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

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

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

2. Review current information/comment form from the State Treasurer and DEC*
See http://dec.vermont.gov/sites/dec/files/wsm/erp/docs/2016-11-16%20FINAL%20Funding%20Clean%20Water%20Report%20Public%20Meeting.pdf for the PowerPoint describing each of the potential revenue sources in a little more detail

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

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

Included in packet. No discussion.

4. Discussion of strategy and when best to provide comments to the State Legislature
The Committee agreed that they should review the State Treasurer’s report (expected January 15th) and prepare comments for review by the CWAC on February 7th with final approval by the CCRPC Board at their February 15th meeting.

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

CONSENSUS POINTS
1. % of funding gap the State should be trying to raise: 80% of needed capital funding should come from the State whether the funds go to municipalities, farmers, or private landowners. It should be noted that the funding has only been focused on capital costs and that there are significant maintenance and
operating costs that will still be maintained by the impacted property owners and municipalities that are not captured in the cost estimates.

2. **Cost effectiveness:** It is critical that the State develop defensible phosphorous reduction estimating tools so that project investments benefits can be evaluated in a consistent way. This is the only way we will all be able to achieve the “biggest bang for the buck” implementation. Guiding these investments to the right places/projects will be easier the more of the revenue is generated by the State.

3. **Nexus:** We believe it is important that there be some nexus between the revenue source and water quality.

4. **Reward/Incentivize best practices:** Any revenue generation mechanism should also provide an ability to reward or incentivize desired behavior. For instance, in a municipality that has established a stormwater utility, if there is a property-based feed, property owners should get a discounted fee. The same idea could be applied to farmers or owners with 3+ acres of impervious if they obtain and fully comply with permit requirements.

5. **Use of funds:** It is important that there be assurances in place that the new revenue will be used for water quality. It would be ideal to have a trust fund that is funded with these new revenues to ensure this result. On a related note, we anticipate that the Clean Water Board will still be the body deciding on how these revenues are used. We would ask that there be a representative for municipalities on that board.

6. **Ramp up:** Based upon the timing of new permit requirements going into effect, it is important to realize that water quality project implementation will be ramping up over the next 3 three years. Therefore, more funding for project planning and development is needed in the short term with even more funding needed for bigger capital project implementation starting in 3 years. Early stage funding could be invested in agricultural RAPs in the early years since they are likely to be less capital intensive. Essentially, we are saying that revenue generation could be done in a way that it ramps up over a few years.

7. **This session:** We believe it is important that the Legislature take action on generating new revenue in 2017. It will take time to develop any new administrative fee collection systems and if decisions are not made this year, we will not be fulfilling our obligations under Act 64 or the TMDL.

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

6. **Set Next Meeting Date**

   To be set by Doodle poll.

7. **Adjournment**

   The meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

   Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht