Agenda
Executive Committee
Wednesday, April 3, 2019 – 5:45 p.m.
Small Conference Room, CCRPC Offices
110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

1. Changes to the Agenda, Members’ Items
2. Approval of March 20, 2019 Executive Committee Minutes*
   (Action)
3. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications
   a. Act 250 Hearing; The Snyder Shelburne Properties, LLC (Fairway at Spear); Shelburne; #4C1318*
   (Action)
   b. Act 250 Hearing; O’Brien Brothers (Northside Neighborhood); Colchester; #4C1319*
   (Action)
   c. §258 Advance Notice; Jericho Landfill Solar, 1.65MW; Jericho; #19-0736-AN*
   (Action)
4. Charge to Board Development Committee to develop slate of officers for FY20*
   (Action)
5. FY20 UPWP and Budget – recommend board warn public hearing for May
   (Action)
6. Draft S.96 Recommendations*
   (Action)
7. Chair/Executive Director Report
   a. Legislative Update
   (Discussion)
8. CCRPC April 17, 2019 Agenda review
   (Discussion)
9. Other Business
   (Discussion)
10. Executive Session – personnel evaluation
    (Action)
11. Adjournment
    (Action)

*Attachments
NEXT MEETING – Executive Committee – Wed. May 1, 2019; 5:45 p.m.

In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 x *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.
DATE: Wednesday, March 20, 2019  
TIME: 5:30 p.m.  
PLACE: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal St; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404  
PRESENT: Chris Roy, Chair  
Mike O’Brien, Vice-Chair  
Barbara Elliott, At-Large  
Catherine McMains, At-Large  
Andy Montroll, Immediate Past Chair  
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director  
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager  
Forest Cohen, Senior Business Manager  
Amy Irvin Witham, Business Office Associate

1. Changes to the Agenda; Members’ Items. There were no changes to the agenda.

2. Approval of February 6, 2019 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE McMAMS, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 6, 2019 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES, WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. Barbara had minor grammatical corrections that she gave to Bernie to insert into the draft minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES.

3. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications – previously reviewed. Regina noted that the Executive Committee members had reviewed these letters via email and approved them and the letters have been sent. The Executive Committee needs to ratify the approvals of the letters at this meeting.
   a. §248 Advance Notice; GMP Solar Canopy; Colchester #19-0385-AN.
   b. §248 Petition; Jolina Court Solar; Richmond; #19-0452-NM.
   c. Act 250 Hearing; JJI South Burlington, LLC/Cider Mill II; South Burlington, #4C1128-5
   BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO RATIFY THE LETTERS FOR THE THREE PROJECTS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Updated Act 250 Recommendations. Regina noted that the board approved eight recommendations to the legislature regarding the proposed Act 250 revisions. The Ad Hoc Act 250 committee has added two new recommendations. One of the proposals in the large draft bill (19-0040) includes a provision requiring that, in order to be used in Act 250, local and regional plans must be approved as consistent with the statutory planning goals. It suggests the Environmental Board serve this function. The Vermont Planners Association (VPA) notes that most local plans are approved by regional planning commissions, and this requirement would be an incentive for municipalities to seek plan review and approval. Since regional plans have no existing approval process, the bill needs to establish the right review/approval process. VPA feels that since regional plans are used in the Act 250 regulatory process under Criterion 10, the Environmental Board should not be reviewing and approving regional plans. The second recommendation deals with appeals for regional plan approvals. Suggested language is:

   #9 “CCRPC supports the position of the Vermont Planners Association regarding regional plan approvals which is to modify the bill language so that regional plans are reviewed and approved by a Development Cabinet; or some similar instrument of the State that is expanded for this function to include representatives with planning expertise – e.g. directors of two adjacent regional planning
commissions, a representative from the VT Planners Association, and a representative from the VT Association of Planning and Development Agencies.” After a brief discussion, members agreed to amend the second line to read “…plans are reviewed for compliance with statutory planning goals and approved by a Development Cabinet…” Regina noted that the Development Cabinet, though not active, is in statute (3 V.S.A. §2293) for the purpose of collaboration and consultation among State agencies and departments.

#10. “Clarify and add to existing statute (Title 24, Chapter 117, Section 4476) to make the existing Environmental Court hear appeals for regional plan approvals and for regional approval and/or confirmation of local plans and the local planning process.”

MICHAEL O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO RECOMMEND BOARD APPROVAL OF THESE ADDITONAL RECOMMENDATIONS AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Chair/Executive Director’s Report.
   a. FY20 UPWP Update. Charlie reported that the UPWP committee will hold its final meeting tomorrow. We have a pretty good draft document and will review a request from UVM. We added six new stormwater projects. The Executive Committee will review the draft UPWP at the April meeting to make a recommendation to the Board.
   b. Legislative Update. Charlie thinks the Act 250 amendments will be a two-year process as there is no formal bill yet, so we will have more time to review and update our position as changes are made. We do hope there will be a bill by spring. The other significant bill is S.96 dealing with clean water service providers. The Senate is likely to vote it over to the House on Friday without including any funding recommendations. The bill includes the idea to distribute funding through a clean water service provider and they’d default to RPCs to do that. However, the service provider would also have to deal with ongoing operation and maintenance of these projects, which is not appealing to the RPCs. Catherine McMains mentioned H.353 which deals with weatherization and energy issues.

6. Other Business. There was no further business.

7. Executive Session. There was none needed.

8. Adjournment. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 6:55 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc
April 4, 2019 DRAFT

Rachel Lomonaco
District #4 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT 05452

RE: Snyder Shelburne Properties, LLC and ABC/MRC, Inc. (Fairway at Spear); Shelburne; Application #4C1318

Dear Ms. Lomonaco:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as the construction of 91 residential units with related site improvements. The project is located west of Spear Street and north of Webster Road in Shelburne, Vermont. The Town of Shelburne Development Review Board approved the project on February 20, 2019. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Suburban Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:

1. The Suburban Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan, which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth.
2. The project will be served by municipal water and sewer, and constructs a new multi-use path on the west side of Spear Street that connects to the existing path on Webster Road.
3. The density and uses are consistent with the local regulations, as shown by the Shelburne Development Review Board’s approval of the project.

Therefore, we find this project to be in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

We also find that this project meets the requirements of Criterion 9(L). Though the project is not located in a state designated center or in an existing center as defined in 10 VSA §6001(16), the project makes efficient use of land and utilities. The project is located between two existing developments and has a compact, clustered form that preserves approximately 3/5 of the site as open space. The project is within the existing water and sewer service area and provides a multi-use path connection to the existing multi-use path on Webster Road. Finally, the project is purely residential.

We have reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis, revised 9/21/2018, conducted by Lamoureux & Dickinson Consulting Engineers, Inc. We concur with its findings and have no concerns regarding the project’s expected traffic impacts.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.
These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

Cc: CCRPC Board
    Certificate of Service
April 4, 2019 DRAFT

Rachel Lomonaco
Act 250 Coordinator
111 West Street
Essex Junction, VT  05452

RE: O’Brien Brothers Northside Neighborhood; Colchester; Application #4C1319

Dear Ms. Lomonaco:

The Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission’s Staff and Executive Committee have reviewed this Act 250 application for a project described as a planned unit development consisting of between 200 and 300 residential units, located on 6200 Roosevelt Highway in Colchester, Vermont. The District Commission intends to narrow the scope of the hearing to 9B (primary agricultural soils) unless the scope is expanded at the hearing. We understand that this project has not yet sought local approval from the Town of Colchester. We offer the following comments:

The project is located within the Metro Planning Area as defined in the Chittenden County Regional Plan, entitled the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. We find this project to be consistent with the Planning Areas for the following reasons:

1. The Metro Planning Area is identified in the Plan as an area planned for growth, and therefore this project helps implement Strategy #2 of the Plan which calls for 80% of new development in the areas planned for growth. Therefore, we find this project’s general location to be in conformance with the Planning Areas of the 2018 Chittenden County Regional Plan.

Because the scope of this hearing is limited to Criterion 9(B), only limited information was made available in advance of this hearing. CCRPC will defer comments on other issues, including Criterion 9(L) and traffic impacts, until more information is available.

Due to the detailed level of development review in most Chittenden County municipalities and the environmental permit reviews at the Department of Environmental Conservation, CCRPC will give specific attention in its Act 250 reviews to the type of use and the Planning Areas section of the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan. While there are many other topics covered in the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, there has been significant analysis at the Regional level regarding transportation impacts. The CCRPC will also focus its attention on transportation, where appropriate, in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which is within the 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan.

