

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

DATE: **Tuesday, April 7, 2020**
 SCHEDULED TIME: 11 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.
 PLACE: ONLINE
 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:	Underhill:
Burlington: James Sherrard	Jericho:	Westford:
Charlotte: Marty Illick	Milton:	Williston:
Colchester: Amanda Clayton	Richmond: Ravi Venkataraman	Winooski: Ryan Lambert, John Choate
Essex: Annie Costandi	Shelburne:	VAOT: Jennifer Callahan
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo	South Burlington: Tom DiPietro	VANR: Christy Witters, Jim Pease, Karen Bates
Burlington Airport: Polly Harris (Stantec)	University of VT: Lani Ravin	CCRPC Board: Don Meals
Friends of the Winooski River:	Lewis Creek Assoc: Andrea Morgante	Winooski NRCD:
Other Attendees: Northwest RPC: Amanda Holland and Kate Longfield; BLUE@ : Andrew Bissell; USGS: Jeremy Foote; Jason Sorenson; Friends of Northern Lake Champlain: Kent Henderson		
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, Chris Dubin, Charlie Baker, Marshall Distel, Eleni Churchill		

1. **Call to Order.** With the consent of the co-chairs, it was agreed to have Dan Albrecht run the meeting since it was all online. The meeting was called to order by Dan Albrecht at 11:04 a.m. Introductions were made.
2. **Changes to the Agenda and public comments on items not on the agenda** No changes.
3. **Review and action on draft minutes of March 4, 2020** After a brief recap by Dan Albrecht, *James Sherrard made a motion, seconded by Ravi Venkataraman to approve the minutes as drafted. MOTION PASSED with abstentions by Annie Costandi, Kent Henderson, Marty Illick, Amanda Clayton, Polly Harris.*
4. **Clean Water Service Providers: Potential applications for designation**
 - a. Review Draft CCRPC application for CWSP for Northern Lake Champlain Direct Drainages Tactical Basin Planning Area (Discussion). Dan Albrecht walked through the sections of the RFP. Under the *Vision* section Dan explained that CCRPC will work with NWRPC on this because the geographic area of Basin 5 includes Franklin and Grand Isle County. In addition, much of the actual project work will be done by partner agencies. The next section of the RFP response describes the steps that the CWSP will take to develop the program. This starts with *Project Identification and Prioritization*. Then includes the formation of the Basin Water Quality Council. The RFP includes the process for BWQC membership for the various groups. Initial inventory of projects will come from the Watershed Projects Database, as well as outreach to watershed groups, and new river reach studies. The project list will be broken into two groups: identification/development and design/implementation. These projects will be loaded into a database/dashboard since we can't have daily access to DEC's Watershed Projects Database. Then the projects will be prioritized by the BWQC.

Questions? Marty described that she has some questions/comments on the prioritization section. She can add these comments to a word document. Dan will send out a word version of the RFP. Marty also asked for a primer on how to establish the p-reductions for BMPs. Christy Witters added that they are close to publishing these calculations.

1 Dan continued with the section *Development of formal partnerships and the broader water quality*
2 *improvement community* - a RFQ will be issued with the hope of streamlining the process and getting
3 funding out to the various partners under master agreements. Then the individual projects can be
4 assigned out with a one-page task order. There may also be an RFP for technical and scientific
5 expertise. The intent is that when a project is awarded to a partner all of the money needed to
6 implement that project from A to Z is rolled into one grant agreement, so admin costs for the partners
7 is intended to be covered.

8
9 *Questions?* Marty suggested this document be as flexible as it can be to allow for variation in the type of
10 activities because we can't anticipate everything. Can't create a budget until after the initial project
11 development is established. The funds really need to be fluid at this initial step. Even in the design phase
12 the project implementation cost gets tweaked.

13
14 Dan continued with the section on *Verification and Inspection*: CCRPC may be able to do some of
15 this, or the technical expertise on retainer.

16
17 *Questions?* Marty suggested that project readiness be a key score for the project prioritization.

18
19 Dan continued with *Part (c) (2) – (5)*: describes the qualifications of CCRPC and NRPC to do this
20 work. Including example work, ability to do the administrative functions, etc. Lastly, Dan explained
21 what we'll need between now and the final submittal including letters of reference/support from the
22 partners.

23
24 *Questions?* Don Meal – more explicit description of how the RPCs will work together; relying on partners
25 for O&M, meanwhile the RPC will be held responsible for this. So we should include more formal
26 description of what RPC will expect from the partners to meet these criteria/O&M. Andrea Morgante – it
27 is still unclear how the council will evaluate and prioritize projects? Dan explained that DEC is working
28 on the rules and guidance for this. Andrea – if it will be a numerical ranking by the rules then what is the
29 point of the BWQC? And I don't think they are a policy making board? Charlie indicated that he does
30 think the intent of the Legislature was for the BWQC to be making policy decisions, mostly through the
31 process of project funding. At the same time, it does seem like the intent of DEC is to rely heavily on
32 phosphorus reduction. The policy decision making may be 20% of the score on co-benefits, etc.

33
34 Dan will get another draft out by the end of this week/early next week. CCRPC asked for additional
35 comments within the next few days. Charlie mentioned that the CCRPC will be dedicating their April
36 Board meeting to work shopping this RFP. He suggested that CWAC members join that call if they are
37 interested.

38
39 b. Update on potential Central VT RPC application for CWSP for Winooski Basin

40
41 Dan explained that Central VT RPC is investigating submitting a proposal for the Winooski Basin.
42 CCRPC would like to be a partner in that proposal just like NRPC is a partner in the Basin 5 proposal.
43 Central VT RPC was going to have a vote on this last night, but we have not yet heard what happened at
44 that meeting.

45
46 **5. Review Water Quality elements of FY2021 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (Discussion)**

47 Marshall Distel provided an overview of the development of the FY21 UPWP. Marshall provided an
48 overview of the consultant program funding over the last few fiscal years. This does not include our other
49 program areas like land use, or funding for GMT. The draft FY21 UPWP was provided in the packet. This
50 will be voted on by the Board in May. CCRPC asked the CWAC to provide any comments if they have any.

51
52 **6. Review first draft of CCRPC “conformance letter”, re: Draft 2020 Basin 5 Tactical Basin Plan**

1 Dan provided an overview of the draft conformance letter that was in the packet. The letter includes a
2 recommendation that RPCs be able to assist in project prioritization as included in statute. Dan asked the
3 municipal members of the CWAC if we should make a wastewater comment. Hinesburg – yes definitely
4 make the comment. RPC understands that the TBP acknowledges that we need to address non-point source
5 pollution even more so, so we don't have to spend so much more money on point sources. Andrea – add a
6 comment about climate change, increased flooding, and the importance of the floodplain protection. James
7 – happy to add a comment on non-point but DEC knows that. We are in this because of CLF but might as
8 well make the point. Andrea – would help if the general public could get a better understanding of the
9 issue – deficiencies in the regulatory system rather than blaming agriculture or wastewater treatment
10 plants, etc. Essex Junction would support similar language, they always bring it up whenever they can.
11

12 Dan recommended that the CWAC look at the Tactical Basin Plan so we can provide more robust
13 comments. Dan suggested that the CWAC specifically look at the Wastewater section because the
14 language is new.
15

16 Jim Pease – also make the point that the cost of the wastewater treatment updates is not cost effective.
17 Andrea – could you total up the cost of improvements by the municipalities v. the non-point source cost.
18 Should also send this letter to the Agency of Agriculture.
19

20 **7. Updates**

21
22 Charlie asked the CWAC to let CCRPC Staff know if there are any suggestions to improve these online
23 meetings.
24

25 **8. Items for Tuesday, May 5th meeting agenda.**

26 a) Review final draft of CCRPC Clean Water Service Provider application for Basin 5. Due May 8th.
27

28 **9. Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 12:18 p.m.
29
30
31

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony