

NRPC PLAN AND POLICY COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION NOTES – NO QUORUM
January 14, 2026

In Attendance: Elizabeth Nance, Peter Zamore, Chip Sawyer

Staff: Catherine Dimitruk, Luke Slomba

The Plan and Policy Committee held a remote meeting via Zoom on January 14, 2026 at 5:30pm. Only 3 committee members were present, meaning that a quorum was not reached. Instead, there was an informal discussion between the staff and committee members present.

Regional Plan Update

C. Dimitruk explained to committee members the current status of the Regional Plan update, and next steps looking forward to adoption by the NRPC Board of Commissioners and final submission to the Land Use Review Board (LURB).

P. Zamore noticed that many of the LURB's comments were not addressed in the current draft and wondered to what extent staff is comfortable with that. C. Dimitruk responded that the unaddressed comments were advisory comments not affecting plan approval, and the LURB should be ok with how we handled them. For the comments on the Future Land Use (FLU) map, staff is confident we can provide enough information to justify our mapping decisions without making changes to the map.

P. Zamore asked whether NRPC has communicated with the LURB that this is the direction we are taking on the map. C. Dimitruk responded that since the upcoming final review is a quasi-judicial process, she is unsure if it's *ex parte* to have conversations before that. P. Zamore wondered whether we could have a written communication and CC people, and noted that that would be a judgement call for the staff.

E. Nance asked whether there would be another draft of the plan before the final submission. C. Dimitruk responded that we will submit this draft for final submission after the board adopts it. Additional information to the LURB will be provided within the application itself.

P. Zamore was concerned about the lack of guidance from the LURB on what to do to justify our mapping decisions. C. Sawyer said the issue is that there's no precedent and they don't know what they want since they've never done it before. We might be able to set the bar, or if they don't like where the bar is set there may be some sort of conditional approval. C.

Sawyer asked how quickly can we come back with corrections if they deny an aspect of the regional plan. C. Dimitruk responded that it would likely be a 5 to 6 month process.

P. Zamore asked what the implications would be of not getting our plan approved. C. Dimitruk responded that interim Act 250 exemptions would still be in place, but communities wouldn't be able to benefit from newly mapped areas. E. Nance stated that it might be worth asking the LURB to come back with clearer guidance before we resubmit.

E. Nance asked who reviewed our plan and who we are communicating with. C. Dimitruk responded that Kiersten Sultan was the lead reviewer, and Greta Brunswick from NRPC attended meetings with her during the preapplication review. At the meetings, the LURB said it was too late in the preapplication process to submit additional information. C. Dimitruk stated that the LURB is getting better at reviewing and the feedback for CCRPC's plan was much more specific.

P. Zamore stated that he thinks it's worth it to justify and explain as much as we can. Since we're first for final review, it might be helpful to just send a signal of our thinking before the final submission.

C. Dimitruk asked whether there were any specific changes to the plan that committee members want to review. There were no changes that committee members wanted to review.

C. Dimitruk explained what would happen next: If the members present are comfortable, we present this draft to the Board in January and the Board decides whether they're comfortable warning the final public hearing. This would mean no more changes to the plan. C. Sawyer asked whether staff reviewed the CCRPC review and saw any feedback that would be applicable to us. C. Dimitruk responded that she didn't see anything directly related. The LURB did adopt a position on how they will deal with statutory conflicts, which is favorable to us.

C. Dimitruk asked whether committee members were ok with sending this draft to the Board. Committee members said yes.

Municipal Plan Reviews – St. Albans City and Richford

Staff and committee members determined that a February meeting would be necessary to issue a recommendation to the Board on approval of the two plans. C. Sawyer stated that February 9 was the anticipated date of adoption for the City Plan and asked whether there would be any problem with delaying the plan reviews. C. Dimitruk said no. E. Nance stated that she did not have time to read the Richford plan and would be happy to have more time

to review. Staff and committee members set the next Plan and Policy Committee meeting for February 11 at 6pm to review the plans.