

1 **Town of Richmond**
2 **Special Selectboard Meeting**
3 **Minutes of January 21, 2026**
4

5 **Members Present:** Adam Wood, Caitlin Filkins, Bard Hill, Greg Rabideau
6

7 **Absent:** David Sander
8

9 **Staff Present:** Josh Arneson, Town Manager; Duncan Wardwell, Deputy Town
10 Manager; Susanne Parent, Town Clerk
11

12 **Others Present:** Recorded by MMCTV, Erin Farr, 18029224324, Adam, Alexis,
13 Angela Cote, Bonny Steuer, Brad Elliott, Brendan, Bruce LaBounty, Cara LaBounty,
14 Chelsye Brooks, Connie van Eeghen, Corali Cotrina (Corali Bisbee), D (NHS&Co),
15 Emily Mitchell (Amy M), Fran Thomas, Gretchen Paulsen, Ian Bender, JAS (NHS&Co),
16 Jean Haskin, Jean's iPad, Jewels Hicks, Judy Rosovsky, Marcy Harding, Mark Fausel,
17 Mary Houle, Patty Brushett, Richard Cowles, Robert Low, Sdowns, Tim Carrier, Tom
18 Astle, Tracy Rosen, Tom Safford, Trevor Brooks, Virginia Clarke, Wafic Faour, Wright
19 Preston
20

21 **MMCTV Video:** <https://youtu.be/a4Vu9YiKRF4?si=fDOVLqdPRnVML26a>
22

23 **Call to Order:** 7:00 p.m.
24

25 **Welcome by:** Filkins
26

27 **Public Comment:** Faour stated that they collected more than 5% of the registered voters
28 of Richmond for petition presented at the January 20 Selectboard meeting. They are not
29 asking the Selectboard to decide on the merit of the language in the pledge. They are
30 asking to put this item on the ballot, so the public has a right to discuss it and vote on it.
31 Hill suggested that they discuss this during the agenda item "Consideration of approving
32 the Town Meeting warning"
33

34 **Additions, Deletions or Modifications to Agenda:** None
35

36 **Items for Presentation or Discussion with those present**
37
38

39 **Public Hearing for 2026 Town Plan**

40 Timestamp: 0:01

41 [https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2026/01/3a1_3 -](https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2026/01/3a1_3_-_TOWN_PLAN_2026_THIRD_DRAFT_EDITS_CLEAN_1.6.26.pdf)
42 [_TOWN_PLAN_2026_THIRD_DRAFT_EDITS_CLEAN_1.6.26.pdf](https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2026/01/3a1_3_-_TOWN_PLAN_2026_THIRD_DRAFT_EDITS_CLEAN_1.6.26.pdf)
43

44 *Rabideau moved to open the public hearing to consider the third edition of the modified*
45 *Town Plan. Hill seconded.*

46 *Roll Call Vote: Filkins, Hill, Rabideau, Wood in favor. Sander absent. Motion*

47 *approved.*

48

49 Clarke, the Planning Commission Chair, stated that every eight years the Town Plan
50 needs to be revised and updated and this is the third draft. Clarke reviewed the process
51 and stated that the second draft was approved at the January 5th Selectboard meeting.

52 There are 11 topics and they talked to lots of people, did lots of outreach, and talked to
53 numerous Committees, community groups, and individuals.

54

55 Clarke stated that the Future Land Use (FLU) map, which was supported by the
56 Conservation Commission and other people in natural resource areas, has received some
57 criticism. Any of the plans and text can be amended at any time during the 8-year
58 lifespan as the Planning Commission will review it periodically. If the Selectboard does
59 not approve of putting it on the warning for the Town Meeting, then it will still need to be
60 approved at some point. If it is approved by the voters, then it will need to be approved
61 by the Regional Planning Commission (RPC). For instance, changing the FLU map to
62 any degree would have to be compatible with the RPC FLU map.

63

64 Filkins stated that she would like to see the presentation to have all the information, then
65 have the Selectboard ask questions, then open it up for public conversation.

66

67 Clarke described the 2018 Town Plan map called Wildlife Habitat in Richmond,
68 Vermont. It would be one of the considerations that would formulate a revised Zoning
69 for Agricultural Residential District.

70

71 Clarke described the Chittenden County RPC's draft FLU map. The Richmond Town
72 Land Use map has to be compatible with this. They used it as the basis for their FLU
73 map. The rural areas are in three categories: Rural General, Rural Ag/Forestry and Rural
74 Conservation. This is not a Zoning map. Rural General (tan) consists mostly of places
75 that are already developed but also feature preserving natural resources. Rural
76 Agr/Forestry (blue) includes blocks of forest or farmland that sustain resources industries
77 and provide critical wildlife habitat/movement, outdoor recreation, flood storage and act
78 for recharge scenic beauty and contribute to the economic well-being and quality of life.
79 Development is not prohibited in any of the areas, it is just carefully managed. Rural
80 Conservation (green) is identified based on existing natural resource mapping that require
81 special considerations for aquifer protection, wetland protection, maintenance of forest
82 blocks, wildlife habitat, habitat connectors, and for other conservation purposes.

83

84 Most of the green areas on the RPC map are already conserved, with legal easements.
85 The Conservation Commission added some of the ANR maps to understand where the
86 natural resources are located. They know they will not be able to preserve all these
87 resources. Clarke confirmed they considered just using the RPC map but the
88 Conservation Commission felt there should be a knowledge of where the resources are
89 located to inform Zoning and minimize the impact of development on the resources.

90 Clarke confirmed that the Housing Committee had impact on the map as well.
91
92 BrooksC reviewed how the CCRPC expects municipalities to be more specific about
93 Future Land Use and municipal plans and bylaws. Information was pulled from the atlas,
94 BioFinder, and wetland areas. Hill observed that the word “development” is not in the
95 Rural Conservation which might explain people’s concerns. Clarke confirmed that
96 development is not prohibited. BrooksC stated that land in Rural Conservation will be
97 subject to Act 250 review. LaBountyB and Hill observed that Act 250 makes it more
98 burdensome to develop. Hill stated that the Mapping Process suggests that they create
99 logical boundaries by using the parcel lines. Clarke confirmed that they could remove
100 those parcels when Zoning. Rabideau stated that it opens up the possibility that the map
101 could be adjusted. It doesn't follow necessarily that a given parcel has to be all one thing
102 either as a question of Zoning or in the case of this mapping resources. Clarke stated that
103 the Zoning map does not have to use these designations. Filkins stated that she is not
104 comfortable putting that reference map in a written document for the Town to agree on,
105 because it will be used for Zoning regulation updates. They need to adjust the way that
106 the Future Land Use map is adjusted to be better understood of the CCRPC map.
107 LaBountyB stated that this is what the Democratic process is about, they have until next
108 November so there is no hurry.

109
110 Harding read her comments on the history of Act 181 which dramatically changed the
111 Planning landscape in Vermont. Act 250 asks if the project conforms with any duly
112 adopted local or regional plan, not local zoning and for that reason, the language in the
113 Town Plan matters. Using a different methodology than the CCRPC, Richmond mapped
114 much more land as Rural Conservation Land than the CCRPC. Harding reviewed that
115 there will be a primary election in August, and the Town Plan could be voted on then,
116 well before the current Town Plan expires and without the expense of a special election.

117
118 LaBountyC illustrated a couple of items on Southview, Interstate 89, and Route 2.
119 LaBountyC observed how some Selectboard and Planning Commission members
120 benefited from the proposed designations. Her property is being devalued by the
121 Planning Commission and Steering Committee. LaBountyC stated that she cannot
122 support this Town Plan or map. LaBountyC reviewed the requests to remove the word
123 “shall” as mentioned in other meetings. LaBountyC stated that the Planning Commission
124 is not trying to do something wrong, but it's 100% driven by conservation.

125
126 Safford read the disclaimer from the map where the CCRPC states that “Errors and
127 omissions may exist. The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission is not
128 responsible for these. Questions of on the ground location can be resolved by site
129 inspections and/or surveys by registered surveyor.” Safford stated that this map is going
130 to be driving decisions with Zoning. The Animal Travel Corridor and Wildlife maps
131 have a very similar disclaimer. Safford asked who's going to be taking responsibility for
132 the errors. Safford stated that you can't put a development in a wetland anyway, so he

133 does not really see the need for increased conservation efforts. There is a trail shown on
134 his property that technically is not a trail, nor a public right-of-way so he wants it
135 removed from the official mapping. His parcel went from entirely Rural Ag and now is
136 entirely Rural Conservation. Every tree was planted by his uncle from 1950-1990 so how
137 does a completely man-made landscape qualify as Rural Conservation.

138

139 Rosovsky, from the Conservation Commission, stated that they were looking at all those
140 components of natural resources and were not doing it with personal antipathy towards
141 anyone, because they don't have particularly detailed information. If people want to
142 develop here, then what do we need to think about.

143

144 Clarke summarized that the map will be amended, if necessary, through a public hearing
145 process. It says at least once every two years, the FLU map should be adjusted to reflect
146 changes in tax map parcel boundaries. The Planning Commission is planning to review
147 the map and a reminder it is not a Zoning map.

148

149 Cowles highlighted the green area next to the road by his parcel next to Greystone which
150 was listed as wetlands but now as floodplain. Act 250 is not going to be something
151 simple or cheap to put a house on this property. He is going through the process with an
152 engineer, and it is ~\$30,000-\$40,000 to get a permit. They do not need to depreciate or
153 devalue people's property. Cowles stated that he does not believe the maps are accurate.

154

155 Carrier asked about existing permits and the floodplain fields. Carrier stated that the
156 Land Use, Land Trust and Act 250 already protect our conservation and this is
157 overstepping it. All the land across the road is under Land Use, Land Trust, Preston's,
158 VYCC, everything all to Richmond. Carrier stated that there is a housing shortage and
159 they should be able to put up a house next door house for their kids or grandkids.

160

161 Mitchell observed that there's a clash between intent versus impact on this map. Mitchell
162 stated that we have to find a way forward to support all the wonderful work that
163 happened in the plan like housing inequities and then figure out a way to move forward
164 positively.

165

166 Cote stated that she was able to figure out why she has a Rural Conservation in the
167 middle of her Rural General property boundaries as it has to do with the elevation. The
168 FLU map has chosen to stay with the 1,000-foot elevation rather than raise it to the
169 2,500-foot elevation that is in the draft CCRP map. Clarke stated that it is actually
170 natural communities and not elevation. Clarke confirmed that they did not use elevation
171 overlays on the map, it is wetlands, riparian areas, natural communities, interior highest
172 priority, interior forest blocks. Clarke stated that natural communities are wetlands,
173 riparian areas, natural communities, interior highest priority, interior forest blocks.

174

175 BrooksC reviewed the BioFinder description as the full range of habitat conditions that
the native flora and fauna evolved with and are adapted to survive in and support the vast

176 majority of Vermont's biological diversity, specifically a hemlock and northern hardwood
177 forest, a highest priority natural community. Clarke stated that if it's not working as an
178 ecosystem, then it's not going to be sustainable into the future.

179

180 Farr suggested using the CCRPC map which seemed more agreeable to people to use as
181 the FLU map. Clarke confirmed that the Selectboard could consider it a minor change to
182 the Town Plan in order to put it on the ballot.

183

184 LaBountyB stated that we're trying to solve a problem that's not there with no sprawl in
185 our Town. We are not overlooking our conserved property. LaBountyB stated that we
186 need to start looking at more housing and not just conserved property.

187

188 Clarke confirmed that the State-wide planning goal is 30% of preserved land by 2030.
189 Preston illustrated that if you look at the total numbers of land that is Conserved that is
190 privately owned may also be in Current Use. Preston stated that there's the difference
191 between land that is in Current Use and land that is by deed, Conserved.

192

193 Rosen stated he wants to build a house that appears to be green now. He gives his
194 blessing for 10 out of the 11 sections but there is no way that anything around these maps
195 should be on the Town Meeting ballot.

196

197 Rabideau stated that the CCRPC map takes into account some facts on the ground that
198 aren't reflected in the new map. He would choose the CCRPC map for some of the
199 reasons discussed by the public.

200

201 Hill summarized the options moving forward with the current Town Plan draft map, the
202 CCRPC map, or delaying. Hill stated that so many people will vote against the current
203 Town Plan draft map. Filkins stated that the CCRPC map would provide the Town Plan
204 with the opportunity for approval. Clarke thought that the Planning Commission and
205 Steering Committee would be okay with going with the CCRPC map and then working in
206 the future to amend it. Clarke & BrooksC summarized that the CCRPC map might
207 undergo some changes too. LaBountyB suggested adopting the current static CCRPC
208 map presented tonight. BrooksC summarized that it is mapping overlays that they do not
209 control but it is really hard work. Brushett expressed frustration about the implications,
210 language, and tenor to the volunteers who worked on the Town Plan. Clarke stated that
211 they are going to have to change the map for river corridor rules that are coming along.
212 Wood stated that changing these maps doesn't necessarily bring it back in control, but it's
213 a good line in the sand now to make it clear what we're comfortable with. Hill observed
214 that Item 7 on page 54 of the Town Plan states the FLU map will be amended when the
215 Land Use Review Board (LURB) has completed its regulations. Houle stated that
216 nobody can sue us if we have those disclaimers that replaces shall/will with should/could.
217 LaBountyC requested that they hold off as she did not have time to review the CCRPC
218 map.

219

220 Clarke confirmed that if they delayed the vote then the Planning Commission would have
221 to meet and discuss the map situation. Clarke stated that if they want to have an
222 approved Town Plan then it has to be compatible with the CCRPC map. Clarke stated
223 that we can replace shall with should. Filkins suggested changing shall to should so that
224 it puts us in a better position to then assess and amend the CCRPC map in the future.
225 Clarke summarized the memo with many action items because they recognized so many
226 things that we were doing right.

227

228 *Rabideau moved to close the second required public hearing for the 2026 Town Plan*
229 *Update. Hill seconded.*

230 *Roll Call Vote: Filkins, Hill, Rabideau, Wood in favor. Sander absent. Motion*
231 *approved.*

232

233 Arneson reviewed and referenced the different “shall” to “should” items in the Town
234 Plan draft with the Selectboard and public.

235

236 *Rabideau moved to approve the third draft of the 2026 Town Plan dated January 6, 2026*
237 *with any minor revisions, and direct the Town Clerk to place Final Draft on the Town*
238 *Meeting Ballot for town-wide approval on March 3rd. Further the Selectboard directs the*
239 *Planning Commission to forward what is now considered the Final 2026 Town Plan draft*
240 *to Regional Planning Commission for consideration and adoption with the following*
241 *amendments:*

242 *-Language on page 54 where the first two instances of “shall” will be modified to*
243 *“should”*

244 *-The Future Land Use map prepared by the Chittenden County Regional Planning*
245 *Commission will be used as the Future Land Use map in its current edition.*

246 *Hill seconded.*

247 *Roll Call Vote: Filkins, Hill, Rabideau in favor. Wood, Sander absent. Motion*
248 *approved.*

249

250

251 **Consideration of approving the Town Meeting warning**

252 Timestamp: 3:01

253

254 Arneson reviewed the current version of the Town Meeting warning including Article 6
255 for the adoption of the 2026 Town Plan, Article 7 for the Conservation Reserve Fund,
256 Article 8 for the Town Center Reserve Fund, and Articles 8-16 for charitable
257 appropriations.

258

259 Filkins reviewed the petition that was discussed at the January 20, 2026 Selectboard
260 meeting. Faour stated that the petition is very clear and it is in over 15 other Towns.
261 Faour stated that Palestine is very much a local issue as it is a question of human rights

262 and where we stand on racism. The language of apartheid free community was adopted
263 because it is the end goal. If they to Israel to accept everybody living from River Jordan
264 to the Mediterranean Sea as equal, then there is no war. Faour requested that the
265 Selectboard put the petition on the ballot to educate the public and let the public decide.

266
267 Hill asked why the petition is asking the voters to advise the Chair of the Selectboard to
268 adopt the pledge instead of just asking the voters to adopt the pledge. Hill suggested just
269 taking the Selectboard out of it. Arneson illustrated that the petition does not force it on
270 the ballot because it is not Town business. The Selectboard could vote to put this petition
271 or anything similar on the ballot. Hill suggested just rephrasing it for the ballot to just
272 ask the voters to support a pledge. Rabideau wondered what specific Town activity or
273 behavior would change if the voters supported this concern. Rabideau stated that not all
274 Israelis support this war or the mistreatment of Palestinian people. Faour stated that the
275 Israeli government in general operates under different laws, one for the West Bank, one
276 for Jerusalem, one for Gaza, and one for Galilee.

277
278 Houle stated that they cannot legally change words in a petition that 250 or so many
279 people signed. Houle stated that affirm, resolve, condemn, and pledge will involve
280 money at some point.

281
282 Bender requested that the Selectboard read his message in the chat before they vote:
283 *03:23:34 Ian Bender: "WE PLEDGE to join others in working to end all support*
284 *to Israel's apartheid regime, settler colonialism, and military occupation."*

285 *I believe this statement violates Richmond's policy on equity and inclusion. I find it*
286 *harmful, threatening, and offensive as Jewish resident of this community. To be clear, I*
287 *am speaking for myself.*

288 *You can argue that the issue lays with the Israeli government and not with the Jewish*
289 *diaspora. However the topic is not a simple one, and this type of language can have*
290 *unintended consequences.*

291 *I would appreciate it if the selectboard would consider removing that segment from the*
292 *ballot initiative.*

293 Bender stated that he does not disagree with the principle that the petition is trying to
294 accomplish but the wording made him very uncomfortable.

