

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

DATE: **Tuesday, November 1, 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/>

<b>Committee Members in Attendance</b>		
Bolton:	Hinesburg: Trevor Lashua	St. George:
Buels Gore:	Huntington: Darlene Palola	Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Burlington:	Jericho:	Westford:
Charlotte:	Milton:	Williston: James Sherrard
Colchester:	Richmond:	Winooski:
Essex: Annie Costandi	Shelburne:	VAOT: Jennifer Callahan
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo	South Burlington: Tom DiPietro	VANR:
Burlington Airport: Don Campbell, Stantec	University of VT: Lani Ravin	CCRPC Board: Don Meals
<b>Other Attendees:</b> VT-DEC: Jim Pease, Karen Bates		
<b>CCRPC Staff:</b> Dan Albrecht; Regina Mahony; Charlie Baker		

**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 October 4, 2016 (Action):**

After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, *Tom DiPietro made a motion, seconded by Brian Bigelow to approve the October 4, 2016 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.*

**3. Review and comment on draft CCRPC letter to DEC regarding conformance of Lamoille TBP with Regional Plan (Action):**

Charlie Baker mentioned that we still don't have a Plan for public review. Dan Albrecht indicated that Danielle mentioned that the link should be on the website today. Charlie Baker suggested that we add a comment that in future tactical basin plan review periods RPC's should be given a minimum of 60 days for review. Jennifer Callahan suggested that we ask for an extension so that we have more time. DEC has to get this Plan to EPA by December so there is no additional time.

Dan Albrecht provided an overview of the staff prepared letter on conformance of the draft Lamoille Tactical Basin plan with the Regional Plan. The letter describes the sections of the Regional Plan (aka ECOS Plan) that provides the context for conformance. Staff has found that the draft Lamoille Tactical Basin Plan is in conformance with the Regional Plan, however we do have some comments that would improve conformance with our planned growth strategy and government financing strategy. The draft conformance letter from Staff specifically identifies the following two comments:

- CCRPC recommends that the Basin Plan include a statement that the Plan does not preclude any development that is consistent with municipal zoning and with applicable state and federal regulations.
- CCRPC recommends the following addition to the lead paragraph of "Chapter 5, The Implementation Table: Protection and Remediation Actions": As projects are developed, DEC and other agencies and organizations that provide funding, or implement projects directly, should prioritize projects that achieve a high phosphorous removed benefit per cost ratio. Additionally, projects that also provide co-benefits such as hazard mitigation, transportation improvement, aquatic organism passage, and/or listed in municipal comprehensive plans and capital plans should also receive additional consideration in making funding decisions.

Discussion included:

1 Lani Ravin asked if phosphorus reduction is the only focus of our efforts? A number of Committee members  
2 indicated that there are other TMDLs (*e.coli*, flow, mercury, etc.) that they are responsible for, and while some  
3 of them also have phosphorus reduction benefits, not all do. There was consensus that since DEC has set up  
4 the TBP's to give preference to phosphorus reduction, we should keep this sentence: As projects are  
5 developed, DEC and other agencies and organizations that provide funding, or implement projects directly,  
6 should prioritize projects that achieve a high phosphorous removed benefit per cost ratio.; and add water  
7 quality improvements associated with other TMDLs as a co-benefit for prioritization.  
8

9 A few edits were provided: should be *e.coli*; table on page 6 – Use “P” not Ph; no “u” in phosphorus; and the  
10 majority of the letter regurgitates ECOS Plan language rather than talking about the Tactical Basin Plan.  
11

12 Other discussion items included:

13 Prioritization based on reduction of phosphorus/dollar spent ignores the critical source areas where phosphorus  
14 reduction should be prioritized. Karen Bates indicated that they'll look at Critical Source Areas (CSAs) to find  
15 projects, but won't necessarily limit funding to those areas if another project will result in more phosphorus  
16 reduction. There was consensus to clarify the language to indicate: when we look at project development we'll  
17 look in CSA areas first; and we should add language that CSA be factored into the prioritization.  
18

