

Gott, Catherine

From: Fat Sheep Farm <info@fatsheepfarmvermont.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 1:00 PM
To: Act250 - Board
Cc: Hurley, Janet; Weinhausen, Alex
Subject: Fwd: Comments on TRORC Draft Regional Plan--



You don't often get email from info@fatsheepfarmvermont.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

You can include this exchange re mapping methodology in the record. Todd Heyman

Read what the Boston Globe had to say about [Fat Sheep Farm & Cabins](#)



Fat Sheep Farm & Cabins
122 Best Road
Hartland, Vermont (Mailing Address: Windsor, VT 05089)
802-436-4696
website: www.fatsheepfarmvermont.com
email: info@fatsheepfarmvermont.com

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Pete Fellows <pfellows@trorc.org>
Date: Sat, Jul 25, 2026, 11:04 AM
Subject: Re: Comments on TRORC Draft Regional Plan--
To: Kevin Geiger <kgeiger@trorc.org>, Fat Sheep Farm <info@fatsheepfarmvermont.com>
Cc: Kyle Katz <kkatz@trorc.org>

We only have one complete document. We will reference the previous multiple RPC state versions.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Kevin Geiger <kgeiger@trorc.org>
Sent: Saturday, 25 July 2026 09:16:44
To: Fat Sheep Farm <info@fatsheepfarmvermont.com>
Cc: Pete Fellows <pfellows@trorc.org>; Kyle Katz <kkatz@trorc.org>
Subject: Re: Comments on TRORC Draft Regional Plan--

A question really for Pete and Kyle.

Kevin Geiger, AICP CFM
TRORC
Chief Planner

Sent from my iPhone

This email is a public record and not intended as legal advice.

On Jul 25, 2026, at 9:13 AM, Fat Sheep Farm <info@fatsheepfarmvermont.com> wrote:

I think I can handle the more complex and complete explanation. Can that be shared in addition to the boiled down version?

Read what the Boston Globe had to say about [Fat Sheep Farm & Cabins](#)

Fat Sheep Farm & Cabins
[122 Best Road](#)
[Hartland, Vermont](#) (Mailing Address: Windsor, VT 05089)
802-436-4696
website: www.fatsheepfarmvermont.com
email: info@fatsheepfarmvermont.com

On Sat, Jul 25, 2026, 9:07 AM Kevin Geiger <kgeiger@trorc.org> wrote:

Todd,

Your comments have been added.

And the questions will be addressed as well.

I can add at this time that we are in the process of boiling down the mapping process into something that will be understandable for a more general audience.

Kevin

Kevin Geiger, AICP CFM
TRORC
Chief Planner

Sent from my iPhone

This email is a public record and not intended as legal advice.

On Jul 24, 2026, at 2:40 PM, Fat Sheep Farm
<info@fatsheepfarmvermont.com> wrote:

Kevin, John, Bill, and mysterious trorc comment email,

I am updating my comments here and also following up with some questions. First, Kevin, thanks for showing up last night and answering questions. I would have preferred the opportunity for a bit more dialogue but you did answer most of my questions. My anger is based primarily on the lack of democratic process which I recognize is a statutory problem, not yours. But it is also based on the public not being allowed into that call where land use was being discussed, and then when Bill raised it at the executive committee meeting, Peter again said to leave things as is and then misrepresented Neil's past public statements substantially. I don't think that satisfies state law, whether open meeting law or Act 181 itself, which says "throughout the process" --- not after the land use provisions have been finalized for the first draft. The fact that it was rushed and there was a pizza outing afterwards was troubling. But we don't have to debate that. It is the tiny morsel of public accountability that is supposed to be available to us and it was not.

Anyway, here's an update to my comments:

1) I object to the mandatory requirements *(and John, you should know Kevin is definitely of the view that these are mandatory requirements by design and appropriately so -- and I agree with him---and you can delete this parenthetical from the comment)* as not being created by people accountable to the voters/citizens as required by Article 6 of the Vermont Constitution. As I said at the information session last night, TRORC has working relationships with these towns and could have lobbied the towns to include mandatory rules in their plans and zoning (or by ordinance) in which case they would have been subject to democratic process, but instead chose to present the most prescriptive and restrictive rules in the regional plan where only appointed officials who are not subject to elections will have approval authority.

2) I want to clarify the reason I believe the Northern Nurseries presence on the same road as White's Dairy is relevant. I don't care whether you call that retail or not, or allow nurseries more leniently than other retail. I raised it to point out that people shopping for stuff, whether at White's Dairy or NN, is not a problem in a rural area. A doctor's office that chooses to locate in a rural area could be a great convenience to the community with significant real world benefits. I use the Dentist just north of White's Dairy. I don't know why we view offices as a problem and inappropriate in close to half of the TRORC area (Rural Ag/Forestry). We are going to need more offices as the towns grow larger. Similarly, I think Hartland is looking at 1.5% of its land, at most, for retail. While new houses will get built with little regulatory impediment, we will still have the same three commercial areas and it will lead to more driving outside the town for more needs, as those three areas will not keep pace with unrestricted residential growth. Residential growth

is simply far less restricted than commercial and that imbalance leads to a wonderful commuter "community" after enough time passes -- which is not environmentally friendly, nor a particularly enjoyable place to live. I watched this happen in my small town where I grew up--there were not enough services for residents and it became a crowded town you had to leave for almost everything. More places for interactions, resources, and services available within our towns is good for our communities.

Here are my follow up questions (not comments you need to include):

1) Last night, it was still very unclear whether any objective criteria, hard and fast, were used for the mapping designations. I find it hard to look at the slide you showed us and say something is, or is not, within a particular zone. But it was also unclear whether that subjective set of criteria, or maybe flexible set of criteria is a better description, was all that was used. Was anything else used? One member of the public mentioned you had previously said there was a complicated, boring formula you used. Was that it -- what you showed us last night? Or is there more?

2) I had mentioned to John that I was skeptical of the idea that Two Rivers "represents" municipalities and I noted I thought there was substantial deviation on the regional plan from all its members. John seemed skeptical of that. I do think it would be good for you to identify which towns are in alignment on the requirements, or in the same ballpark, on some of the more controversial and attention grabbing components, for example: no fossil fuel primary heat, mandatory electric car charging stations, transportation impact studies, no principal retail zones, no office building zones, is there anyone with those restrictions in rural conservation (impervious surface, house site locations specs, use restrictions, etc), the AOFB limitation (notably on almost half the area), etc. John said creating such a document would be a good exercise to see if the plan is, or is not, out of step with its supposed constituents. I hope you will make that document available soon. It would be your opportunity to show how closely aligned the regional plan is to all of the town's policies.

3) I did want to point out to you that Act 181 did change 4345a(17) from your view of regional impact getting "due consideration" to "substantial deference" which might as well be polar opposites in legal speak. I am interested in knowing what your lobbyist, either VADPA or Necrason, said about this with your legislators. Seems like a small edit that could have only come from outside the state house. I'd like for you to share any communications on that to the extent that they are public records, or to the extent you're willing.

4) Kevin, I am genuinely interested in the 3 most important rules the regional plan has implemented and why you think they contributed positively, as well as any Act 250 appeals you participated in as a party. I am open to having my mind changed, but I honestly have never seen anything of value

come from either. But I don't follow you carefully. But if you have something to share, I'd be curious to hear it.

Can you confirm you will add my updated comments and please answer the above questions, particularly 1 and 2, as promptly as possible?

Thanks,

Todd

On Thu, Jul 23, 2026 at 2:20 PM Regional Plan <regionalplan@trorc.org> wrote:

Todd,

Thank you for your comments. We have logged them and they will be included in our responsiveness summary.

Best,

Kyle

From: Fat Sheep Farm <info@fatsheepfarmvermont.com>

Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2026 6:34 PM

To: Regional Plan <regionalplan@trorc.org>

Cc: Bill Emmons <wbemmons3@gmail.com>; nmalmquist@drm.com; Nancy Jones <npj.4251@gmail.com>; Peter Berger <peter.berger@fairleevt.gov>; John Broker-Campbell <jbcampbell@hartlandvt.org>

Subject: Comments on TRORC Draft Regional Plan--

To Whom It May Concern,

I am sending comments on the draft regional plan. I would hope someone other than staff reviews these comments and takes them

seriously, particularly given the lack of landowner participation in the meeting in which the land use policies were last addressed.

I would appreciate the opportunity to discuss any of these comments with any member of the Board which supervises the staff at TRORC.

I am aware of the public meetings on the calendar.

Thanks for your consideration,

Todd Heyman

--

Read what the Boston Globe had to say about [Fat Sheep Farm & Cabins](#)

Fat Sheep Farm & Cabins

[122 Best Road](#)

[Hartland, Vermont](#) (Mailing Address: Windsor, VT 05089)

802-436-4696

website: www.fatsheepfarmvermont.com

email: info@fatsheepfarmvermont.com

--

Read what the Boston Globe had to say about [Fat Sheep Farm & Cabins](#)

Fat Sheep Farm & Cabins

[122 Best Road](#)

[Hartland, Vermont](#) (Mailing Address: Windsor, VT 05089)

802-436-4696

website: www.fatsheepfarmvermont.com

email: info@fatsheepfarmvermont.com