295
296 Haskins stated that she does not believe the Selectboard can modify the petition once
297 people have signed it. Arneson reviewed that if the petition was about Town business,
298 then it would be forced onto the Warning as written. The Town attorney has advised,
299 based on case law, that it is not forced onto the ballot because it is not specifically about
300 Town business. It is up to the Selectboard to add it on to the Warning with some leeway
301 to make changes.

302
303 Faour stated that if they do not put it to the voters, then the Selectboard is violating his

304 equity. Alexis stated that there is nothing in that language about Jewish people or about
305 Israelis, it is about the apartheid system in Israel. This pledge is asking people to oppose
306 an apartheid system. Brushett stated that the Selectboard should put this on the ballot to
307 let the voters vote but it is also important to have these difficult conversations. Faour
308 summarized that it multiple Towns or Cities pass this then it will put pressure on the State
309 to declare itself as an apartheid free community.

310

311 Filkins read a draft from Article 3 of the Warning:

312 *“Shall the voters of the Town of Richmond adopt the following pledge:*

313 *We affirm our commitment to freedom, justice and equality for the Palestinian people and*
314 *all people, and*

315 *We oppose all forms of racism, bigotry, discrimination and oppression, and*

316 *We declare ourselves an apartheid free community and to the end*

317 *We pledge to join others in working to end all support of Israel's apartheid regime,*
318 *settler colonialism and military occupation.”*

319

320 *Hill moved to put the language as worded in the draft Article 3 on the ballot for Town*
321 *Meeting Day.*

322

323 Arneson confirmed that this would be voted on from the floor as Richmond has not
324 adopted public questions other than the budget to go on Australian ballot. Rabideau
325 asked if it was a necessary component of the statement to include the language of
326 apartheid, military, and occupation. Filkins thought it was key to the message otherwise
327 they are not calling out what is actually happening. Hill illustrated the comment from the
328 chat that one modification is to say “end all support to the government of Israel’s
329 apartheid regime.” Filkins stated that they want to have that conversation and vote the
330 decision. Farr asked what if the Town is not in support of this, is that opening up the
331 Town or the people voting on the floor to an unsafe situation. Faour stated that it is on us
332 to educate the public. We are using the tool of democracy to bring to the public a
333 question. Haskins observed that there is typically 125 people who attend Town Meeting
334 out of the 3,000 voters in the Town of Richmond. Haskins illustrated how she knows a
335 lot of people that go to Town Meeting and don’t vocalize how they feel for fear of
336 standing up and stating their true feelings. Arneson confirmed that there is a process for
337 a certain number of people who could call for a paper ballot on Town Meeting. Filkins
338 stated that this is going to come up on the Town Meeting Day floor regardless so why not
339 give people the time to think and educate themselves.

340

341 *Rabideau seconded motion.*

342 *Roll Call Vote: Filkins, Hill, Rabideau in favor. Wood, Sander absent. Motion*
343 *approved.*

344

345 Arneson presented the draft of the Official Warning of the Annual Town Meeting with
346 Articles 1-4 By Floor Vote and Articles 5-18 By Australian Ballot.

347

348 *Hill move to approve the Official Warning of the March 3, 2026 Annual Town Meeting as*
349 *presented. Rabideau seconded.*

350 *Roll Call Vote: Filkins, Hill, Rabideau in favor. Wood, Sander absent. Motion*
351 *approved.*

352

353

354 **Adjourn**

355

356 *Rabideau moved to adjourn. Hill seconded.*

357 *Roll Call Vote: Filkins, Hill, Rabideau in favor. Wood, Sander absent. Motion*
358 *approved.*

359

360 **Meeting adjourned at: 10:45 p.m.**

361

362 **Chat file from Zoom:**

363 00:42:56 Judy.Rosovsky: I agree with Chelsye, we used ANR Biofinder and
364 the 4 town work done by Arrowwood to add local details to the RPC map

365

366 01:15:15 Brendan: I live in that south view “coffee cup” and I agree that that
367 doesn’t make sense, feels like some shady stuff happened there

368

369 01:17:44 Brendan: No scenarios where perfect circles should exist on that map

370

371 01:18:58 Jean Haskin: If my property is coded as conservation, do I get a tax
372 break?

373

374 01:20:18 Jean Haskin: Reacted to "No scenarios where p..." with 🤔

375

376 01:25:05 Patty Brushett:I find Cara’s implication that selectboard members are
377 being given preferential treatment insulting to both the selectboard the planning
378 commission and the community they serve.

379

380 01:48:32 Jean Haskin: What is a natural community?

381

382 01:49:27 Jean Haskin: It’s where the turkeys live!

383

384 01:58:54 Judy.Rosovsky: Just a reminder that current use land is different
385 than conserved land as the land owner can choose to end their participation in current use.

386

387 02:06:28 Jean Haskin: Go with the CCRP map

388 02:07:31 Patty Brushett:I think this is a good idea. Let’s move forward

389 02:08:11 Van Eeghen, Constance O: I agree; the CCRP map provides a way to
390 move forward
391
392 02:09:44 JAS: Wait for the ccrp maps to be approved. Why would we adopt first?
393
394 02:15:33 Bonny Steuer (she/her): Thank you for your statement Patty. I
395 completely agree.
396
397 02:22:12 D: No downside to waiting for August election that's scheduled. Let's
398 get it right. Please let's remember that civil discourse is crucial for democracy. The
399 conversation has in general been peaceful but firm. Please let's not convolute opposition
400 expressed w personal disappointment. Everyone is working hard. Please consider delay.
401 Great to have civic engagement. Thank you so much.
402
403 02:23:11 Trevor Brooks: This is only one page. The CCRPC map does not
404 have the same level of opposition. The FLU can be changed after Town Meeting if the
405 Town Plan passes. At that point there would not be a rushed timeline and make
406 modifications then if needed.
407
408 02:24:51 Jewels Hicks: Reacted to "This is only one p..." with 👍
409
410 02:26:35 D: Yes thank you Bruce!
411
412 02:28:39 Patty Brushett: Move forward with CCRPC
413
414 02:39:12 Patty Brushett: Please move forward.
415
416 02:44:44 Adam: Hey all I need to sign off and deal with some sick family members.
417
418 02:45:23 Adam: As we sit now I'd lean towards moving foward with the plan with
419 ccrpc maps
420
421 02:46:19 Van Eeghen, Constance O: The word "shall" appears six times in the
422 current draft of the 2026 Town Plan
423
424 02:46:58 Erin Farr: Shall is in the updated document 7 times.
425
426 02:48:06 Erin Farr: Page 7, 52, 53, 54, 77, 106
427
428 02:48:34 Erin Farr: Same thoughts Connie :)
429
430 02:48:41 Van Eeghen, Constance O: Reacted to "Same thoughts Connie..." with
431 👍

432
433 02:49:27 Patty Brushett: Make a decision and move forward.
434
435 02:54:29 Patty Brushett: Yay!
436
437 02:57:42 D: Thank you for the lively and open discussion select board! Please
438 let's not rush to bring to vote with all these moving parts being discussed, and wait for the
439 CCRP map to be approved at state level. please let's delay to town vote and get it right.
440 Thank you!!
441
442 03:23:17 Bonny Steuer (she/her): I support this being brought directly to the
443 voters.
444
445 03:23:31 Patty Brushett: Revise the language that that keeps the intent of the signers
446 of the petition. And let the voters decide.
447
448 03:23:34 Ian Bender: "WE PLEDGE to join others in working to end all support
449 to Israel's apartheid regime, settler colonialism, and military occupation."
450
451 I believe this statement violates Richmond's policy on equity and inclusion. I find it
452 harmful, threatening, and offensive as Jewish resident of this community. To be clear, I
453 am speaking for myself.
454
455 You can argue that the issue lays with the Israeli government and not with the Jewish
456 diaspora. However the topic is not a simple one, and this type of language can have
457 unintended consequences.
458
459 I would appreciate it if the selectboard would consider removing that segment from the
460 ballot initiative.
461
462 03:26:31 Patty Brushett: Let the voters decide.
463
464 03:36:49 Jean's iPad: I would also be concerned with repercussions against the
465 town or people of the town if this were approved
466
467 03:40:54 Bonny Steuer (she/her): I agree with Bard and re-write by Josh. You
468 might want to say "Israel's government" or the government of Israel.
469
470 03:41:57 Bonny Steuer (she/her): The recognition of apartheid is the clear
471 focus
472
473 03:46:17 Bonny Steuer (she/her): All are invited to the film and panel
474 discussion being held on Feb. 22 from 4-6 pm at the library

475
476 03:52:19 Patty Brushett:They can call for a paper ballot
477
478 03:55:11 Patty Brushett:Please read Bonny's message in the chat
479
480 03:56:46 Bonny Steuer (she/her): Thanks Caitlin