

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

DATE: **Tuesday, June 5, 2018**
 SCHEDULED TIME: 11 a.m. to 12:00 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/>

Committee Members in Attendance		
Bolton: Joss Besse	Hinesburg: Merrily Lovell	St. George:
Buels Gore:	Huntington: Darlene Palola	Underhill: Brian Bigelow (dep. 11:40 a.m.)
Burlington: Jenna	Jericho:	Westford:
Charlotte:	Milton: Dave Allerton	Williston: James Sherrard
Colchester: Karen Adams	Richmond: Geoff Urbanik	Winooski: Tim Grover
Essex: Annie Costandi	Shelburne:	VAOT: Jennifer Callahan, Tyler Hanson
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo	South Burlington: Tom DiPietro	VANR: Christy Witters
Burlington Airport: Polly Harris (Stantec); Larry Lackey (depart 11:30 a.m.)	University of VT: Claire Forbes	CCRPC Board:
Other Attendees: Winooski NRC: Corrina Parnapy; DEC: Christy Witters, Helen Carr, Emily Schelley, Kevin Burke; Lake Champlain International: Juliana Dixon; UVM-EPSCOR: Sam Christopher, Alexandra Cole		
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Regina Mahony, Chris Dubin		

1. Call to Order The meeting was called to order by Annie Costandi.

2. Review and action on draft minutes of May 1, 2018

After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, Chelsea Mandigo *made a motion, seconded by Christy Witters to approve the minutes with corrections as follows: Jenna was not in attendance. MOTION PASSED with Olson, Lovell, Sherrard, Harris and Urbanik abstaining.*

3. Implementation/interpretation of 2017 VT Stormwater Manual: Kevin Burke, DEC

Kevin Burke provided an overview of how the changes to the stormwater manual have been working. Only seeing more applications in the winter and spring under the new requirements. Seeing a lot of disconnections and projects utilizing swales. If you can't infiltrate the next go to has been gravel wetlands. Folks have been interested in non-infiltrating bioretention but there have been some concerns about what soil types to use. Gravel wetlands also being used more because the location of the water table isn't a factor. They have also seen some Tier 3 designs coming in (like wet ponds). The application review for these is significantly lengthened. The designers are being told that they should have used a higher performing design (Tier 1 & 2); and asking them to re-think the solution. Some of these designers may not have realized that the rules have changed.

There was some discussion regarding the comment from some designers that there isn't enough room on the site for the Tier 1 or 2 practices, and perhaps the proposed development will need to be downsized to adequately treat the stormwater. In some circumstances it may make sense to make some accommodations for wastewater systems.

There has been some confusion regarding a net reduction in impervious. A net reduction in impervious is not exempt from the permit coverage. The reduction helps you meet the regulations, but you are still required to get a permit.

Municipal projects that meet the definition of public transportation are eligible to apply the design elements of this section (Sub-section 6).

There are some questions that they still need to work through to meet the post-construction soil depth and quality standard. Who is testing the soils? What soils/materials can be used?

1 Has there been any thought to adequate isolation distances from these designs and the buildings? Issues
2 with downslope toward the buildings. Also concerns about infiltration into basements. And maintenance
3 easements that abut a home. There is nothing in the manual to address this exactly.

4 How are we doing about assessing compliance? How are we ensuring that the BMPs are meeting the
5 intended goals? Sometimes the treatment systems aren't even built, but the self-certification and compliance
6 paperwork has been submitted. In these circumstances, definitely let the State know because they take these
7 very seriously.

8 Are we seeing any more decentralized stormwater management rather than one gravel wetland? The State
9 hasn't seen much of this, but they do suggest the disconnections when it makes sense.

10 The web-based permit notification system (Environmental Notice Bulletin) has been great and very helpful.

11 12 **4. Updates**

- 13 a. [S.260 as signed](#). There is more representation on the Board which is helpful; but no funding. Three
14 acre permit will go into effect in 2023 for Lake Champlain basins. Expired permits will be handled
15 under the new stormwater rule, which should be filed with ICAR in July, then LCAR. There is going
16 to be a lot in this rule making round. It will be helpful for DEC to come to the CWAC to present the
17 draft rule making changes. The ½ acre threshold will go into effect in 2022. It will cover ½ acre of
18 new development, not expansions to ½ acre (right now expansions that go to 1 acre do require a
19 permit). Changes to the ½ acre threshold are not included in this round of rule changes.
- 20 b. Winooski TBP process: Dan provided an overview of the anticipated timeline for review and
21 recommendation on the Winooski Tactical Basin Plan (TBP). Dan explained the crosswalk between
22 the Winooski TBP and the ECOS Plan (Chittenden County Regional Plan). The ANR deadline for
23 signing off on the TBP is December 31st, but the schedule shows an ANR signature by November 15th
24 which is very close to the public comment period. Suggested language should be provided to DEC
25 when we review the final plan, so that they can easily incorporate it. WNRCD is looking at the draft
26 plan this week and will get comments to Karen this week. Discussion about providing top priority
27 projects on the 5-year Winooski TBP. Burlington wouldn't want to be tied to a certain list of projects.
28 Ultimately there will be a process in place to help prioritize the lists in the big watershed database, but
29 that won't be ready yet. There was CWAC consensus that the projects will change within the five-year
30 timeframe, and the BMPs aren't necessarily defined for each project. Further the CWAC agreed that
31 the general language about prioritizing projects based on the TMDLs and permits is the most useful
32 way to identify these projects in the TBP. MRGP, FRP and PCPs should all be referenced. Phosphorus
33 Control Plans should be added to the list of priorities for MS4 communities. Or make it more general
34 that all MS4 required TMDLs should be referenced.
- 35 c. Chris Dubin provided an overview of the changes to the Grants in Aid program this year:
- 36 a. A Selectboard member or authorized personnel can sign the application.
37 b. Don't need to certify the connected roadway miles.
38 c. Must pay MRGP fee by July 1 (except for MS4s).
- 39 d. Intern work will be done this summer to track what work has been done, and what is intended to be
40 done this year. The implementation table is due December 31, 2018 for the MRGP. The database is
41 still being tested, and a few things need to be worked out. The "implementation table" is essentially an
42 online database. There will likely be an outlet id associated with each road segment so those can be
43 tracked appropriately for permit compliance.

44 45 **5. Items for Tuesday, July 3rd meeting**

46 No agenda items identified.

47 48 **Adjournment**

49 The meeting adjourned at 12:14 p.m.

50 *Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony & Dan Albrecht*