

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

DATE: **Tuesday, April 4, 2017**  
 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: Sharon Murray  | Hinesburg:                                    | St. George:                       |
| Buels Gore:  | Huntington: Darlene Palola                    | Underhill: Brian Bigelow          |
| Burlington: Jenna Calvi  | Jericho:                                      | Westford: Dave Tilton             |
| Charlotte:   | Milton:                                       | Williston: James Sherrard         |
| Colchester:  | Richmond:                                     | Winooski: John Choate; Tim Grover |
| Essex: Annie Costandi, Co-Chair                                      | Shelburne: Chris Robinson                     | VAOT: Jennifer Callahan           |
| Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo                                      | South Burlington: Tom DiPietro & Dave Wheeler | VANR:                             |
| Burlington Airport:  | University of VT: Lani Ravin                  | CCRPC Board:                      |
| <b>Other Attendees:</b> VT-DEC: Jim Pease, Karen Bates and Tim Clear |   |                                   |
| <b>CCRPC Staff:</b> Dan Albrecht; Charlie Baker; Regina Mahony       |   |                                   |

**1. Welcome:** Annie Costandi called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. Dan Albrecht requested the addition of an item to address latest proposed revisions to the CCRPC bylaws regarding the CWAC. The request was accepted.

**2. Review and action on draft minutes of March 8, 2017 (Action):**  
 After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, *Sherrard made a motion, seconded by Calvi to approve the March 8, 2017 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED. Sharon Murray abstained.*

**3. Clean Water Roadmap Web Tool**  
 Tim Clear, DEC provided a presentation on this tool (<https://anrweb.vt.gov/DEC/CWR/>). Shows where the phosphorus is coming from across the VT landscape at a finer scale than the previous data. It allows you to apply BMPs to any land use at a landscape scale. He will send a link out so RPCs can sign up for an account and have greater access to the full features of the tool. Dan Albrecht asked if the municipalities will have that access as well; Tim Clear said that they will have access as well. The tool includes a variety of scales in the watershed down to the catchment scale (this is titled “NHDPlus” in the basin dropdown menu), which makes it more helpful than the previous tool with only went down to the HUC (hydrologic unit code) 12 scale. Tim Clear showed the detail behind the land use sectors. The public facing part of the tool is the “baseline”. The RPCs and those with log-ins will be able to work with the scenarios tool. You can add BMPs as an application to a land use in the scenario tool and it will show you how much phosphorus was reduced from that land use sector. The tool also includes a compare tab that displays charts for the base and scenario loads. There are no costs associated with the BMPs at this point; they weren’t able to come up with a cost per BMP to build into the tool. There may be a way to plug costs in. This tool is only for non-point sources (no wastewater treatment plants). If you are in scenario mode it will save the scenarios that you created. The tool also includes The Nature Conservancy’s Water Quality Blueprint Conservation values. The red areas in this data layer have the most conservation value. There is a lot more detail on The Nature Conservancy’s tool on their website. TNC’s water quality impact may be a helpful tool in looking for locations to address phosphorus reduction. Charlie Baker asked if this will be used for helping to prioritize projects? Tim Clear explained that this is not a site specific tool, the lowest scale you want to use this for is the catchment scale. This was funded by Kuerig Green Mountain, and developed by an outside consultant.

#### 4. Winooski Tactical Basin Plan Update

1 Karen Bates, DEC, stated that the Winooski Tactical Basin Plan is on track to be done by December 2018.  
2 We've identified data on the priority areas where we want to focus; and the clean water roadmap tool will be  
3 helpful in that. Karen Bates has been meeting with the Steering Committee which includes the RPCs, and the  
4 Lamoille and Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District, and the watershed groups (Friends of the  
5 Winooski, Mad River, etc.). The NRCs are concerned that they don't have any funding to participate in this  
6 effort, so they are deciding how much they want to participate on the Steering Committee. Karen Bates went  
7 over the project schedule. Through August DEC and the RPCs will be downloading projects to the Watershed  
8 Project Database. Tom DiPetro asked about how to add private improvements that haven't been gathered  
9 anywhere else (for example the Friendly's, now CVS lot). DEC Staff explained that it hasn't been figured out  
10 how that will be captured. But anything that wants to seek funding should be on the TBP list. DEC has all of  
11 the shovel ready projects that the municipalities were asked to provide, and by April 15<sup>th</sup> those will be added to  
12 the database. South Burlington will add it to the Flow Restoration model, and ideally he'd like to only upload  
13 that once into one database. Karen Bates asked the municipalities to give her any other projects that they want  
14 added to the database. You'll get extra points down the road if the project is in the database, so definitely let  
15 her know.  
16

