

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

DATE: **Tuesday, May 2, 2017**  
 TIME: 11:00 a.m. to 12:15 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/>

<b>Committee Members in Attendance</b>		
Bolton: Deb Shelby	Hinesburg:	St. George:
Buels Gore:	Huntington: Darlene Palola	Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Burlington:	Jericho:	Westford:
Charlotte:	Milton:	Williston: James Sherrard
Colchester: Warner Rackley	Richmond:	Winooski: Tim Grover
Essex: Annie Costandi, Co-Chair	Shelburne: Chris Robinson	VAOT:
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo	South Burlington: Tom DiPietro	VANR:
Burlington Airport: Polly Harris (Stantec)	University of VT: Lani Ravin	CCRPC Board:
<b>Other Attendees:</b> VT-DEC: Neil Kamman, Karen Bates, Jim Pease; Lake Champlain International: Juliana Dixon; David Wardrop		
<b>CCRPC Staff:</b> Dan Albrecht, Charles Baker		

**1. Welcome:** Annie Costandi called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

**2. Review and action on draft minutes of April 4, 2017 (Action):**

After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, corrections were suggested as follows: page 1, line #39, correct spelling of Keurig, page 2, line #44, correct to read “should be adding what...” *Sherrard made a motion, seconded by DiPietro to approve the April 4, 2017 minutes as corrected. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.*

**3. Tactical Basins Plans: Project Prioritization Process**

Neil Kamman of DEC briefed the Committee. Darlene first asked about how uses are addressed in the plans. Neil noted that Chapter 4 addresses Designated Uses and Classification of Water Bodies with an overall theme of “protect the best, restore the rest.” Dan noted that due to a compressed schedule the Lamoille TBP only provided generalized recommendations and that in terms of CCRPC input, again due to the compressed schedule, that input was only able to make a general recommendation that projects with efficient Phosphorus removal coupled with strong co-benefits such as hazard mitigation should receive priority. James felt that projects that are required by permits such as Flow Restoration Plans, Phosphorus Control Plans and Municipal Roads General Permits should get priority.

Neil outlined how TBPs are structured. A discussion of the Lake Champlain TMDL sets the stage while other sections address what is known. Using the new maps generated by the Clean Water Roadmap, DEC and the public can see the relative impacts of each sector (ag, developed lands, roads, etc.) contribute to phosphorus within a catchment area, i.e. what are the stressors in a given area. Through the accompanying Watershed Projects Database, we can list all of the projects in a given watershed that have been completed or are identified or fully scoped and ready to go.

**4. Watershed Projects Database: input of municipal projects**

Albrecht noted that DEC had recently trained RPC staff on how to populate the database so that municipal efforts can be captured. Albrecht expressed concerns about RPC staff time getting bogged down into “scoring” the hundreds of projects identified in a Basin. Charles noted the need for that Plan to clearly state the top projects in a Basin on the basis of DEC prioritization process supplemented by the

1 recommendations of the RPCs and municipalities. Neil noted the concerns and indicated they would definitely  
2 be looking to generate a short list of “ready to go” projects. With regards to projects related to road erosion,  
3 initially projects related to MRGP implementation will not be included in the Watershed Projects Database  
4 (for example, we don’t want to be tracking each 100-meter road segment) but Emily Bird at DEC will work to  
5 build a bridge between the WPD and the regulatory database so that the WPD can capture the benefits of  
6 MRGP-related projects. Deb expressed concerns that projects in small towns such as Bolton won’t be  
7 addressed. Neil noted that the Plans capture needed projects noting the example of Texas Hill in Huntington.  
8 With regards to Flow Restoration Plans required for MS4 communities DEC has already worked with them to  
9 generate a list of implementation-ready projects. Daryl asked how DEC measures project efficacy. Neil noted  
10 that the Database will only use modelled estimates for now.

11 Neil continued noting the overall DEC scoring rubric of : #1 – how well does a project address the  
12 Stressor (e.g. Phosphorus Removal, Sedimentation, etc.) ; #2-Readiness, is the municipality in favor of it and  
13 #3) Computed P-removal efficiency and cost. After this DEC process, RPCs will then work with the  
14 municipalities to put forth its recommendations for priorities. Albrecht then noted that all of the RPCs are  
15 working to develop a standardized set of criteria for each RPC to use to prioritize. These criteria are different  
16 than those used by DEC and are looking to assess the relative co-benefits of a project such as Hazard  
17 Mitigation; Transportation Infrastructure; Social-Cultural Importance; Economic Importance; Community  
18 Support, etc. Neil noted that the Plan going forward --modelled somewhat on VTRANS’s transportation  
19 project scoring carried out via its Transportation Planning Initiative process with RPCs---- will be to have  
20 DEC’s scores count for 70% and RPC-recommendations count for 30%.

21

## 22 **5. Upcoming Funding Opportunities**

23 **a. Ecosystem Restoration Program**

24 **b. VTRANS: Transportation Alternatives**

25 **c. CCRPC, FY18, UPWP: Conceptual Design Assistance**

26 Albrecht distributed a handout (see meeting link above) with information on each of these three items. With  
27 regards to the CCRPC funds, the RPC plans to issue an RFQ to develop a consultant pool to assist towns with  
28 developing conceptual designs and cost estimates for projects to comply with the pending Municipal Roads  
29 General Permit.

30

## 31 **6. Items for June meeting agenda**

32 t.b.d.

33

## 34 **7. Adjournment**

35 The meeting adjourned at 12:12 p.m.

36

*Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht*