

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

DATE: **Tuesday, July 5, 2016**
 TIME: 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 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:	St. George:
Buels Gore	Huntington: Barbara Elliot	Underhill:
Burlington:	Jericho: Katherine Sonnick	Westford:
Charlotte:	Milton: Jacob Hemmerick	Williston:
Colchester:	Richmond:	Winooski:
Essex: Annie Costandi	Shelburne: Chris Robinson	VAOT: Jennifer Callahan
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo	South Burlington: Tom DiPietro	VANR:
Burlington Airport:	University of VT:	CCRPC Board: Don Meals
Other Attendees: VT-DEC: Karen Bates; Jesse Baum, Intern		
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht; Regina Mahony; Charlie Baker		

1. Welcome: Don Meals 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 May 3, 2016:

Dan recapped the minutes and noted he would correct a misspelling of his last name. Tom DiPietro made a motion, seconded by Jennifer Callahan to approve the May 3, 2016 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Update on Potential Funding Sources for Clean Water Initiative

Charlie Baker passed out potential funding sources as developed by the Treasurer’s Office and DEC. The charge from the Legislature to the Treasurer’s Office was to figure out a way to fund clean water improvements with new money. Bonding isn’t new money. The State would need an actual revenue source to pay back the bonds. The list includes 43 revenue options. 1-13 were part of the original options, the rest of the list (14 to 43) were added based on the process they engaged in. Charlie asked for 3 to 4 CWAC members to participate on CCRPC’s Committee that will take the lead on developing a CCRPC Board position on this. They were asking for feedback on this list last Friday – but it is just the initial step. They are responsible for providing a report to the Legislature by Nov. 15th. They aren’t necessarily required to provide a recommendation, just a report. Charlie also provided another handout that describes the column headers. The following comments were made:

- It may help to split the list in two categories – one in which the State collects the fees, and the other where the municipalities would collect the fees.
- There was a question about whether the state would collect land based fees in municipalities who already have stormwater utilities – that has not been settled.
- There should be a balance with a portion of the revenue coming from visitors who appreciate the natural resources that we have (like a surcharge on rental cars).
- Taxes and fees that don’t have a nexus to phosphorus in the lake were questioned (for example #’s 39 – prescription medicine tax, 40 – personal care product tax and 41 – nutritional supplement tax).
- There was discussion regarding taxing property and whether it would be total acres v. impervious surface. It was suggested that taxing impervious surface would be more equitable. Also tract level taxing would be more equitable than a 1/5th acre parcel in Burlington v. University Mall in South Burlington.
- Raising permit fees are on the list twice and they already raised them, so that may not be a good option.
- Punitive fees aren’t going to be very much money so it may not make sense to spend much time on developing a system for it.

- 1 • Are sewer surcharges (#36) just on sewer treatment plants or septic? There was some discussion that
2 the amount of phosphorus from onsite septic is very low.
- 3 • There was a suggestion regarding taxing drinking water utilities that take the water from the lake.
4 They are directly concerned about the quality of that water, as it costs them more to treat it for use.
5 Users already pay for the maintenance of those systems, but there is an incentive.
- 6 • There will likely be a mix of revenue sources and they be distributed equitably so that people/groups/
7 entities are not overly burdened with multiple taxes/fees.
- 8 • There was a comment that you don't want to make it more expensive to live in downtowns and push
9 people out – which is ultimately more costly and less beneficial to the lake.
- 10 • There was a question about the toilet paper tax and whether it is just on toilet paper or things that
11 people flush even though you aren't supposed to (like baby wipes).
- 12 • There was also a suggestion that we shouldn't create such a complicated system that costs more to
13 administer than revenue it collects. Charlie indicated that the Treasurer is focused on using existing
14 systems, rather than create a new one (for example, adding non-profit properties to the existing
15 property tax system).
- 16 • There was a question about the purpose of #25 – unenrollment from current use ag land within x
17 distance of waterways and apply estimated tax dollars to improvements. Is there a logical nexus – and
18 will this fee help or hinder the establishment and maintenance of riparian buffers? There was a
19 suggestion that under #25 you could tax those farms without a buffer the fee based on impervious
20 acreage. #25 may become a moot point with the new Required Agricultural Practices (RAP)s.
- 21 • Is #27 – manure per ton fee for all animals (even pets) - just a flat fee? There was a comment that
22 including pets seems silly.
- 23 • There was a suggestion to tax phosphorus content of food/supplements on farms (a large contributor of
24 phosphorus). It would be logical to tax farmers in a manner that would encourage behavior change
25 that would limit the amount of phosphorus getting to the lake.

26
27 Charlie asked for 2 or 3 volunteers. Don will likely be recruited on the Board side. Don indicated that it
28 would be really helpful to have a municipal staff person on the Committee. They will probably meet 3 or 4
29 times. Dan will send out a solicitation email to the rest of the CWAC members that aren't here today.

30 31 **4. Discussion of Elements of a Legislative Agenda to be Developed by the CWAC for Consideration by** 32 **the CCRPC Board**

33 Dan Albrecht stated that in addition to the revenue conversation, there will be many rules being developed,
34 and asked the CWAC what topics they'd like to see CCRPC take a position on. Tom suggested that it may be
35 helpful to educate DEC on what municipalities have already done. Tom asked Karen about the Phosphorus
36 Implementation Plan being updated now that the TMDL is finalized. Karen indicated that DEC just needs to
37 establish the allocations and she noted that Neil Kamman is pulling that together so we can find out if there
38 will be a public comment period.

39
40 Charlie provided the CWAC with information from the Clean Water Fund. They are looking for comments
41 this month on where revenues will go. Dan will send this email out to the CWAC.

42 43 **5. Other Business**

44 Dan Albrecht showed the CWAC the current project priorities for the Lamoille Tactical Basin Plan, though the
45 Plan is not yet ready for comment. He will circulate this to the CWAC for any initial feedback.

46
47 There was discussion regarding the road erosion inventories and how they are being done. Karen asked about
48 whether we've looked at stormwater inputs and whether the inventories are making note of problematic inputs
49 from private property/roads. Dan indicated that the interns are inventorying all of the roads in the field and
50 documenting problematic areas.

1 There will be an August 2nd meeting of the CWAC with much of the meeting dedicate to reviewing the
2 State's new draft Water Quality Standards.
3

4 **6. Adjournment**

5 The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.
6

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony and Dan Albrecht

DRAFT