Public Meeting of the Vermont Interagency Environmental Justice (EJ) Committee (IAC)
Hybrid Meeting Minutes
January 27, 2026

Note to reader: These draft minutes were compiled by staff from the Agency of Natural Resources. If you would like to see any changes to these draft minutes, please reach out to anr.ejcoordinator@vermont.gov

---

Meeting Information:
Date: January 27, 2026
Meeting Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM EST

Attendees:

Interagency Committee (IAC): Karla Raimundi, Abbey Willard, Janet Hurley, Bob Donohue, Grace Vinson, Elizabeth Schilling, Claire McIlvennie, Amy Redman, Stephanie Smith, Xusana Davis

State of Vermont: Juliet Birch, Kim Barrett, Collin Smythe, Jenny Ronis, Kate Jerman

---

10:00 AM

Welcome & Introductions

- Consent to Community Agreements
    - Consent received, no comments.
- Approve November 6, 2025 Meeting Minutes
    - Minutes approved, no comments
- Approve January 26, 2027 Agenda
    - Agenda approved, no comments.

10:10 AM

Environmental Benefits Baseline Spending Reports Presentation

- Kim B.: Today we will review the timeline for the Baseline Spending Report development, the components in the Baseline Spending Report submission, and we will provide updates on each agency's progress in developing their reports
- Kim B.: Deadlines:

    - Baseline Spending Reports are due to CREJU on Tuesday, February 10 close of business
    - Baseline Spending Reports are due to the public on Friday, February 13
- Jenny R.: Do we have an obligation to make the reports public in addition to your team submitting them?
    - Kim B.: CREJU will submit the reports to the Advisory Council and make them public via our Environmental Justice Public Resource Library. Covered agencies must post their reports to their public websites.
    - Karla R.: ANR has also created a cover letter to tie together all of the reports. This cover letter will be made public and packaged for the Advisory Council
- Abbey W.: AAFM has some more comprehensive data in addition to their regular data and their narrative statement. The comprehensive data will go on their website. They will share the regular data with CREJU for submission.
    - Karla R.: CREJU is hoping to compile and send the complete report to the Advisory Council
    - Abbey W.: Thinking of the report as primarily narrative – will include tables to explain the work and the programs covered by the investments included in the data. The comprehensive data does not fit into a table or chart that could be emailed, so we are going to share it via pivot tables and maps on the AAFM website
    - Karla R.: Recommend including a brief statement that explains what was just shared – where to find the comprehensive data, why the data is separate, etc.
- Abbey W.: Is CREJU looking to create a comprehensive webpage to share the work being done under the VT EJ Law?
    - Karla R.: We currently are relying on the EJ Public Resource Library to hold all products that have been created and finalized under the EJ Law
    - Abbey W.: Individual agencies are starting to produce a significant amount of data, it would be helpful to have a place where that lives in a public and accessible way
    - Karla R.: The EJ Public Resource Library currently stores all of the data covered agencies have created through their reports
    - Juliet B.: CREJU has discussed doing a “revamp” of the EJ Law website to make it more friendly and accessible. There are two obstacles: Current focus on the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines deadline under the ADA, recent restructuring of ADS. There isn’t yet the capacity to focus energy towards this revamp, but it is a viable idea and something worth pursuing

- Kim B.: Two components of the Baseline Spending Report submission: The data inventory component and the rationale component
    - The data component should include all of the core data fields, at minimum. Some covered agencies may choose to include more, which is welcome. However, covered agencies are minimally asked to address these core data fields in their reports
        - Abbey W.: To include all of these data components in a spreadsheet would imply thousands of lines of data. How do you expect to email that data to AC members? How will it fit in an email?
        - Juliet B.: The way we usually do submissions to the AC is by relying on links to the EJ Resource Library. The reports would be uploaded to the EJ Resource Library and then the email submission to the AC would include hyperlinks to the reports. This would solve the concern around size of an email
        - Abbey W.: Do we need to upload this data to the EJ Resource Library instead of our website
        - Juliet B.: We can link the data on your public website in the EJ Resource Library. It would just be helpful to have all of the data trace back to the same location.
- Juliet B.: The rationale component explains the decision-making that went into the reporting process – explaining the decisions to omit or include investments, what you were unable to include due to lack of data collection, etc. Including context that explains how the information should be interpreted and how the data can be used could also be helpful for the public
    - Grace V.: If you have any examples from ANR's draft, that would be helpful to receive.
    - Juliet B.: Since our draft is not final and still be reviewed by leadership, we can share it with you offline as opposed to sharing it in the public setting. What we are sharing today is a recap or a summary of what you all already know. Hopefully what we are sharing today is not new information.
- Stephanie S.: The DPS draft has been reviewed by the Commissioner and is complete. DPS will not be changing their report from here forward. The DPS report doesn't necessarily address what the gaps are because they can't necessarily identify the gaps until they are told what they need after the report is reviewed. We haven't yet had the opportunity to see what others are doing. The rationale explains what is included and why and what is not included and why
    - Juliet B.: The question regarding gaps in data is referencing if you are missing core data fields. These gaps would come to the surface throughout the reporting process, not necessarily something that would

require evaluation. Sounds like DPS has produced what is being asked of them.
    - Karla R.: From the beginning of this process, we were clear that this first round of reporting will be unique to each agency and over time we will develop uniformities based on lessons learned. The annual reports will be easier to compile due to smaller scope. Trusting the process and trusting the quality of your work is important.
- Amy R.: The cover letter that is drafted is really strong and names so many of the challenges that covered agencies are facing. The department is doing a sample methodology for this report. Working a lot with programs in the report development. Still at the beginning process to understand what it would take to develop the report. Should VDH publish the cover letter to their public site alongside their report?
    - Juliet B.: For reference the cover letter is intended to be the cover letter for all covered agencies' Baseline Spending Reports, tying together all challenges and achievements. Feedback due February 2nd. Intended audience is the Advisory Council and the general public. Covered agencies are welcome to include this cover letter alongside the report on their website.
- Abbey W.: Thoughts on the difference between "what changes can the covered agency make to their data collection process" versus the goal for redistribution of spending that is a separate due in July. AAFM included a lot of content of what they could do differently in their report, but then realized this seemed like a proportionality plan so they pulled it out of the report to prepare for July.
    - Kim B.: This bullet is more pertaining to changes to the data procurement procedure as opposed to changes that you can make to spending.

10:35 AM

Agency Baseline Spending Report Share-Outs

- Karla R.: ANR update – ANR is in the process of finalizing the ANR report. The report was developed on the department level and these three elements of the report are to be reviewed by leadership to bring us closer to being able to finalize and submit.
- Grace V.: Worked with ACCD finance staff to procure financial data. Still working on the rationale component. Meeting with senior staff next week to finalize report.
- Janet H.: Worked with Karla to discuss the current draft LURB report and the challenges LURB is facing in making the report relevant. LURB does not have

spending, so there isn't much to report on. LURB has a draft. Still serves to be improved to describe how the program functions across the state.

- Claire M.: PSD is in the same place as LURB, largely regulatory department. Not a lot of programs or programmatic spending. The narrative report goes into the explanation of how they deemed they would not include a data component of their report. It is unusual for them to have a lot of direct investments.
- Abbey W.: AAFM has a draft and spent a lot of time drafting a report that is accessible and clear to the public to describe the process and the purpose of the data and where it came from. Four staff have been redirected to work on this report. This level of commitment is long-term unsustainable.
- Amy R.: This VDH report is mainly a transparency report. There will be a sample of investments that is representative of what the full report analysis could look like, but not complete inventory
- Bob D.: The AOE report and financial analysis is complete. Working on incorporating the spreadsheet into a table in a Word document
- Collin S.: AOT is having leadership review the report and has been doing some edits based on leadership review. Working to fine tune the data. AOT approach is to do an inventory of the programs through a metrics process and picked three programs that very clearly aligned with the environmental benefits in the law. Have embedded this data in GIS. Putting together tables and maps. Some fine tuning still needed, but it is all coming together. AOT is dealing with a recent restructuring.
- Stephanie S.: DPS report is done. DPS's data is a lot less than the volume being discussed by AAFM. A lot of the report is addressing why certain investments are not included and addressed in detail.
- Elizabeth S.: PUC has a report that has been approved by leadership. Similar to the LURB or PSD because there is not direct or indirect spending from PUC. They regulate utility spending, and will report on the spending on low-income customers and regular customers as well.

