



September 30, 2026

To: Vermont Land Use Review Board

From: Daniel Jones, John MacGovern, and Rhoda Moore

Subject: Comments on Mount Ascutney Regional Commission Regional Plan

On July 27, 2026, The Mount Ascutney Regional Commission (MARC) approved a Regional Plan that was submitted to LURB on August 11, 2026 and posted on its website on September 1, 2026. Prior to MARC's meeting, a set of proposed changes were submitted by Daniel Jones, John MacGovern, and Rhoda Moore. Those proposed changes are shown in the attachment. They relate to the description of the "Redevelopment Area" - a roughly 12-acre section of the 118.6-acre site of the former Southeast State Correctional Facility in Windsor (see pages 3-14 and 3-15 of the Regional Plan).

The Regional Plan submitted to LURB does not comply with the motion at the July 27 MARC meeting to approve the Regional Plan. LURB should not approve the Regional Plan as currently written.

A recording of the MARC meeting is on YouTube at [MARC public hearing & MARC Board meeting 7/27/2026](#). The motion to approve the Regional Plan was made by Commissioner Walter Martone at time 57:45 in the recording. He said "I have a motion. Given the recommendations of the review committee, I recommend and I move that we adopt the Regional Plan as amended today."

Immediately preceding the motion, at about 54:00, Commissioner Martone clarified, at least partly, what amendments he was referring to. First, he stated that the specification of a 200-yard distance from the Redevelopment Area to the Windsor Grasslands Wildlife Management Area (WMA) was a statement of fact that should be included in the Regional Plan. The current version of the Plan does not include that statement of fact. Instead, it confuses the description of the Redevelopment Area by stating "The site is adjacent to the Windsor Grasslands Wildlife Management Area." While the prison site is adjacent to the WMA, the Redevelopment Area is not.

To confuse the prison site with the Redevelopment Area would be a disservice to the public. The Plan notes that "This Redevelopment Area designation seeks to continue the conversation on how to use this underutilized legacy infrastructure...." It is essential that a clear distinction between the entire prison site and the Redevelopment Area be maintained. The word "site" is used repeatedly in the description of the Redevelopment Area in the Regional Plan. The fact that it refers to one thing and not the other is not made clear.

Commissioner Martone did not mention the proposed amendment stating, “It [the Redevelopment Area] currently includes several buildings, surrounded by a razor wire-topped fence, that might be useful for future development”. Yet, that proposed amendment has been included in the Regional Plan. This may be taken to suggest that all the proposed amendments were to be adopted unless specifically rejected. If this was not the intent of the motion, then the statement was added without authorization by the Commissioners.

Commissioner Martone said that he had no comment on the proposed amendment specifying that redevelopment should be done in a way that “does not excessively or unreasonably disrupt the rural character of the area...” This amendment was carried into the final version of the Plan.

Other proposed amendments were not addressed in Commissioner Martone’s motion or in his explanations immediately preceding his motion. One such proposal was to delete the incorrect statement, “The state will need to transfer control or ownership of the parcel”. That statement has been retained in the Regional Plan.

Another proposed amendment that was ignored stated that the Windsor Town Plan should give due consideration to the regional and state interests that may be impacted by development of the Redevelopment Area.

A comparison of the motion to approve the Regional Plan to what has been written in the Plan and submitted to LURB shows the following various procedures:

- a) mentioning and supporting a proposed amendment but then not including it in the Plan (e.g., the 200-yard designation);
- b) not mentioning a proposed amendment but then including the proposed amendment in the Plan (e.g., the mention of the razor wire fence and the confusing statement that the site is adjacent to the WMA);
- c) mentioning a proposed amendment but not specifying whether the proposed amendment was to be adopted or rejected and then including it in the Plan (e.g., mention of protection of rural character); and
- d) not mentioning a proposed amendment and then not including it in the Plan (e.g., the fallacious claim regarding the state needing to give up control of the property and ignoring recognition of regional and state interests).

Before being approved by LURB, the Regional Plan should be changed to include all of the changes proposed by Jones, MacGovern, and Moore except the extraneous comment regarding transfer of land to the Department of Fish and Wildlife. Also, the statement that the “site” is adjacent to the WMA should be removed.