

1 **CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**  
2 **CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
3 **JUNE 14, 2018**  
4 **Meeting Notes**  
5

6 A meeting of the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission’s Clean Water Advisory Committee  
7 was held on Thursday, June 14, 2018 in the Conference Room of the Central Vermont Regional  
8 Planning Commission.  
9

10 Committee Members Present:

11  
12 Karen Bates – ANR  
13 Dona Bate – Montpelier City Council  
14 Russ Barrett – Northfield Conservation Commission  
15 Michael Gray – Woodbury/ Board of Commissioners  
16 John Hoogenboom – Moretown Selectboard  
17 John Brabant – Calais/Board of Commissioners  
18 Larry Becker- Middlesex Conservation Commission  
19 Stewart Clark – Worcester Planning Commission  
20 Brian Shupe – Friends of Mad River  
21 Amy Hornblas – Cabot/Board of Commissioners  
22

23 Committee Members Absent:

24 Michele Braun – Friends of Winooski River  
25 Corrina Parnapy – Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District  
26 Ron Krauth – Middlesex/ Board of Commissioners  
27

28 Others Present:

29 None  
30

31 **CALL TO ORDER**

32 Pam DeAndrea called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM.  
33

34 **CHANGES OR AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

35  
36 Add in review of tables to Basin plan review comments discussion.  
37

38 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

39  
40 No members of the public were present.  
41

42 **APPROVAL OF MAY 10 MINUTESs**

43 Changes were made to the following lines as indicated in the draft circulated to the CWAC. The  
44 amendments listed below were made based on discussion. Stew moved to approve minutes with  
45 suggested changes. Larry seconded.  
46

47 Page 2, lines 3& 4: add “The scope of the “Tactical” Plan is the entire Winooski Basin, within and  
48 beyond the area served by the CVRPC.”

49 Page 2, line 18: added the text to clarify which objective was being referenced in Stewart’s comment:  
50 “as described in TBP top objective #11”

1 Page 2, line 24: reworded lines 24 and 25 to be clearer on gullies: “Landslide and gullies: don’t fit into  
2 implementation categories nicely. Request from this group before it would be funded – what is the state  
3 of a particular gully? Does ANR fund it or is it too big?”

4 Page 2, lines 29 and 30: reworded to be clearer on reference to lakeshore habitats: “Stewart – Can we  
5 look at why we are looking at the Lake Champlain lakeshore when the Winooski Basin (the mouth of  
6 the Winooski River) forms such a small part of Lake Champlain coastline?”

7  
8 **BASIN PLAN COMMENTS**

9 Purpose for this meeting for comments: go through objectives. Pam will compile comments from  
10 everyone on CWAC and send them to Karen.

11 We also want to look through implementation table and make sure we are not missing anything.

12 In Karen’s email regarding guidance to review tables, Table 13 should have been listed as Table 11.

13  
14 John B. – is the agency dealing with glyphosate? Karen will reach out to ag folks to find out how we can  
15 do more with incorporating this.

16  
17 Larry: The stream equilibrium tracking method is not clear what the link to phosphorus loading is with  
18 this. Please make clearer and more understandable for audience.

19  
20 Stew: Table of contents and other areas refer to “Basin 8”. Please define Basin 8 early on or just use  
21 Winooski Basin within the Plan. Along the same lines, the “303d list” should be defined.

22  
23 Objectives: Karen reviewed them with the members of the group: protect river corridor protection and  
24 floodplain restoration were discussed. Stew asked if channel straightening and dredging will be included  
25 as something that is not the best way to manage rivers. Karen said that would be addressed later in the  
26 document.

27  
28 Larry – Is no till recommended? Karen responded that the plan does not necessarily recommend it but  
29 that it would be recommended through the NRCS.

30  
31 Brian- shouldn’t we have language in here that RAPs should be followed? Maybe a general comment  
32 that the ANR can provide technical assistant for the adherence to water quality regulations.

33  
34 John B. – Are other agencies that are doing other initiatives for farms being mentioned in the plan? A  
35 major concern in East Montpelier and Calais is more pesticides being applied on farms as they acquire  
36 more fields to farm that used to be just hay fields. Streams in area should be monitored for pesticides –  
37 baseline monitoring. KB response – they can ask pesticide monitoring in the DEC.

38  
39 The group discussed E. Coli in waters. Karen mentioned that watershed organizations volunteers have  
40 helped considerably - maybe LCCD or other district could do some monitoring if asked.

41  
42 Karen also mentioned Great Brook in Middlesex needing some assessment of stormwater. Pam said that  
43 Middlesex could be lumped that into a SWMP with Waterbury and that the conservation commission is  
44 interested as is Waterbury. Pam will email Stew information on it to possibly include Worcester in the  
45 plan.

46  
47

1 Other priorities:

2 Lakes – littoral zone. Strategies could include working with lake associations by connecting them with  
3 Lake Wise program. Get addresses from town clerks? Michael was not sure how to get in touch with  
4 them. That can be a strategy of how to contact lakeshore landowners.

5

6 Road erosion inventories – MRGP addresses what gets prioritized. Not sure how to fund the more  
7 expensive projects yet. Prioritization will be done through the inventory process in a sense since those  
8 roads that do not meet standards get identified.

9

10 John B. – is silviculture addressed? Karen responded yes. Brian mentioned that sugarbush operations  
11 are falling through the cracks on following the AMPS since they can fall under the agriculture category.  
12 Karen will look into that more.

13

14 Brian - There should be an objective on private roads. John H. indicated that Storm Smart program  
15 within the Mad River Watershed is a great program to help with private road assessment and fixing.

16

17 For towns outside of the Mad River Valley, Karen suggested to reach out to FWR for a private road  
18 workshop. Class 4 roads – make them a trail may be a solution sometimes. ANR can provide grants for  
19 groups like VYCC to do the work. Can put strategies in the plan for towns to deal with Class 4 roads.  
20 Stew- should address both planning commission and selectboard for outreach, conservation and road  
21 crews on strategies for Class 4 roads.

22

23 Wetland protection: Phosphorus reduction and flood resiliency also means protection of upper wetlands.

24

25 Tables: Karen will send out again with town names and what you would like them to review  
26 specifically.

27

### 28 **LANDSLIDE/GULLY FUNDING PRIORITIZATION**

29

30 Karen went over handout on criteria for landslide/gully restoration projects. Landslides will be put in  
31 the plan but gullies are more of a priority to fix. Landslides will not be funded that are along streams.

32 Stew – would tallis slopes be included? No since they are not causing water quality problems.

33 Larry – does it fit into TMDL? Is so, then shouldn't it be included? We can address the lake without  
34 addressing the gullies.

35 Karen Bates- When there are projects that propose sediment basins that need to be cleaned out regularly  
36 and it is unlikely that they will be cleaned out, Karen would prefer to not fund those: the reason is - why  
37 have a sediment basin at the bottom if there is no one to clean it out?

38 Stew- landslides after Irene. Karen – what would it take to restore them? She also mentioned that we  
39 can't fix everything and we are not supposed to.

40

### 41 **TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING**

42 Basin Plan Tables

43 Possible projects for Fall ERP grant applications

44

### 45 **SCHEDULE**

46

47 Thursdays: Next meeting July 12, 2018.