

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

DATE: **Tuesday, June 1, 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: Catie Calabrese	Williston: Christine Dougherty
Colchester: Karen Adams (arr. ~12:30 pm)	Milton: Dave Allerton	Winooski: Ryan Lambert
Essex: Annie Costandi, co-chair	Shelburne: Chris Robinson	VAOT: Jennifer Callahan
Essex Junction: Chelsea Mandigo, co-chair	South Burlington: Dave Wheeler, Tom DiPietro	Univ. of VT: Lani Ravin
DEC:		
Other Attendees: Winooski NRCD: Remy Crettol; DEC; Stone Environmental: Amy Macrelis; Fitzgerald Environmental: Evan Fitzgerald		
CCRPC Staff: Dan Albrecht, 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 changes to the agenda nor public comments were made. As the meeting was online Dan asked for concurrence from the co-chairs to facilitate the meeting. The chairs concurred.

2. Review and action on draft minutes of May 4, 2021

After a brief recap by Dan, *Jennifer Callahan made a motion, seconded by Chelsea Mandigo to approve the minutes of May 4th as drafted. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED with no abstentions.*

3. Update on offline meeting concerning Adopt-a-Drain

Chelsea Mandigo noted that she had met with staff of some other towns regarding mutual plans to start an Adopt-a-Drain program, a national template managed by Hamline University in St. Paul, MN. Essex, Essex Junction and Burlington are definitely interested while Milton, Winooski and South Burlington are considering it. They will be meeting virtually with Hamline University staff later this week and will report back on the outcomes.

4. Review and approval of base budget elements for FY22

Dan brought up the rough draft of the proposed budget for FY22 on the screen. He explained that it would be good to have the committee adopt a budget that fund the essential annual elements before consideration of how to spend the surplus which will be addressed later in the agenda. Dave Barron of Pluck noted an error in the numbers for Pluck (which should total \$9,000) not \$12,180. After a walk-thru of the various budget elements, *on a motion by Christine Dougherty, with a second by James Sherrard the following budget was approved unanimously:*

RETHINK RUNOFF BUDGET, FY22	As Adopted	6/1/2021
Lead Agency Services: CCRPC		
Albrecht, Salary & Fringe plus indirect (~\$97/hr)	\$7,760	estimate: 80 hours
Web hosting, domain regis	\$450	
Incidentals	\$300	ad hoc purchases
Survey set aside, per annum	\$3,000	
	sub-total>>>	\$11,510

Advertising: paid to vendors		
July 1 - mid-Sept, 2020	\$10,000	
January 1 - February 28, 2021	\$2,800	
April 1 - June 30, 2021	\$13,200	
	sub-total>>>	\$26,000
Marketing: Pluck (@\$100/hr)		
Reports	\$1,500	
New Creative	\$1,000	
Content and Web Updates	\$3,500	
Ad production/placement/media buying	\$2,000	
Design for Stream Team	\$1,000	
	sub-total>>>	\$9,000
Stream Team: WNRCD (@\$50/hr)		
Admin	\$3,000	estimate: 60 hours
Outreach (+ cost of promotional items)	\$9,300	estimate: 180 hours
Project Development & Implementation (+ supplies, minor subcontractors, misc)	\$12,200	estimate: 200 hours
Mileage	\$500	
	sub-total>>>	\$25,000
	TOTAL	\$71,510
Dues@ 12 x \$6,000	\$72,000	

5. First review of possible uses of accumulated surplus

a) Projected Surplus: Dan displayed a table showing expenses to date and projected expenses for FY21. The prior estimate from our May meeting of \$14,886 is no longer applicable. The projected year-ending surplus is now about \$12,423 due mostly to him having 20 more hours in April and May then projected due to the effort needed to manage the Social Change Marketing RFP process.

b) Rethink Runoff options: Dave walked through his memo posted earlier. The options are shown in order of preference. 1. Social Media Content Development, estimated at \$250-\$1,000 per month. This would create opportunities for more 2-way engagement with residents rather than just one-way as currently happens with the Program broadcasting its message; 2. Interactive Basin Map, estimated at \$5,000 but this option would need more research if it is endorsed; 3. Refresh Current Animated Spots, estimated at \$5,000-\$6,000. This was originally planned for FY23 but could be moved earlier.

c) Stream Team options: Dan displayed the options presented by WNRCD in their memo posted earlier. These are 1. Regional Rain Barrel Workshop(s)-\$3,000; 2. UVM Campus Project-\$1,500-\$3,000; 3. Airport Project-\$1,500-\$3,000; 4. VTRANS Project-\$1,500; 5. Stream Clean Up-\$3,000 and 6. Add Stream Team Parameters (to water quality sampling)-\$3,000

d) Discussion: the following points were raised

Ravin: UVM happy to work with Stream Team on a project

Mandigo: could support use of surplus to do both MM1 and MM2 "new" projects

Dougherty: could support Regional Rainbarrel Workshop and a boost to advertising.

Sherrard: agrees with Dougherty. Surplus should be spent, not good to carry it

1 Callahan: could work with Stream Team to expand programming with VTRANS. Currently have rain barrel
2 display at Williston Welcome Center.
3 Dougherty: Disagrees. Wants use of the surplus funds to have regional impacts as per her earlier
4 recommendations. Noted however that it can be hard to find/purchase lots of rainbarrels.
5 Wheeler: all ideas are okay but wants to see a) large cisterns sized appropriately for roofs as rainbarrels are too
6 small and b) more promotion on reduction of salt use. He referenced such an effort in Wisconsin.
7 Sherrard: He wants to see surplus spent on additional media purchases. He (admittedly selfishly) advocated for
8 messaging that CSO overflows are not a big problem as they do not cause the frequent algal blooms.
9 Mandigo: She noted that all the other respondents to our RFQ promote the idea of more Social Media
10 Engagement.
11 Barron: followed up, we have just been doing one-way communication. Social media is more of a
12 conversation.
13 Mandigo: given time, let's summarize the consensus so far. No interest in new work on the basin map. For
14 MM2, add stream cleanup and stream team (water quality) parameters. There is interest in regional rainbarrel
15 workshop and doing some boost to media. Barron indicate he will refine the estimates for Social Media
16 Development. This will be discussed at the next meeting because we want to move quick to spend down the
17 surplus. Albrecht noted and Mandigo concurred that a small operational reserve is still appropriate (\$1k-\$2k)
18 to start the year and then we can assess its use later in FY22.
19

20 **6. How to keep stream flow monitoring going via-cost sharing**

21 Christy Witters, Amy Macrelis and Evan Fitzgerald all indicated that they are happy to help the MS4
22 communities in any capacity on this issue. Some of the potential candidate streams include Potash Brook,
23 Indian Brook, Morehouse Brook to name a few. Witters noted that although it is no longer required to be
24 collected having more data is always better. Some members noted especially the need for data on low-flow.

25 The staleness of bio-monitoring data (aka "bugs and fishes") was noted. Witters indicated that she is
26 reaching out to the DEC Bio-monitoring staff to see if they can produce data more frequently and in more
27 public-friendly format. Macrelis noted that the towns have been doing lots of work on flow restoration but we
28 don't know if it is working to revive the various bug and fish species. Wheeler noted that UVM researchers are
29 collecting data as well conducting more modelling so it would be good to have this flow data collected for
30 comparative purposes. Lani Ravin noted that UVM is developing a stormwater website and trying to populate
31 it with new data so we are willing to work with anyone to help the website be useful for everyone.

32 The discussion concluded that a meeting with Dave Braun between him and the municipalities would be
33 appropriate and also to discuss whether each town would pay just for its applicable stream or would the towns
34 pool funds.
35

36 **7. Update on Costandi & Mandigo presentation to NEWIPCC Nonpoint Source Pollution Conference**

37 Chelsea noted that she and Annie presented last Thursday. Over 100 people were signed on. Some questions
38 were received on budget, collaboration with other organizations and how we decide where we advertise.
39

40 **9. Items for July 6th meeting agenda**

41 New initiatives for FY22, Action Item: Stream flow monitoring for which streams, Adopt-a-Drain update,
42

43 **10. Adjournment** The meeting was adjourned at 1:28 p.m.
44
45
46

Respectfully submitted, Dan Albrecht