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,
SUMMARY TABLE FOR SOILS DISTURBANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Key</th>
<th>Soil Description</th>
<th>Area (ac)</th>
<th>Disturbed Area (ac)</th>
<th>Disturbed %</th>
<th>Value Rating</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Mitigation Area (ac)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASK</td>
<td>Adams &amp; Winowe soil, 0-5% slopes</td>
<td>64.083</td>
<td>64.083</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPA</td>
<td>Beltvale &amp; Olive ridge soils, 10% slopes</td>
<td>58.990</td>
<td>58.990</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRS</td>
<td>Dorr &amp; Downey ridge soils, 0-12% slopes</td>
<td>140.247</td>
<td>140.247</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRS</td>
<td>Dorr &amp; Dorr ridge soils, 0-12% slopes</td>
<td>81.426</td>
<td>81.426</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRS</td>
<td>Dorr &amp; Downey ridge soils, 0-12% slopes</td>
<td>70.270</td>
<td>70.270</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLL</td>
<td>Lysler &amp; Lysler soil, 0-10% slopes</td>
<td>14.515</td>
<td>14.515</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRM</td>
<td>Lymar Mawson rocky loam, 0-12% slopes</td>
<td>3.051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMB</td>
<td>Munson &amp; Hinesville soil, 0-12% slopes</td>
<td>28.370</td>
<td>28.370</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCM</td>
<td>Muon &amp; Mawson soil, 0-12% slopes</td>
<td>81.047</td>
<td>81.047</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWA</td>
<td>Strong &amp; Strong soil, 0-12% slopes</td>
<td>12.506</td>
<td>12.506</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS: 189.12 ac

AREA AVAILABLE FOR ON-SITE MITIGATION = 28.4 ACRES
April 4, 2019 DRAFT

Phillip D. Foy  
General Counsel  
Encore Renewable Energy  
110 Main Street, Suite 2E  
Burlington, VT 05401

RE: Advance Notice of Petition for ER Jericho Landfill Solar, LLC’s Proposed 1.6MW Solar Array at 508 Browns Trace Road in Jericho, VT (Case #19-0736-AN)

Dear Mr. Foy:

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission has received the 45-day notice of a Section 248 Petition to be filed with the Vermont Public Utility Commission for a 1.6MW solar array at 508 Browns Trace Road in Jericho, VT. We have reviewed this project in light of CCRPC’s 2018 Chittenden County ECOS Plan, which gained a Determination of Energy Compliance from the Vermont Department of Public Service on August 9, 2018.

ECOS Energy Goal
CCRPC finds that this project meets the intent of the Energy Goal (Goal #17) of the 2018 ECOS Plan: “Move Chittenden County’s energy system toward a cleaner, more efficient and renewable system that benefits health, economic development, and the local/global climate by working towards the State’s Comprehensive Energy Plan goals.”

Strategy 2, Action 4b of the ECOS Plan states “CCRPC supports the generation of new renewable energy in the County to meet the Vermont Comprehensive Energy Plan’s goals of using 90% renewable energy by 2050, in a manner that is cost effective and respects the natural environment”. Development of this solar facility helps implement this action. The Plan’s suitability policies help determine whether projects are cost effective, and the Plan’s constraint policies help determine whether projects respect the natural environment.

Suitability Policies
The 2018 ECOS Plan recommends the location of renewable energy generation facilities in appropriate locations, as defined by the policies in Strategy 2, Action 4b. The project as proposed meets the following suitability policies:

- The project is located on a previously impacted site and is located on a state-designated preferred site for net metering.
- The project is outside of any state designated centers or historic districts.

CCRPC finds that the general location of this project meets the suitability policies of the 2018 ECOS Plan. CCRPC is highly supportive of projects sited on previously developed sites like this parcel, which is a former landfill.

Constraints
The 2018 ECOS Plan states that ground mounted renewable energy generation is constrained in certain areas due to state and local restrictions on development. Strategy 2, Action 4b states: “Site renewable energy generation to avoid state and local known constraints and to minimize impacts to state and local
possible constraints, as defined in Strategy 3, Action 1.f, and Strategy 4, Action 1.f, and Action 2.e. Renewable energy generation sited on existing structures or parking lots complies with this policy."

CCRPC has reviewed the constraints that exist on the site of the proposed project. The natural resources assessment and conceptual site plan submitted by the applicant show that there are Class II Wetlands and Primary Agricultural Soils on the parcel. However, the project’s conceptual location appears to avoid these resources. **CCRPC is not requesting further information or action related to these constraints at this time.**

This project located on the Mobbs Farm property, an area conserved by the Town of Jericho. Conserved lands in general are a possible constraint. However, the Jericho Selectboard has approved the use of town land for the solar project. **This project’s location does not negatively impact constrained conserved lands.**

These comments are based on information currently available; we may have additional comments as the process continues. We understand that the project may change between the advance notice and the final application. CCRPC will review the project location again after the final application is submitted to confirm our initial findings above.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Charlie Baker
Executive Director

cc: CCRPC Board
Katherine Sonnick, Jericho Planning Coordinator
S.96 proposes to redesign the way in which funding is determined and distributed for clean water projects that are not subject to a permit.

A summary of the bill produced by the Office of Legislative Council is attached. The most recent version of the full bill can be found here:


As of the morning of March 28th, the bill is under debate on the floor of the Senate.

Staff recommends consideration of the attached recommendations regarding S.96. The Clean Water Advisory Committee will consider recommending these comments to the CCRPC Board on April 2nd. The Executive Committee will consider recommending these comments to the CCRPC Board on April 3rd. The CCRPC Board will consider these recommendations at their April 17th Board meeting.

For questions, contact Charlie Baker, 846-4490 ext. *23 or cbaker@ccrpcvt.org
## S.96. An Act Relating to Establishing a Clean Water Assessment to Fund State Water Quality Programs

**Section by Section Summary**

### Section 1. Adds 10 V.S.A chapter 37, subchapter 5, §§ 921-927 Water Quality Restoration and Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec. 1</th>
<th>10 V.S.A. § 921 Definitions for the Subchapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Basin”:</strong></td>
<td>a watershed area designated by ANR for use as a planning unit for required water quality planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Best management practice” or “BMP”:</strong></td>
<td>a schedule of activities, prohibitions, practices, maintenance procedures, green infrastructure, or other management practices to prevent or reduce water pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Clean water project”:</strong></td>
<td>a best management practice or other program designed to improve water quality to achieve a target established under 10 V.S.A. § 921 that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Does not need a permit under 10 V.S.A. ch. 47 (water quality permit), is not subject to 6 V.S.A. ch. 215 (agricultural water quality requirements), exceeds permit requirements of 10 V.S.A. ch. 47, or exceeds requirements of 6 V.S.A ch 215; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o is within the activities identified in 10 V.S.A. § 924(b)–(developed lands, natural resource protection, forestry, agriculture).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Design life”</strong></td>
<td>means the period of time that a clean water project is designed to operate according to its intended purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Maintenance”:</strong></td>
<td>ensuring that a clean water project continues to achieve its designed pollution reduction value for its design life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Standard cost”:</strong></td>
<td>the projected cost of achieving a pollutant load reduction per unit or per best management practice in a basin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 V.S.A. § 922 Water Quality Implementation Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>§ 922(a):</strong> After listing a water as impaired, ANR shall include the following in any plan to implement the TMDL for the water:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 V.S.A. § 922</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Quality Implementation Targets</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • § 922(b): ANR shall conduct the analysis required by § 922(a) for previously listed waters as follows:  
  o For phosphorous in the Lake Champlain watershed, not later than November 1, 2021.  
  o For phosphorous in the Lake Memphremagog watershed, not later than November 1, 2022.  
  o For all other waters impaired by phosphorous, nutrients, or sediment, not later than November 1, 2024.  | • § 923(a): After listing a water as impaired, ANR shall publish a methodology for calculating pollution reduction values for a clean water project in that water. Pollution reduction values set by ANR are the exclusive method for determining a value.  
• § 923(b): After listing a water as impaired, ANR shall publish a methodology to establish a design life for a clean water project.  
  o The design life shall be determined based on a review of values in other jurisdictions, values recommended by qualified organizations, actual data on design life of a practice, or a comparison to other similar practices if no other data exists.  
  o A design life adopted by ANR shall be the exclusive method for determining the design life of a BMP or other control.  
• § 923(c)(1): If a proposed clean water project has no pollution reduction value or design life for a listed water, ANR shall establish the reduction value or design life for the project within 14 days of a request from the person proposing the project.  
  o A pollution reduction value or design life established under this subdivision shall be based on a review of: pollution reduction values established in the TMDL; pollution reduction values or design lives established by other jurisdictions; pollution reduction values or design lives recommended by qualified organizations; and other applicable data.  
  o Upon request of a clean water service provider, ANR shall evaluate a proposed clean water project and determine whether the project is eligible to receive funding as a part of a State Water Quality Restoration Grant under 10 V.S.A. § 925.  
• § 923(d)(1): ANR shall conduct the analysis required by § 923(a) and (b) as follows:  
  o For clean water projects and design lives related to phosphorous, not later than November 1, 2021.  
  o For clean water projects and design lives related to nutrients or sediment, not later than November 1, 2024.  
  o By no later than November 1, 2020, ANR shall adopt a schedule for implementing §§ 923(a) and (b) for clean water projects and design lives related to all other impairments.  
• § 923(e): When implementing §§ 923(a) and (b), ANR shall follow the type 3 notice process under 10 V.S.A. § 7714. When implementing the requirements of § 923(c), ANR shall follow the type 4 notice process in 10 V.S.A. § 7715. |
### 10 V.S.A. § 924
Clean Water Service Provider; Responsibility for Clean Water Projects

- **§ 924(a)** On or before March 1, 2020, ANR shall adopt rules that assign a clean water service provider to each basin to achieve the pollutant reduction values established by ANR for the basin and implement and maintain clean water projects in a basin.
  - ANR shall assign a RPC as the clean water service provider for a basin unless an alternate entity is designated by rule.
- **§ 924(b)** Clean water projects that a provider may fund to meet a pollution reduction value, include, in no order of priority:
  - developed lands, including MS4s, operational stormwater discharges, municipal roads, and other developed lands discharges;
  - natural resource protection, including river corridor protection, wetland protection, and riparian corridor protection;
  - forestry; and
  - agriculture.
- **§ 924(c)** A provider shall be responsible for maintaining a clean water project for the entirety of the design life of that project.
- **§ 924(d)** If a clean water service provider achieves a greater level of pollutant reduction than a pollution reduction goal or five-year target the provider may carry those reductions forward into a future year.
  - If a provider achieves its goal and has excess funding, it may use those funds towards other eligible projects, operation and maintenance responsibilities for existing projects, projects within the basin that are required by law, or other work.
- **§ 924(e)** A clean water service provider shall report annually to ANR regarding clean water projects completed that year; inspections of previously implemented projects; all indirect and administrative costs incurred; all of the subgrants awarded by the provider; and all data necessary for ANR to determine the pollutant reduction achieved by the clean provider in that year.
- **§ 924(f)** If a clean water service provider fails to meet its allocated reduction goals or its five-year target or fails to maintain previously implemented clean water projects ANR shall take appropriate steps to hold the provider accountable, including:
  - entering a plan to ensure that the provider meets current and future pollution reduction goals and five-year targets;
  - initiating an enforcement action for the failure of a clean water service provider to meet its obligations; or
  - initiating rulemaking to designate an alternate entity as accountable for the basin.

### 10 V.S.A. § 925
Water Quality Grant Programs

- **§ 925(a)** ANR shall administer a Water Quality Restoration Formula Grant Program to award grants to clean water service providers to meet the pollution reduction requirements under this subchapter.
  - The grant amount shall be based on the annual reduction goal for the provider multiplied by the standard cost for pollutant reduction including the costs of administration and reporting.
- **§ 925(b)** ANR shall administer a competitive Water Quality Enhancement Grant Program to fund projects that protect high quality waters, create resilient communities, and promote the public’s use and enjoyment of the State’s water.
- § 925(c): ANR shall administer a Stormwater Implementation Grant Program to provide grants to persons who are required to obtain a permit to implement regulatory requirements that are necessary to achieve water quality standards.
  - The grant is only available in basins where a provider has met annual goals or is making sufficient progress towards the goals.
  - This grant program may fund projects related to the permitting of impervious surface of three acres or more.
- § 925(d): ANR shall administer a Municipal Stormwater Assistance Grant Program to provide grants to any municipality required to obtain a stormwater permit.
  - The grant is only available in basins where a provider has met annual goals or is making sufficient progress towards the goals.
  - For all of these grant programs, no more than 15% of the total amount awarded to a provider can be used for administrative costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 V.S.A. § 926</th>
<th>Technical Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ANR shall give technical assistance, upon request, to persons who receive a grant or subgrant to implement a clean water project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 V.S.A. § 927</th>
<th>Rulemaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ANR may adopt rules to implement the requirements of this subchapter.

**Sec. 2. 10 V.S.A. § 1253(d)(2): Basin Planning Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec. 2</th>
<th>10 V.S.A. § 1253(d)(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sec. 2 amends ANR’s duties when conducting watershed basin planning to require ANR to review and update the pollution evaluations and design life estimates that it conducts for clean water projects under 10 V.S.A. §§ under 922(a)(1) and (2).
| Sec. 2 also requires ANR to identify funding needs for projects in the basin that will result in enhancement of resources.

**Sec. 3. 10 V.S.A. § 1387. Findings and Purpose for Clean Water Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sec. 3</th>
<th>10 V.S.A. § 1387</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sec. 3 adds a findings section in the statute that established the Clean Water Fund to provide that success in implementing the Clean Water Initiative will depend on providing sustained and adequate funding to support implementation of the following:
  - the requirements of Ac 64; TMDLs or other cleanup plans; ANR’s CSO rule; and operations of clean water service providers.
| The findings also note that to ensure success in implementing the Clean Water Initiative, the State should commit to an annual appropriation of not less than $57,811,342.00, beginning in FY 2020 and adjusted thereafter to ensure maintenance of effort.
| Sec. 3 provides that the Fund shall be used to implement the Initiative, including funding clean water service providers.
### Sec. 4. 10 V.S.A. § 1389. Clean Water Board

| Sec. 4  
10 V.S.A. §1389  
Clean Water Board |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sec. 4 amends the authority of the Clean Water Board to add to the Board’s authority a requirement that if there are insufficient funds in the Clean Water Fund to issue all grants required to clean water service providers, the Board shall:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Direct ANR to prioritize work for basins, adjust pollution allocations to providers, and issue grants based on available funds;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Make recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly on additional revenue to address unmet needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Notify ANR of the insufficient funds so that ANR can consider additional regulatory controls to address water quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sec. 4 also amends what the Clean Water Board shall recommend funding for, including funding for:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o grants to clean water service providers to fund costs associated with the monitoring, operation, and maintenance of projects;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o the Water Quality Enhancement Grant Program;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o the Agency of Agriculture’s CREP Program, Farm Agronomic Practice Program, and Clean Water Initiative Grant Program;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o the Water Quality Restoration Grants, provided funding shall be at least $1,500,000.00;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sec. 4 provides that after recommending funding for water quality grants and programs, the Board shall recommend funding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o investment in watershed planning;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o assistance required for State and municipal compliance with stormwater requirements for highways and roads;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o funding for education, outreach, demonstration, and implementation for RAPs and any required agricultural BMP;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o funding for the Municipal Stormwater Assistance Grant as provided in subsection 925(d) of this title;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o funding for education and outreach regarding implementation of water quality requirements; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o funding for the Stormwater Implementation Grant Program as provided in subsection 925(c) of this title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sec. 5. 10 V.S.A. § 8003. ANR Enforcement

| Sec. 5  
10 V.S.A. § 8003  
ANR Enforcement |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sec. 5 provides that ANR may use its default enforcement authority to enforce the water restoration goals and targets assigned to clean water service providers under 10 V.S.A § 923 and 924.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sec. 6. 24 V.S.A. § 4345a. Regional Planning Commission Authority

#### Sec. 6

**24 V.S.A. § 4345a**
Regional Planning Commission Authority

- Clean Water Projects

- Sec. 6 amends the enabling statute for regional planning commissions to provide that RPCs shall have the authority, if designated as a clean water service provider under 10 V.S.A. § 924, to provide for the identification, prioritization, development, construction, monitoring, operation, and maintenance of clean water projects in an assigned watershed basin.

- In carrying out these duties, RPCs shall adopt a policy for how the RPC will issue subgrants to other organizations in the basin giving due consideration to the expertise of those organizations.

- When selecting clean water projects, RPCs shall prioritize projects identified in the basin plan and shall consider the pollutant targets provided by ANR and the recommendations of the basin water quality advisory council.

### Sec. 7. 24 V.S.A. § 4353. Basin Water Quality Council

#### Sec. 7

**24 V.S.A. § 4353**
Basin Water Quality Advisory Council

- A RPC designated as a clean water service provider shall establish a basin water quality advisory council for the basin.

- The purpose of basin water quality advisory council is to make recommendations to the RPC on identifying the most significant water quality impairments that exist in the basin and prioritizing the projects that will address those impairments.

- A basin water quality advisory council shall include, at a minimum, the following:
  - representatives from each natural resource conservation district in that basin;
  - representatives from each local watershed protection organization operating in that basin;
  - representatives from applicable local or statewide land conservation organizations; and
  - representatives from each municipality within the basin.

- The RPC and the basin planner from the ANR shall provide staff support to the council. The RPC may invite support from persons with specialized expertise, including UVM Extension, ANR staff, and Agency of Agriculture staff.

### Sec. 8. Recommendations on Nutrient Credit Trading

#### Sec. 8

**Recommendations on Nutrient Credit Trading**

- On or before July 1, 2022, ANR shall submit to the General Assembly recommendations regarding implementation of a market-based mechanism that allows the purchase of water quality credits by water quality and other entities.