11:10 AM

Public Comment

- No comments.

11:15 AM

Break

11:20 AM

Civil Rights and Environmental Justice Report Workplan Unfacilitated Session

- Kim B.: This is an opportunity to revisit the workplan that was developed last year to support the Civil Rights and Environmental Justice complaint intake process.
- Karla R.: This workplan was the product of work from Karla and Elizabeth after a public meeting last year. Speaks to a recommendation from the AC on developing a single intake system for CR and EJ Complaints. We have communicated that Civil Rights should be separate and distinct from EJ due to pre-existing federal requirements. ANR is not comfortable combining these areas of work. The AC seemed to resonate with this and is open to an EJ focus on the single intake system. The IAC response last year asked the AC to answer the question of "what is an environmental justice complaint" and how is it distinct from a civil rights complaint. Having an answer to this question would help the covered agencies to build out a complaint intake system that is in alignment with the AC's vision. Should the workplan be included in the report submission on March 15, 2026?
- Janet H.: Do you anticipate there being funding needs for this workplan? If so, how do you anticipate getting the funding? It looks like a lot of the workplan doesn't require a consultant if the covered agencies have the capacity, but if the capacity is not there, there would need to be resource support
    - Karla R.: Phase 4 would potentially require funding support. There is not a timeline attached to this workplan currently so as to allow flexibility. Prior to Phase 4, there is work that needs to get done. We could activate the Advisory Council to advocate before the legislative body to help secure resources to implement their recommendations. Will require coordination with the AC.
    - Janet H.: This suggests to me that the timeline would need to be at least a year out. There is no time to lobby the legislature now.
    - Claire M.: The core content of this workplan is in alignment with the discussion that was had last year. The timeline would depend on agency capacity for this work. This would require the people from each agency who manage and respond to complaints to collaborate and get involved in this process. Revision of the workplan could include parsing what could still happen in lieu of additional funding versus things that would require additional funding. Agrees that there is a role for the AC, but this advocacy work really feels like the work of state government to advocate on behalf of the law and the covered agencies. This is something we should lead on, not the AC.

- Abbey W.: There is an extensive timeline to design legislative budgetary processes that AAFM is familiar with. This would mean that the plan by August of 2026 that would result in funding would result in positions being available in May of 2027.
    - Claire M.: It would be more realistic to push it out by a year. Objective of having a budget ask two legislative sessions from now
    - Karla R.: Initiating the work in two years after a phase of coordination. The first two phases of the workplan can operate independent of the budget availability. There are conversations of creating a buddy system with AC members. If you want an AC member buddy, please fill out the survey
    - Claire M.: Could be good to add a phase 0 to the workplan that includes building the core team of people who would be working on this plan outside of public meetings.
    - Karla R.: There are other deliverables that may benefit from a subgroup or core team approach. This includes deliverables like the Mapping Tool or the Goal of Redistribution of Spending
- Karla R.: Next meeting to assess how we'll move through deliverables over the next several years

11:55 AM

Updates

- Juliet B.: Mapping Tool updates:
    - Community Engagement SC Process:
        - SC had a final meeting identifying questions for the runner ups
        - We received responses from both contractors
        - We met with one contractor on their responses thus far
    - GIS Process:
        - We finalized the draft SOW with ADS and shared it with Stone Environmental
        - We are discussing internally how to address their questions and will re-engage ASAP.
- Juliet B.: Community Engagement updates:
    - VT EJ Community Engagement subgroup was formed including:
        - Victor Davila, AC
        - Jennifer Byrne, AC
        - Mariana Sears, AC
        - Charlotte Safran, VDH
        - Richarda Ericson, PSD
        - Sarah McIlvennie, AAFM

        - All of CREJU
    - This group has met once and has set a goal to meet biweekly

12:00 PM

Close Out