



NEKCV EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
APPROVED OCT 2, 2025

DATE	Thursday, September 4, 2025	START TIME	5:30 PM	LOCATION	on Zoom and at 306 Meadow St., Brighton
-------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------	---------	-----------------	---

ATTENDANCE - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE			
Nick Anzalone	Chuck Burt	Mary Metcalf	Mike Strait
Siobhan Perricone	Ray Lanier	Jeremy Matt	Brian Machesney
Sally Vallet	Tom Fisher		

ATTENDANCE - GOVERNING BOARD			
Rudy Chase (Entered for executive session)	Henry Amistadi		

ATTENDANCE - STAFF			

ATTENDANCE - GUESTS			

TIME	ITEM	
5:32	The meeting began with a quorum.	
5:32	Agenda Review: No modifications requested to the agenda.	
5:33	Motion To Approve Draft Minutes For Aug 21 2025.	<p>Motion by Chuck Burt Seconded by Siobhan Perricone.</p> <p>Passed with no objections, Sally Vallat Abstaining</p>
5:34	<p>Discussion about Proposed Bylaws Amendment</p> <p>Chuck Burt provides context on the scenario of a town representative working for a direct competitor, goal of likely getting legal review of how delegates are appointed and re-appointed by towns, other legal review of bylaws relating to remove and replace, and possibly update of bylaws if necessary.</p>	
5:37	<p>Mary Metcalf had a question about section 13 - thinks it could be more clear. Where is the pool of people, and who appoints the Clerk? Jeremy Matt thought maybe we should clarify that Richard Azimov isn't the clerk with a different title, since he holds the formal office. Siobhan Perricone mentions the clerk and treasurer are statutory requirements. Jeremy Matt agreed to own proposing a clarifying change to the bylaws.</p>	
5:45	<p>Motion #1: To move forward with proposed changes of bylaws through feedback from an attorney and then revert to committee for final vote.</p>	<p>Motion by Brian Machesney Seconded by Jeremy Matt</p>

TIME	ITEM	
5:46	Motion #2: To amend motion #1 to clarify that Clerk-related language is also being evaluated by an attorney.	Motion by Chuck Burt Seconded by Jeremy Matt Tom Fischer Abstains.
5:47	Motion #2: Passed with no objections.	
5:48	Motion #1: Passed with no objections	
5:49	<p>Review, Feedback and Discussion of revised mission statements</p> <p>Chuck - I think mission statements should be simple. Personally I prefer candidate 2 because it cuts it down to what is strictly necessary.</p> <p>Siobhan - agreed. Candidate 1 has more "how we intend to get there"</p> <p>Mike - I like the second one from a grant perspective. We don't want to be too distinct so that you can get disqualified from grants. Federal grants are very concerned about creeping outside of your mission. Broad terms are way easier to make fit.</p> <p>Henry - agree with Mike</p> <p>Ray - I think it is important to talk about us going where no for-profit organization wants to go. Tied into that is the unserved and underserved. Affordability kind of covers that, but not all the way.</p> <p>Brian - does universal cover that?</p> <p>Ray - In a broad way. Probably. It is less satisfying because it doesn't say what we're designed to do. I'd really like to see unserved and underserved.</p> <p>Jeremy - The goal of serving everyone covers that but I understand something feels missing.</p> <p>Chuck - We're prioritizing the underserved right now because that necessitated our existence. But I would like to see us overbuild and give others an option someday. I would prefer that our mission doesn't prevent us from doing that.</p>	

TIME	ITEM	
	<p>Sally - I looked up the definition. I think we're saying the same thing. Concise definition of org's fundamental purpose outlining what it does, who it serves, and overarching values. I think we're missing something. It is a nuance. 2 is closer but I think it should be expanded some.</p> <p>Mary - 2 gives us freedom in the future. Candidate 1 we might be stuck with "why didn't you do what you said you would do."</p> <p>Henry - Vermont is not a word in either statement. That feels like a marketing and buy-vermont-buy-local perspective, that seems like a problem. I think Vermont should be there.</p> <p>Brian - I agree with Chuck that we'd like to serve more people, but I do think our mission right now is the underserved and unserved. That can change once we serve them.</p> <p>Ray - We have Comcast as a fiber competitor. What turns people who have the choice is when I tell them our mission is to cover areas where other people refused to go, that turns them around and lands them with us.</p> <p>Sally - I'd like to see us parse out who are we serving, what are the values</p> <p>Henry - why do we need broadband? What is the feedback from BEAD telling us?</p> <p>Chuck - i'm in favor of hearing primary points of feedback and running with it</p> <p>Siobhan - +1 (lots of other agreement)</p> <p>Tom: Example mission statement from my employer: Our mission is to generate the energy solutions the world needs.</p>	
6:22	<p>Motion to enter executive session and discuss Executive Director performance review under the provisions of 1 V.S.A. § 313</p>	<p>Motion by Jeremy Matt</p> <p>Seconded by Tom Fisher</p> <p>Passed with no objections.</p>
6:58	<p>Exited Executive Session</p> <p>No action was taken during executive session except the vote to exit executive session, motioned by Chuck Burt, and seconded by Tom Fisher</p>	

TIME	ITEM	
6:58	<i>Motion To Adjourn</i>	Motion by Chuck Burn Seconded by Ray Lanier Passed with no objections.
6:59	<i>Meeting Adjourned</i>	