### Sec. 9. Effective Date

This act shall take effect on July 1, 2019
Thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning on S.96. These comments and recommendations have been developed by Clean Water Advisory Committee, Executive Committee, and Board and approved by the Board of the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission at their April 17th meeting.

Sec. 3, 10 V.S.A. § 1387. FINDINGS, PURPOSE, CLEAN WATER INITIATIVE - The bill includes language that the State should commit to annually appropriate $50-60 million to ensure the maintenance of effort. As we have testified previously, **CCRPC supports the State investing adequately in the efforts to achieve clean water.**

Sec. 1, 10 V.S.A. §922. WATER QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING AND TARGETS - The Secretary of ANR shall determine any additional pollutant reduction needed beyond what can be expected to be achieved from the existing regulatory programs. If there are additional pollutant reductions required, the Secretary shall make an allocation of the pollutant reductions to each basin and clean water service provider in annual and five-year pollution reduction targets. The Secretary shall also determine the standard cost per unit of pollutant reduction starting with Lake Champlain by November 1, 2021. **CCRPC supports allocating grant funding by basin based upon need.**

Sec. 1, 10 V.S.A. §923. QUANITIFICATION OF POLLUTION REDUCTION; CLEAN WATER PROJECTS – The Secretary shall publish methodologies for calculating pollution reduction values and design life associated with clean water projects. **CCRPC supports this effort, but would like to see the same language to determine pollution reduction values in (a) that is in (b) to determine design life: “...shall be determined based on a review of values established in other jurisdictions, values recommended by organizations that regularly estimate the [pollution reduction] of clean water projects, actual data documenting the [pollution reduction] of a practice, or a comparison to other similar practices if no other data exists.”**

Sec. 1, 10 V.S.A. §924. CLEAN WATER SERVICE PROVIDER; RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLEAN WATER PROJECTS – The Secretary shall assign clean water service providers through rule making, defaulting to an RPC. This section describes responsibilities of a CWSP including funding clean water projects, maintaining clean water projects, reporting on progress, and measures the Secretary may take to hold a CWSP accountable. **CCRPC supports holding a CWSP accountable, however, would like to see the following changes made to reduce the risk to a CWSP and share more responsibility with ANR, a basin water quality advisory council, and property owners. We are concerned that no regional planning commission or other entity will agree to take on this work with these risks.**

- In (c) Maintenance responsibility. A clean water service provider shall be responsible for maintaining reporting on the maintenance of a clean water project by the property owner or other responsible party or ensuring the maintenance for the entirety of the design life of that clean water project. **The Secretary and clean water service providers shall develop mutually agreeable language to be used in grant agreements between the clean water service provider, ANR, and a property owner clearly defining the maintenance responsibilities and consequences for failing to maintain the project.**
- In (e) Reporting. A clean water service provider shall report annually, with the approval of the basin water quality advisory council, to the Secretary.
- In (f) Accountability for pollution reduction goals. ...The Secretary may take the following steps:
  1. Enter a plan to ensure that clean water service provider meets current and future year pollution;
(2) Initiate an enforcement action pursuant to chapter 201 or 211 of this title for the failure of a clean water service provider to meets its obligations; or
(3) Initiate rulemaking to designate an alternative entity as accountable for the basin.

Sec. 1, 10 V.S.A. §925. WATER QUALITY GRANT PROGRAMS - The Secretary shall administer four grant programs: 1) a Water Quality Restoration Formula Grant to address annual pollution reduction targets in impaired watersheds, 2) a Water Quality Enhancement Grant of at least $1.5 million to protect high quality waters, 3) a Stormwater Implementation Grant for persons who are required to obtain a permit, and 4) a Municipal Stormwater Assistance Grant for municipalities required to obtain a permit. **CCRPC is supportive of these grant programs, but are concerned about the implications on other funding programs such as for municipal roads. Will this new grant program take away from the grant assistance that the State has been providing municipalities, farmers, conservation districts, and watershed associations? Will a shift reduce or improve the State’s ability to achieve our clean water goals?**

Sec. 1, 10 V.S.A. §926. CLEAN WATER PROJECT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE – CCRPC appreciates the Secretary providing technical assistance and also requests legal assistance for clean water service providers as follows:

- The Secretary shall provide technical assistance upon the request of any person who, under this chapter, receives a grant or is a subgrantee of funds to implement a clean water project. **The Secretary shall provide legal assistance to clean water service providers in developing model partner and maintenance agreements.**

Sec. 6, 24 V.S.A. § 4345a. DUTIES OF REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS – Provides duties of an RPC serving as a clean water service provider. **CCRPC recommends that paragraph (20)(B) be revised to make it clear that the basin water quality advisory council will be the entity prioritizing the projects:**

- (B) When selecting projects, a basin water quality advisory council regional planning commission shall prioritize projects identified in the basin plan for the area where the project is located and consider the pollutant targets provided by the Secretary and the recommendations of the basin planner from the Agency of Natural Resources and the regional planning commission staff basin water quality advisory council.

Sec. 7, 24 V.S.A. § 4353. BASIN WATER QUALITY ADVISORY COUNCIL - This basin water quality advisory council would include all the partners in a basin and would be responsible for identifying and prioritizing clean water projects. **CCRPC supports formalizing a process for all the partners in a basin to work together in deciding upon priority clean water projects and recommends the following clarification:**

- (a) ...The purpose of the council is to make decisions recommendations to the regional planning commission on identifying the most significant water quality impairments that exist in the basin and prioritizing the projects and partners to be funded by the clean water service provider that will address those impairments.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and recommendations.
In accordance with provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, the CCRPC will ensure public meeting sites are accessible to all people. Requests for free interpretive or translation services, assistive devices, or other requested accommodations, should be made to Emma Vaughn, CCRPC Title VI Coordinator, at 802-846-4490 ext. *21 or evaughn@ccrpcvt.org, no later than 3 business days prior to the meeting for which services are requested.

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, April 17, 2019 - 6:00 p.m.
CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202
Winooski, VT 05404

DRAFT

CONSENT AGENDA –
C.1 TIP Amendments

DELIBERATIVE AGENDA
1. Call to Order; Changes to the Agenda
2. Public Comment Period on Items NOT on the Agenda
3. Action on Consent Agenda - (MPO Business) (Action; 1 minute)
4. Approve Minutes of March 20, 2019 Meeting * (Action; 1 minute)
5. Warn Public Hearing for the FY 20 UPWP and Budget* (Action; 15 minutes)
6. Charge to Board Development Committee to Develop slate of officers for FY20*(Chair Action; 1 minute)
7. Winooski Master Plan Approval, Confirmation of Planning Process, and Determination of Energy Compliance * (Action; 10 minutes)
8. S.96 Recommendations * (Action; 30 minutes)
9. Chair/Executive Director Report (Discussion; 15 minutes)
   a. Legislative Update
10. Committee/Liaison Activities & Reports (Information, 2 minutes)
    a. Executive Committee (meeting minutes: March 20, 2019 & April 3, 2019)*
    i. Act 250 Sec 248 letters*
    b. Transportation Advisory Committee – draft minutes April 2, 2019*
    c. Clean Water Advisory Committee – draft minutes April 2, 2019*
    d. MS4 Subcommittee – draft minutes April 2, 2019*
    e. UPWP Committee - draft minutes – March 21, 2019*
    f. Finance Committee – draft minutes – March 27, 2019
11. Members’ Items, Other Business (Information, 5 minutes)
12. Adjourn

The March 20th Chittenden County RPC streams LIVE on YouTube at https://www.youtube.com/Channel17TownMeetingTV, and is available on the web at https://www.cctv.org/watch-tv/series/chittenden-county-regional-planning-commission.
Upcoming Meetings - Unless otherwise noted, all meetings are held at our offices:

- Executive Committee – Wednesday, May 1, 2019; 5:45 p.m.
- Transportation Advisory Committee - Tuesday, May 7, 2019; 9:00 a.m.
- Clean Water Advisory Committee - Tuesday, May 7, 2019; 11:00 a.m.
- CWAC MS4 Subcommittee – Tuesday, May 7, 2019; 12:15 p.m.
- Planning Advisory Committee - Wednesday, May 8, 2019; 2:30 p.m.
- CCRPC Board Meeting - Wednesday, May 15, 2019; 6:00 p.m.

Tentative future Board agenda items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agenda Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2019</td>
<td>FY20 UPWP and Budget Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report from Board Development Committee on FY20 Nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burlington City Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 2019</td>
<td>Annual Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Election of Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Calendar of Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warn FY20-23 TIP Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 2019</td>
<td>FY20-23 TIP Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>NO MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18, 2019</td>
<td>Essex Junction Village Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Potential Topics/Speakers:
VTTrans Rail?
UVM-Medical Center Population Health?
South Burlington City Center?
Road Erosion Inventory Status?
E-assist Bikeshare and E-scooters?