

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
2 AD HOC WATER QUALITY FUNDING COMMITTEE – DRAFT MINUTES
3

4 DATE: Wednesday, December 7, 2016
5 TIME: 8:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
7 DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
8 <http://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/environment-natural-resources/water-quality/#committee>
9

Committee Members in Attendance		
Burlington: Megan Moir (arr. 8:16 a.m.)	Essex Junction: James Jutras	Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Williston: James Sherrard	CCRPC Board: Don Meals	
CCRPC Staff: Charles Baker; Dan Albrecht		

10
11 1. **Welcome:** Charlie Baker called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m. No changes were made to the agenda.

12
13 2. **Review current information/comment form from the State Treasurer and DEC***

14 See <http://dec.vermont.gov/sites/dec/files/wsm/erp/docs/2016-11-16%20FINAL%20Funding%20Clean%20Water%20Report%20Public%20Meeting.pdf>
15 for the PowerPoint describing each of the potential revenue sources in a little more detail
16 See <http://dec.vermont.gov/watershed/cwi/cwf/future> for all information available.

17
18
19 Members expressed concerns about the lack of cost per pound information and whether money be spent wisely
20 early on. Don Meals noted that urban practices have better information on performance compared to rural but
21 still wide ranges in terms of percent effectiveness in removing phosphorus. Members also expressed concern
22 about the need for long-term monitoring of that effectiveness of the performance measure and the eventual
23 phosphorus loading into sub-basins and Lake overall.

24
25 Members agreed that it would be good to have more allowance for trading across sectors but hampered by
26 various factors such as the likelihood that Phosphorus Control Plans will likely specify percent reduction in
27 each sector rather than one actual tonnage number requirement per catchment/sub-basin.

28
29 3. **Review of VLCT Water Quality Action Paper**

30 Included in packet. No discussion.

31
32 4. **Discussion of strategy and when best to provide comments to the State Legislature**

33 The Committee agreed that they should review the State Treasurer's report (expected January 15th) and prepare
34 comments for review by the CWAC on February 7th with final approval by the CCRPC Board at their February
35 15th meeting.

36
37 5. **Discussion of major themes to be included in comments**

38 GENERAL COMMENTS

- 39
- 40 • Per acre fee on farms seems a bit unfair especially if they are being asked to also implement fixes.
 - 41 • Also problematic if per parcel fee is so low that administrative costs imposed on Town clerks negate the benefits.
 - 42 • Nail salon fee seems like a stretch. There are other types of businesses that pollute.
 - 43 • PCPs: four 5 year plans spread over 20 years 2017-2018 (PCPs and MRGPs will be added to MS4 permits)
- 44
45

46 CONSENSUS POINTS

- 47 1. % of funding gap the State should be trying to raise: 80% of needed capital funding should come from
48 the State whether the funds go to municipalities, farmers, or private landowners. It should be noted
49 that the funding has only been focused on capital costs and that there are significant maintenance and

1 operating costs that will still be maintained by the impacted property owners and municipalities that
2 are not captured in the cost estimates.

- 3
- 4 2. Cost effectiveness: It is critical that the State develop defensible phosphorous reduction estimating
5 tools so that project investments benefits can be evaluated in a consistent way. This is the only way
6 we will all be able to achieve the “biggest bang for the buck” implementation. Guiding these
7 investments to the right places/projects will be easier the more of the revenue is generated by the State.
8
- 9 3. Nexus: We believe it is important that there be some nexus between the revenue source and water
10 quality.
- 11
- 12 4. Reward/Incentivize best practices: Any revenue generation mechanism should also provide an ability
13 to reward or incentivize desired behavior. For instance, in a municipality that has established a
14 stormwater utility, if there is a property-based fee, property owners should get a discounted fee. The
15 same idea could be applied to farmers or owners with 3+ acres of impervious if they obtain and fully
16 comply with permit requirements.
- 17
- 18 5. Use of funds: It is important that there be assurances in place that the new revenue will be used for
19 water quality. It would be ideal to have a trust fund that is funded with these new revenues to ensure
20 this result. On a related note, we anticipate that the Clean Water Board will still be the body deciding
21 on how these revenues are used. We would ask that there be a representative for municipalities on that
22 board.
- 23
- 24 6. Ramp up: Based upon the timing of new permit requirements going into effect, it is important to
25 realize that water quality project implementation will be ramping up over the next 3 three years.
26 Therefore, more funding for project planning and development is needed in the short term with even
27 more funding needed for bigger capital project implementation starting in 3 years. Early stage funding
28 could be invested in agricultural RAPs in the early years since they are likely to be less capital
29 intensive. Essentially, we are saying that revenue generation could be done in a way that it ramps up
30 over a few years.
- 31
- 32 7. This session: We believe it is important that the Legislature take action on generating new revenue in
33 2017. It will take time to develop any new administrative fee collection systems and if decisions are
34 not made this year, we will not be fulfilling our obligations under Act 64 or the TMDL.
- 35

36 Charlie said he will work to put these into an email which he will send today to the State Treasurer. That letter
37 will then be a building block for a formal CCRPC Board comment letter for consideration at its February 15th
38 meeting.

39

40 **6. Set Next Meeting Date**

41

42 To be set by Doodle poll.

43

44

45 **7. Adjournment**

46 The meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

47

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht