

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
2 CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – DRAFT MINUTES
3

4 DATE: Tuesday, May 1, 2018
5 SCHEDULED TIME: 11 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
6 PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT
7 DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents, and presentations discussed accessible at:
8 <http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/>

Committee Members in Attendance		
Bolton: Joss Besse	Hinesburg:	St. George:
Buels Gore:	Huntington: Darlene Palola	Underhill: Brian Bigelow
Burlington:	Jericho:	Westford:
Charlotte:	Milton:	Williston:
Colchester:	Richmond:	Winooski: Tim Grover
Essex:	Shelburne:	VAOT: Jennifer Callahan
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo	South Burlington:	VANR: Christy Witters
Burlington Airport: Polly Harris-Stantec	University of VT: Claire Forbes	CCRPC Board: Don Meals
Other Attendees: Winooski NRCD: Corrina Parnapy; DEC: Karen Bates		
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Charles Baker, Chris Dubin		

9
10 1. **Call to Order** The meeting was called to order by Don Meals.

11
12 2. **Review and action on draft minutes of April 3, 2018**

13 After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Brian Bigelow *made a motion, seconded by Claire Forbes to*
14 *approve the minutes with corrections as follows: Jenna was not in attendance. MOTION PASSED with Harris,*
15 *Meals and Palola abstaining.*

16
17 3. **Initial Analysis of April 2018 Winooski Tactical Basin Plan working draft (Dan Albrecht, CCRPC)**

18 Albrecht provided an overview of the draft comments in the memo (see CWAC webpage) provided to the
19 CWAC. The memo includes recommendations on improving the prioritization of projects and clarifying what
20 can realistically be done in five years.

21
22 Darlene asked about a reclassification of Cobb Brook in Huntington. Karen Bates said that this has been added
23 to the monitoring spreadsheet to begin the process. The goal is to maintain the water quality of the brook, and
24 the first step will be monitoring.

25
26 Karen asked for input on the stressors, as community members may know that better. As well as helping to
27 define the general strategies (which Karen refers to as best management practices).

28
29 Discussion regarding what would make projects a priority – flow restoration plans, top projects from the
30 stormwater master plans, top projects from the river corridor studies, Phase II fluvial erosion geomorphology
31 studies, etc. The point is not to get DEC to state that they'll fund all these projects, but to identify and come to
32 consensus on the projects that are more critical than others. Still not clear if the project themselves will stay in
33 the database, and the Plan will stay at the general strategy level.

34
35 Karen suggested that if we can get more specific in the table on general strategy that would be great, but this
36 isn't a list of actions. There was a suggestion to include implementation of the Flow Restoration Plan and list
37 the Towns that have those; and the Stormwater Master Plan projects?

38
39 Joss explained that on the PAC we've been focusing quite a bit on implementing plans in order to understand
40 how to pick it up and use it. We've encouraged actions plans with schedules. Karen said these are strategies
41 that are supported, but not necessarily going to be checked off in five years. The TBP indicates that they are
42 implementing regulations that will help meet the phosphorus reduction targets; but we don't know exactly
43 know what projects will happen. DEC itself has a more specific list of what they are going to do (i.e. how

1 many staff will be trained). Discussion on the last statement on page 132 that indicates that everything in the
2 Plan will be accomplished in the next five years. Don Meals suggested that there also needs to be a higher
3 level of prioritization between the Winooski and the other basins because the Missisquoi has a harder job than
4 we do in the Winooski.

5
6 Jennifer suggested that ideally, we'd have all projects on the table and we'd be able to look at the most bang
7 for the buck for all types of projects, because we aren't just looking at road projects. We should be looking at
8 all projects together in a basin. Also, not sure about putting all Flow Restoration Projects in the plan and call
9 them a priority. Because they shouldn't all be done in comparison to other projects. Ideally, we'd have
10 phosphorus reduction and cost estimates completed so we can prioritize the full list of projects. But we don't
11 have the data yet. But can we prioritize which sectors should be prioritized so we can make the best
12 recommendation to the Secretary about how to best accomplish water quality improvements in the basin.

13
14 There are more issues/pollutants in the Plan than phosphorus. All of these are identified in Table 4; this list
15 will be updated with the 2018 list. Can we say these other issues are important, but at 5% or something?

16
17 Clean Water Fund Board is the group that decides where to put money at the larger sector level (i.e.
18 agricultural v. developed lands). From CCRPC's standpoint the conversation is the same and the TBP should
19 also include our recommendation.

20
21 Table of strategies for different sectors – what it says for agriculture is exactly what we've been saying for
22 decades. Business as usual has not gotten the job done; so we should distinguish between new things. Also
23 don't see any mention of tile drainage as a priority; there is new data coming out that this is a source of
24 phosphorus.

25 26 **4. Legislative Update (Charlie Baker)**

27 S. 260 – Charlie Baker stated that S.260 is intended to identify long-term funding. Current bill
28 includes an occupancy fee. Likely that the Governor will veto. Though they were thinking about postponing
29 the fee raising. The House seemed more open to raising revenue. Hopefully this is all setting up for a
30 productive conversation next year. We are not on a sustainable path. Cannot keep kicking the ball down the
31 road. The EPA letter said we are okay for now but State needs to address the 3-acre permit and the long-term
32 revenue source. If we don't get this straightened out it will essentially shut-down any more development and
33 wastewater treatment plants, etc.

34 Christy Witters does not have any more information on the 3-acre permit.

35 36 **5. Updates**

37
38 Charlie Baker sent around a letter from James Sherrard that he is going to submit on the Wetlands
39 General Permit. May be critical that these issues are addressed in order to implement the stormwater
40 improvement projects. The challenge is more of an issue around the buffers. James Sherrard is asking if
41 CCRPC would consider supporting similar comments. Don Meals couldn't support it without looking at if
42 more. Chelsea is supportive as they've discussed this before. Jennifer added that they support it if it will help
43 them improve their current BMPs. These are managed permits and the rule isn't going to help them make the
44 improvements in the buffer. Don Meals suggested that natural wetlands should not be used as a BMP for
45 stormwater management. He would be okay with it, if you could ensure that the function of the wetland is not
46 impacted but it is difficult to address that in a general permit. Comments are due in May. Dan will send this
47 letter out to the rest of the CWAC and suggest that they submit comments on their own if they'd like. Charlie
48 will discuss with the Executive Committee and it may end up on the Board agenda.

49
50 Grants in Aid – St. George and Burlington not likely to spend any of their money. All construction
51 needs to be done by June 30th and invoices submitted in July. There will be another round of Grants in Aid
52 funding, but you are only eligible if you pay your administrative fee of the MRGP permit on time.

1 Karen Bates showed a sample of the “rack card” for the Raise the Blade campaign.

2

3 **6. Items for Tuesday, June 5th meeting**

4 Did not discuss.

5

6 **Adjournment**

7 The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

8

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony & Dan Albrecht

DRAFT