19 Regarding the river corridors and relation of the TBP to municipal zoning, and specifically the statement that a  
20 TBP shouldn't preclude development in municipal zoning, Don Meals indicated that if a municipality permits  
21 development in an environmentally sensitive area that will be detrimental the TBP should identify this. There  
22 was consensus to rework the first comment to more accurately describe the continued level of cooperation and  
23 understanding that river corridor protection areas should be protected.  
24

25 *Trevor Lashua made a motion, seconded by Lani Ravin, to send this letter to the CCRPC Board for submittal*  
26 *to DEC, with the edits discussed in this meeting. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.*  
27

#### 28 **4. Finalize Committee comment letter on DEC draft 2017 Vermont State Stormwater Manual (Action):**

29 Dan Albrecht provided an overview of the status of the update of the stormwater manual, and explained that  
30 the draft letter before the Committee was largely based on James Sherrard's comments. Dan Albrecht asked  
31 James Sherrard to explain some of the points that he wrote.  
32

33 James Sherrard indicated that comments are due today. There was quite a bit of discussion concerning the first  
34 bulleted point: over whether or not to ask for further definition of what qualifies someone as a “designer”.  
35 Currently it is not well defined which is causing some confusion on who can do what; however there were  
36 concerns regarding how it would be defined and potentially causing a level of licensure (like a P.E.) over what  
37 is really needed. Ultimately the Committee decided that training to ensure those designing the systems and  
38 inspecting them is imperative; and that the comments should recommend a training program and not further  
39 definition of a designer. The Committee decided that the first bullet point be changed to read as follows:  
40 *“The CWAC recognizes the important role stormwater designers have with regards to STP design and*  
41 *ongoing inspection efforts. Knowing this, the CWAC encourages the State to develop and implement a*  
42 *“Designer Training” program as part of the Manual Upgrade.”*  
43

44 *[ Brian Bigelow left the meeting. ]*  
45

46 James Sherrard further described other points in the letter which cover points of clarification, and request that  
47 sources are properly cited for reference. *Tom made a motion, seconded by Trevor that we submit these*  
48 *comments as amended to DEC today. Motion passed.*  
49

1 James explained that Tom wrote an excellent letter on the wetland rules and other municipalities may want to  
2 sign on to it, as Williston is going to. Tom will send this letter to Dan and he'll send it out to the rest of the  
3 CWAC.

4  
5 Jim indicated that they submitted the street sweeping to the TAC, and they've received a lot of proposals. This  
6 grant would help figure out the right timing to collect leaves – 6 municipalities in Chittenden County signed  
7 up. Some municipalities have residents sweep leaves out to the street and in some places it can take 2 months  
8 for the leaves to be swept up. Other municipalities require leaves to be bagged before they are picked up –  
9 which is likely the best practice. There are also research projects going on in Wisconsin and Minnesota to  
10 figure out the actual effects of street sweeping, and then establish accurate street sweeping credits.

11  
12 **5. Items for December meeting agenda**

- 13 • Add introductions to the agenda.
- 14 • Discussion on the “municipal allocations” in the just-posted draft Lamoille Tactical Basin Plan so we can  
15 see where it landed, and discuss how to help inform the next Plan.
- 16 • Recommendation to CCRPC Board regarding continuation of the CWAC, and the charge. Dan asked for  
17 some initial feedback on this so he could prepare a draft recommendation. Committee members were in  
18 favor of 1) continuing the Committee; 2) no need to expand the membership and 3) per the discussion at  
19 the Oct. 4<sup>th</sup> meeting, set up a quarterly process or subcommittee process to work with watershed  
20 organizations on project development.
- 21 • Twenty minute kick-off on the upcoming update to the Winooski Tactical Basin Plan.

22  
23 **6. Adjournment**

24 The meeting adjourned at 12:18 p.m.

25 *Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony and Dan Albrecht*