. Statute says that the RPC will hold two hearings with a 30-day notice and given that each of the RPC's committees is an instrumentality of it, can represent and undertake its business, so long as the full Board of Commissioners is who moves to adopt the plan on its content and merits and the public input is received to that date." The same minutes record: "modifications to the future land use map are being incorporated and will be available for review within two weeks, with a full month for public comment," and that the hearing was opened at 6:41 pm and adjourned at 7:03 pm.

A-3. September 14, 2026 meeting

Transcript: "Well, it looks like we have a quorum of our regional plan committee so I can call the meeting to order, and then we can appoint a chair Pro tem [...] I can do that, so I'm going to do roll call for the Regional plan committee. If you just State your name in your town, Let's start with Berlin, Alex, Farrell Berlin, And cabinet Brittany Butler. Cabot and cows Representing callus."

Agenda: "Regional Plan Committee Special Meeting, September 14, 2026 @ 6:30 pm." Minutes: "Regional Plan Committee Meeting Minutes, September 14, 2026

[...] J. Brabant called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm. Roll call was taken." Members marked present: Brabant (Calais), Farrell (Berlin), Butler (Cabot).

A-4. October 20, 2026 draft minutes (unapproved)

"PUBLIC HEARING: CENTRAL VERMONT DRAFT 2026 REGIONAL PLAN. Chair Carbee went over the rules for how the public meeting hearing comments would be heard [...] Public hearing was opened at 6:38 pm and kept open while the Commission continued through other business."

"Concerns were raised by members of the public (i.e. Mr. Whitiker) about procedural errors in the committee's report and requested a deferred hearing with full approval."

"Regional Plan Adoption Vote: Chair Carbee asked if there were any further comments from the public and there were none."

A-5. Executive Committee records

Oct 20 Board Packet, Committee & Appointed Representative Reports, September 2026 (pp. 81–82 of 123): Executive Committee: "Accepted July and August 2026 unaudited financials. [...] Accepted 8/31/2026 Meeting Minutes. [...] Set October Agenda for the Board of Commissioners." Regional Plan Committee: "The Committee hosted a Public Hearing on the Draft 2026 Central Vermont Regional Plan."

CVRPC Executive Committee minutes archive (centralvtplanning.org/about/minutes-agendas-staff-reports/executive-committee/), viewed November 1, 2026, lists 2026 meetings on Jan 5, Feb 2, Mar 2, Apr 6, May 4, May 18 (special), Jun 1, Jul 6, Aug 3, Aug 31, Oct 5 and Nov 2. It lists no September 2026 meeting.

Executive Committee Rules of Procedure (adopted June 9, 2020): "ROLE: The Executive Committee has the authority to act on behalf of the Commission for activities outlined under 'General Activities' without further approval by the Commission [...]" "A quorum shall consist of a majority of members."

A-6. ASAP4CV's § 4348(d)(1)(D) notice (Objector's letter to CVRPC, August 10, 2026)

"On July 25, 2026, ASAP4CV requested, as my notice in writing sent under 24 V.S.A. § 4348(d)(1)(D), before any hearing on the Regional Plan had been warned. [...] In your July 27 reply, you characterized the request as adding ASAP4CV to a mailing list. I responded the same day that this is a statutory notice obligation, not a mailing list request. I did not hear back on that point."

A-7. Maps (emails with CVRPC)

Objector to Meyer, Sept 1, 2026: "as of my August 10 survey, six of the region's 23 towns had large-format future land use maps on display at Kellogg-Hubbard [...] The remaining 17 towns' maps, later delivered, were not large format at all; they were reduced to 11x17 tabloid size, at a scale that makes parcel-level detail unreadable. I'd ask that this be corrected for all 23 towns, not just the six."

Meyer to Objector, Sept 4, 2026: "A large scale, regionwide map was available for public viewing at the CVRPC offices at 29 Main Street. [...] Response: No such records exist. I am unable to respond to your request that large format maps for each municipality in the region be made available at the Kellog Hubbard Library. I will need to confer with staff who are out of the office this week."

Objector to Meyer, Oct 26, 2026: "I haven't found the individual maps yet. Are they downloadable?" Meyer to Objector, Oct 27, 2026: "Copies of each town's individual map have been provided to you as part of previous records requests. They are not currently available on the CVRPC web site for download."

A-8. Methodology adoption

Objector to CVRPC Executive Director, Sept 10, 2026 (Public Records Act request): "Any record reflecting that CVRPC's Board of Commissioners — with or without a prior recommendation from the Regional Plan Committee — voted to adopt, or otherwise formally approved, the use of VAPDA's Future Land Use Methodology and Process (any version, including v3.0 and the current v4.0) as CVRPC's methodology for mapping Future Land Use Areas under 24 V.S.A. § 4348a. [...] any record showing the Board declined to vote on the question and instead delegated the decision to staff or committee."

CVRPC Executive Director to Objector, Sept 15, 2026: "The response: No such records exist."

Land Use Review Board web page, "Act 181 Statewide Future Land Use Methodology - Updated February 24, 2026" (act250.vermont.gov/document/act-181-statewide-future-land-use-methodology), viewed November 1, 2026: "The Land Use Review Board is not the owner of this document, it is posted on our website as a courtesy." "[P]lease contact the Vermont Association of Planning & Development Agencies who maintains this document."

A-9. August 31, 2026 Land Use Review Board meeting

Board Member Brooke Dingledine: "the board will rule on all of the aspects of the plan … we are not limited to just the elements in our final review," and later that the quasi-judicial review "is not confined just to the elements." Chair Janet Hurley: the Board will have "jurisdiction to say … whether or not this Regional Plan was adopted with … meaningful participation." (Quoted from Objector's contemporaneous notes of the meeting. The Board's recording, which Board Member Weinhagen's August 31 notice says would be posted on the Board's website and YouTube channel within five days, controls.)