

CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
MS4 SUBCOMMITTEE
 OF CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE – **DRAFT** MINUTES

DATE: **Tuesday, April 6, 2021**
 SCHEDULED TIME: 12:15 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.
 PLACE: ONLINE via Zoom
 DOCUMENTS: Minutes, documents and presentations discussed and a video recording accessible at:
<http://www.ccrpcvt.org/meetings/clean-water-advisory-committee/>

Committee Members in Attendance		
Burlington: James Sherrard	Burlington Airport:	Williston:
Colchester: Karen Adams	Milton: Dave Allerton, Kirsten Jensen	Winooski: Ryan Lambert
Essex: Annie Costandi, co-chair	Shelburne: Chris Robinson	VAOT: Jennifer Callahan
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo, co-chair	South Burlington: Tom DiPietro, Dave Wheeler	Univ. of VT: Lani Ravin
DEC: Christy Witters		
Other Attendees: Winooski NRCO: Kristen Balschunat; DEC: Karen Bates; Pluck: Dave Barron		
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht (via phone), Regina Mahony, Sai Sarepalli		

1. Call to Order, Changes to the Agenda and Public Comments on Items not on the agenda:

The meeting was called to order at 12:17 p.m. No public comments were made.

2. Review and action on draft minutes of March 3, 2021

After a brief recap by Annie Costandi, *Chelsea Mandigo made a motion, seconded by Dave Allerton to approve the minutes of March 3rd as drafted. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.*

3. Recruitment of members to review proposals for Social Marketing Services

Annie Costandi explained that the social marketing services contract is up on June 30th, and it can't be extended. An RFP was put out on March 19th. Proposals are due this Friday. Annie Costandi asked for two more volunteers to help Annie, Chelsea and Dan with review of the proposals. Kirsten Jensen and Karen Adams volunteered.

4. Schedule www.rethinkrunoff.org review date for member input

Annie Costandi explained that Dave Barron sent an email a couple of weeks ago with a google doc where he was requesting feedback on the website. He has not received that many comments on the google document. Annie Costandi stated that we are going to host an open zoom meeting so members can provide Dave Barron with more direct feedback. Dave Barron added that this will likely take place in the last week in April. Dave Barron stated that it is a larger scale discussion on where we want to take the site. It is the fifth year of the site, and we have been pushing the action side of things more. The site has been adjusted every year, but it may be time to re-think things a bit more. Dave Barron will send out a doodle poll to schedule the meeting. Members can also reach out to Dave directly if that is more convenient. Most of the comments received on the google doc so far are straight forward, and Dave has been incorporating those edits.

5. Budget Update: See attached memo from Dan Albrecht

Annie Costandi stated that the purpose of this agenda item and memo is to inform the discussion on the Adopt-A-Drain program, which is next on the agenda. There is a \$61,000 account balance; and an expected \$47,000 in expenses which also includes funds accrued to help pay for a new survey in 2023. Therefore, there is a surplus of approximately \$14,000.

6. Decision on joining, budget allocation and member contributions to join Adopt-A-Drain program, <https://regions.adopt-a-drain.org/>

Chelsea Mandigo stated that there was a discussion about this at the last meeting, and the Committee was largely divided on whether to join the Adopt-A-Drain program or not. The concept discussed at the last

1 meeting was that costs for the start-up could be split between municipalities and the overall Rethink Runoff
2 budget and that some of the existing surplus could be used if members agreed. There were few people still on
3 the call at that point during the last meeting, so it would be helpful to have a more thorough discussion of this.
4 Chelsea Mandigo stated that it would be helpful to know where each municipality stands on this.

5 Chelsea Mandigo - Essex Junction is for this. Have some residents interested in this type of project.

6 UVM, Lani Ravin – Have a Department that addresses this for them already; therefore they would not
7 benefit from this. UVM would want to understand what this means for their financial contribution. Open to
8 alternatives. Lani stated that she does not have a set agenda in mind; but she needs to defend the \$6,000 annual
9 ask each year and wants to understand if UVM's contribution is subsidizing other work that they are directly
10 benefiting from.

11 Kristen Balschunat – stated that the issue at hand is for the municipalities that are interested, should they go
12 in on this separately or is there enough interest to do it collectively.

13 VTrans, Jenn Callahan – same issue as Lani Ravin; and not sure about using the surplus for this. Jenn
14 Callahan asked if this would be an annual expense? Kristen Balschunat said that the funding would only be
15 used for the initial \$250 set-up cost per municipality, and for exercising option #4 which funds setup costs and
16 printed materials. The cost would not be as great in future years.

17 DEC, Christy Witters – stated that this seems like more of a traditional MS4 program. So not a good fit for
18 UVM, VTrans and the Airport. So perhaps the municipalities that want to participate can do it out of the
19 traditional MS4 funding.

20 Burlington, James Sherrard – stated that we've been doing rain barrel workshops, etc that UVM, VTrans
21 and the Airport have not necessarily directly benefitted from all along. However, we are all collectively
22 benefiting from this work and its benefits to the Lake. This brings up a larger issue if the non-traditional
23 organizations don't want to support these types of programs. Seems like we can use a portion of the surplus –
24 doesn't have to be all or none. Burlington is very interested in this program.

25 UVM, Lani Ravin – agrees that UVM is in the program for the benefit of the larger community. But
26 perhaps if we have such a large surplus perhaps the dues can be reduced?

27 So. Burlington, David Wheeler – stated that So. Burlington is on the fence because they already have staff
28 that do this work. It doesn't rise to a top priority of what they'd like their residents to do. It seems better to
29 have the street sweeper do this work, and not incentivize residents using plastic trash bags to collect and weigh
30 the debris. It is also not clear if the City would be able to get phosphorus reduction credit for this work.

31 Winooski, Ryan Lambert – stated that Winooski is on board with this at \$0.05 per resident. Winooski's
32 DPW is currently responsible for street sweeping but they only go out every so often so this could help clean
33 out the catch basins in the in between. Ryan Lambert stated that he doesn't think they'd ask residents to weigh
34 the debris. Ryan Lambert also added that Winooski would support pay structure #3 because it is paperless, and
35 he doesn't believe the mailings would provide much benefit. Yard signs are also tough in Winooski because
36 they wouldn't be allowed in the ROW and may not be that effective if not right next to the drain.

37 Pluck, David Barron – added that part of the benefit of the program is to actually get people involved and
38 aware of the issues.

39 DEC, Karen Bates provided this comment in the chat - I see Dirt washing off landscaped residential
40 property in south Burlington into storm drains. This program could remind people of what shouldn't go down
41 drains.

42 Milton, Dave Allerton – Milton would be in favor of this because they don't have a street sweeper and have
43 limited staff capacity to keep the drains cleaned out.

44 Kristen Balschunat indicated that Christine Dougherty emailed from Williston and indicated that it would
45 not be a good fit for Williston; and that Chris Robinson emailed that he would only be in favor if completely
46 run by Stream Team staff because they don't have staff to run the program. It seems like there is some support
47 for this from the Town's who'd like help with street cleaning, and education; and others that have this work
48 covered.

49 Chelsea Mandigo stated that it seems clear that there isn't consensus on this being a MS4 initiative; given
50 that is it possible to use the surplus for the municipalities that are interested? David Barron suggested that
51 perhaps the surplus should be used for a program that would cover all of the partners. James Sherrard
52 expressed concern about making a decision about surplus and splitting it up. Dan Albrecht clarified that there

1 are 12 members, 9 municipal and 3 non-traditional. Dan Albrecht stated that he'd discourage voting today on
2 how to divide up the surplus because that is part of a much larger discussion.

3 Jenn Callahan - added that this is either a program in the Stream Team work or not. If it isn't then it would
4 be awkward to use the funding for that. We are all benefitting; but if it isn't part of this program then we
5 shouldn't use this money for it.

6 Tom DiPietro – stated that he'd prefer the money that was put into the program be used for the program.
7 Perhaps we should have a larger conversation about what would be a good use of the money; rather than just
8 talk about this one program. He's unclear where this program came from.

9 James Sherrard – suggested that perhaps a municipality could opt to not do their next round of the rain
10 barrel work and instead do this.

11 Chelsea Mandigo stated that it was the Village's turn to do the rain barrel project and wanted to create a
12 program similar to this instead. Then they realized that Adopt-A-Drain already exists as a formal program.
13 Burlington was interested too, and they thought that it might have more common interest. Kristen Balschunat
14 stated that they can certainly help a Town do adopt a drain work rather than the rain barrel work; but they have
15 limited funds and so they'd need to know if funding was available from the Rethink Runoff budget. Since it is
16 April, Kristen Balschunat stated that she needs some direction to get started on programming for this summer.

17 Chelsea Mandigo suggested that perhaps we need to have a discussion on the surplus next year; and then
18 talk about the Adopt-a-drain program as an option within the Rethink Runoff program. Burlington, Essex &
19 Essex Junction are interested in moving forward on this program and so perhaps they work with Kristen on
20 this directly. All three of them are project towns this year. Kristen Balschunat could help them with that, but it
21 would be more efficient to roll out a county-wide program.

22 Lastly, Kristen Balschunat stated that she believes this is where the municipalities stand on the program:

	Interested	Not Interested	Unsure/Maybe
Burlington	X		
Essex	X		
Essex Junction	X		
Milton	X		
Williston		X	
Winooski			X
So. Burlington		X	
Shelburne			X
Colchester	X		

23 **7. Discontinuance of Additional Flow Monitoring, see 3/18 email from Witters**

24
25
26 Christy Witters discussed an email that she sent where the state decided that Flow Monitoring is no longer a
27 requirement for MS4s. The flow monitoring doesn't seem to be producing results that they were hoping for.
28 She heard from Winooski that they would be interested in continuing with flow monitoring. Christy would like
29 to know if there is interest from others; and if so whether the state would hold the contract as they've done in
30 the past. Ryan Lambert stated that Winooski is interested in continuing but it does depend on the cost to the
31 City. He added the instrumentation is already in place and it doesn't seem like a bad idea to keep this data
32 point especially to help figure out changes to rain events and drought. Also, it is a helpful control data point.

33 *[Kristen Balschunat left the meeting.]*

34 Tom DiPietro stated that So. Burlington does have some interest in continuing to monitor some watersheds but
35 not all – would be interested in Potash. Part B to this is that they've put so many projects in and they'd like to
36 see how that is reflected in the flow modeling. Christy Witters stated that the current model is not the easiest to
37 use, and only one person can run it. They are interested in upgrading the model but it is a matter of funding.

38 Jenn Callahan stated that she would be interested in the modeling conversation. They are okay with
39 discontinuing flow monitoring, but would like to know more about the long-term plan. Are we only going to
40 rely on biomonitoring? Christy Witters stated that ultimately the biomonitoring is the main factor in the
41 permit. DEC/ANR is going to have a bigger conversation about overall stream health because biomonitoring
42 isn't the best indicator for all of the impairments/stressors. Jenn Callahan added an interim indicator to help us

1 know if we are doing the right projects would really be helpful, especially because changes in the
2 biomonitoring really takes a long time to see if there are improvements or not. Christy Witters will keep the
3 MS4 Committee posted on these conversations and will provide an update at the next meeting.
4

5 There was a discussion about the MOU and when this will expire. Christy will talk to Dave and Blain about
6 this and figure out the latest information and can continue the conversation at the next MS4 meeting.
7

8 **8. Updates**

9 None

10 **9. Items for May 4th meeting agenda**

- 11 1) Media contracts
12 2) Consider two-year extension to WNRCD Contract
13 3) Discussion about the surplus and how it could be used.
14 4) Check in on stream health/flow monitoring discussion.
15

16
17 **10. Adjournment** The meeting was adjourned at 1:27 p.m.

18
19 *Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony*
20