

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – DRAFT MINUTES

DATE: **Tuesday, December 6, 2016**
 TIME: 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.
 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
 DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
<http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/>

Committee Members in Attendance		
Bolton:	Hinesburg: Trevor Lashua	St. George:
Buels Gore:	Huntington: Darlene Palola	Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Burlington: Megan Moir/ Jenna Calvi	Jericho:	Westford:
Charlotte:	Milton: Jeff Castle	Williston: James Sherrard
Colchester:	Richmond:	Winooski: John Choate
Essex: Annie Costandi	Shelburne:	VAOT: Jennifer Callahan
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo	South Burlington: Tom DiPietro	VANR:
Burlington Airport:	University of VT: Lani Ravin	CCRPC Board:
Other Attendees: VT-DEC: Jim Pease, Karen Bates. WNRCD: Holly Kreiner		
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht; Regina Mahony;		

1. Welcome: Annie Costandi called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. No changes were made to the agenda.

2. Review and action on draft minutes of November 1, 2016 (Action):

After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, *James Sherrard made a motion, seconded by Chelsea Mandigo to approve the November 1, 2016 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.*

3. Review of proposed changes to CCRPC bylaws incorporating CWAC as Standing Committee and recommendation to CCRPC Board on same:

Dan Albrecht provided the CWAC with the proposed bylaw language for incorporating CWAC as a standing committee at CCRPC Board. This includes the make-up of the Committee, the tasks, and the MS-4 subcommittee. This is the same language that was included in the original charge. There was consensus that more formal inclusion of watershed groups was not needed at this time (by the CWAC and the watershed groups). There was a brief discussion.

Darlene Palola made a motion, seconded by Brian Bigelow, to recommended to the CCRPC Board that the CWAC be included in the CCRPC Bylaws as a standing committee, with the language as proposed, rather than an Ad Hoc Committee. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

4. Review of “municipal allocations” of Phosphorus in Lamoille TBP and discussion of how to help inform development of next TBPs

Dan Albrecht provided an overview of the municipal allocations by sector within the Lamoille TBP, as this wasn't available the last time the CWAC reviewed this Plan. There were a number of questions regarding Table WLA-3 about the MRGP, MS4 and 3 acre program being treated differently for Milton and Essex (called out as the only MS-4 towns in the Lamoille Basin) v. the rest of the MS-4 Towns. Will the MRGP and 3 acre permit be incorporated into the MS-4 permits or not? Dan Albrecht showed the high phosphorus catchments and explained that these are areas where phosphorus could be reduced, Karen Bates explained that the catchments are areas where phosphorus could potentially be reduced, not that they have to be reduced in accordance with these tables. The miles of hydrologically connected roads, the estimated number of 3-acre parcels is also included. Milton's WWTP is not called out as needing to address any phosphorus reduction because they are under their design flow.

5. DEC Presentation Karen Bates: start of Winooski TBP update process (Discussion, 25 minutes)

Karen Bates provided the CWAC with an initial presentation of the Winooski TBP update process, starting from the ANR Atlas. We have a lot more data now than we did 5 years ago that will help us prioritize the

1 improvements. Karen Bates also described some of the engagement that has already occurred with some of the
2 watershed groups. Dan Albrecht described that there will be categories in the TBP, but we also have variety of
3 studies and other TMDLs that describe projects, and we'd like to be able to prioritize projects within this plan
4 based on phosphorus reduction and co-benefits. We weren't able to do this in the Lamoille TBP, but that is the
5 intent for the Winooski TBP. James Sherrard expressed some concern regarding the prioritization because
6 some of the projects may not hit all of the priority criteria – for example some of the flow restoration projects
7 won't reduce phosphorus. Karen Bates explained that this is a good question because it is unclear if the TBP
8 is only intended to prioritize ERP funds, or all grant programs. James Sherrard feels that it would be best if
9 the TBP helps prioritize for all of the TMDLs, not just phosphorus. How the TBP relates to the individual
10 funding sources is still unclear.

11
12 Karen Bates also suggested that RSEP should be explaining how they think outreach and education should
13 work since we are already doing this.

14
15 Jennifer Callahan added that these plans should be much more broad than just the phosphorus TMDLs because
16 there are many funding sources that will look to these plans for direction.

17
18 **6. Comment letter on Draft TS-4 Permit and Phosphorus Control Plans* (Action, 20 minutes) Note:**
19 **The CWAC may elect to defer action on this letter and have it addressed by MS-4 Committee.**

20
21 The CWAC discussed whether it makes sense for the CWAC to comment on this draft permit, and if it will
22 have an impact on the MS-4 phosphorus control plans. VTrans has already done quite a bit of commenting on
23 this permit, and they will not be participating in comments from the CWAC. Dan Albrecht explained that
24 folks can always recuse themselves. Charlie Baker explained this is no different than how the TAC operates,
25 where they are often submitting comments to VTrans, and VTrans recuses themselves from that discussion.

26
27 James Sherrard asked a broader question about whether the CWAC wants to set a policy that comments are
28 only submitted if there is consensus. Tom DiPetro explained that it is important for the CWAC to weigh in on
29 high level broad comments, but it won't be possible for the full Committee to reach consensus on very detailed
30 comments. The municipalities can always send in more detailed comments on their own if they'd like. James
31 Sherrard suggested that if we are too broad we may be doing a disservice to clean water, and are intent is to
32 provide feedback on this.

33
34 There is a challenge with this particular situation because there wasn't much time to respond to this particular
35 situation. The questions are whether the CWAC should set up a process to comment on these types of things
36 and to lay out the general rules of procedure on this; and whether the CWAC wants to send this letter or defer
37 action to RSEP.

38
39 Tom made a motion, seconded by Megan Moir, to defer this item to the MS-4 subcommittee. Further
40 discussion included the importance of providing comments on rule making, the importance of drafting the
41 letters more broadly to address water quality issues that is universally accepted by the entire CWAC, and the
42 relevancy of the topic to the entire CWAC. MOTION PASSED.

43
44 **7. Items for January meeting agenda**

- 45
- 46 • What the CWAC is and how to submit comments.
 - 47 • Potential draft MRGP.
 - 48 • Clean Water Financing.
- 49

1 **8. Welcomed new Burlington representative**
2 Jenna Calvi introduced herself. She has been recently hired and will take over Megan Moir's responsibilities
3 due to her promotion.
4

5 **9. Adjournment**
6 The meeting adjourned at 12:12 p.m.
7

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony and Dan Albrecht

DRAFT