17  
18 They are looking at re-classifying some of the water bodies from Class B to B1 for fisheries. By June 2017  
19 there will be fact sheets for each sub basin including phosphorus modeling results. These will help gather  
20 feedback from stakeholders. Outreach to subwatershed communities is on request at this point. There will be  
21 a more robust municipal outreach in the Fall. Dan Albrecht explained the role of the RPC – basin planning  
22 outreach; compile list of existing municipal level regulations/protections; mapping; and stormwater planning  
23 information. We are working on a couple of stormwater management plans currently, and these will help in  
24 the project prioritization.  
25

26 There was a discussion on breaking down the Lower Winooski Basin into smaller areas to give the reader a  
27 more defined area that they can better relate to; and to focus community outreach meetings in logical  
28 groupings. Karen Bates suggested some break-down areas, and Charlie Baker suggested that these geographic  
29 areas should be able to be modeled together. Charlie Baker asked, by Fall 2018, if all of the projects will be  
30 entered into a scenario so we can see if what we are calling for in the TBP will be successful? Karen Bates  
31 described that the scenario tool may be used more as a public engagement, community prioritization tool  
32 because you'll be able to pick and choose what BMP would produce the greatest result. James Sherrard stated  
33 that it is without cost considerations. Jim Pease asked for a clarification on the questions. Charlie Baker  
34 stated that ultimately CCRPC is being asked to provide a recommendation on the priorities in the TBP to the  
35 Secretary. We need the phosphorus reduction and cost estimates in order to be able to help prioritize. We  
36 need to attach quantitative data as much as we can. There was some discussion regarding the relationship  
37 between the TMDL and the Tactical Basin Plan. Charlie Baker clarified that we've committed to EPA that we  
38 are using the TBP to prioritize our projects to meet the TMDL. Everything is in the TBP, road work, MS4  
39 work, etc. and all of that should be prioritized. At both the State and local level we want to make sure we are  
40 making financial decisions based on the most phosphorus reduction. Jim Ryan's permit program is requiring  
41 municipalities to prioritize projects within the roads permit. That wouldn't be done in the TBP. Tom DiPetro  
42 asked what EPA is going to look at for success, and how do we show what's been done. Are they going to  
43 look to the TBP, or the roadmap tool? EPA hasn't explained what they'll be looking at yet. Karen Bates  
44 suggested that perhaps we should be adding a what we've done so far, and what success have we had in each  
45 sector. This would be the first Basin Plan that would do that accounting. So we'll need to figure out how to  
46 get those past projects in the database. DEC has begun doing that with the ERP grant. Karen Bates asked  
47 what the municipalities would like to do. Tom is asking for coordination. He anticipates being asked by three  
48 different DEC departments so it would be great to coordinate this. Charlie Baker added that it is important to  
49 get these projects accounted for because we've committed to EPA for a phosphorus reduction plan so we  
50 should be able to show how we have been doing this, as well as how we plan to do it going forward.  
51

#### 5. ADDED Agenda Item on CWAC Bylaws

1 Dan Albrecht provided an overview of the changes to the CWAC Bylaws. There was some discussion  
2 regarding the “organizations as may be determined appropriate by the CWAC or the CCRPC.” The  
3 municipalities would be concerned about allowing other voting members that don’t have a financial stake.  
4 The CWAC decided to clarify that these other organizations would be non-voting members due to a lack of  
5 financial interest. Charlie Baker also explained the other clarification on assistance with municipal bylaws.  
6

7 Tom made a motion to approve the bylaws as amended, second by Darlene. MOTION PASSED. Charlie  
8 Baker provided an overview on the comments we received and amendments that Staff is suggesting to address  
9 those concerns.

10  
11 **6. Items for May meeting agenda**

12 Chelsea asked for the packets to be sent out a week before, there wasn’t enough time to review this  
13 information.

- 14 • Emily Baird regarding project tracking? There was a discussion regarding cancelling the May meeting if  
15 Emily isn’t available.
- 16 • Charlie Baker talked about the potential of pooled funds through ERP. Jim Pease added that we did not get  
17 funding for the street sweeping/catch basement cleaning study. The total study cost is \$300,000. There is  
18 a potential for \$50,000 from Wastewater Services (a regional entity would need to apply). We’d need to  
19 have some implementation components to it. Tom DiPetro asked about whether we are putting the cart  
20 before the horse. Can we figure out what the credit would be for doing some different implementation  
21 strategies (i.e. for leaf pick-up) before putting this large amount of money in a study. Let’s determine a  
22 credit, try that out for a while and then study it.  
23

24  
25 **7. Adjournment**

26 The meeting adjourned at 12:37 p.m.  
27

*Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony & Dan Albrecht*