

1                                   **CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**  
2                                   **CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
3                                   **AUGUST 16, 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, July 12, 2018 in the Conference Room of the Central Vermont Regional Planning  
8 Commission.

9  
10 Committee Members Present:

- 11 Ron Krauth – Middlesex/ Board of Commissioners  
12 Stewart Clark – Worcester Planning Commission  
13 Russ Barrett – Northfield Conservation Commission  
14 Amy Hornblas – Cabot/Board of Commissioners  
15 Michele Braun – Friends of Winooski River  
16 Karen Bates – ANR  
17 Kristen Balschunat - Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District  
18 Larry Becker- Middlesex Conservation Commission  
19 Dona Bate – Montpelier City Council  
20 John Brabant – Calais/Board of Commissioners

21  
22 Committee Members Absent:

- 23 Michael Gray – Woodbury/ Board of Commissioners  
24 John Hoogenboom – Moretown Selectboard  
25 Brian Shupe – Friends of Mad River

26  
27 Others Present:

28 None

29  
30 **CALL TO ORDER**

31 Pam DeAndrea called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM.

32 Welcome and introductions: Introduced Kristen Balschunat from WNRCD and she went over the work  
33 that they do and their program.

34  
35 **CHANGES OR AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

36 Pam: would like to announce some events and meetings.

37 John: would like a segment to address pesticides to our conversations. Tonight and future agenda items.

38 Ron - Future conversations also – pharmaceuticals. John mentioned that USGS has done an herbicide  
39 and antibiotic studies in Midwest.

40  
41 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

42  
43 Dona commented on what a great job Karen did at the TAC meeting.

44  
45 **APPROVAL OF MAY 10 MINUTES**

46 June minutes: changes were made to the following lines as indicated in the draft circulated to the CWAC  
47 per Larry Becker’s suggestions: Lines 17-21 and line 42. June minutes are approved as amended by  
48 Larry’s comments.

49  
50 July minutes approved as is.

51

1 **DISCUSSION ON DRAFT WINOOSKI TACTICAL BASIN PLAN:**

2  
3 Stew- confused why we are going through the plan more when other agencies have needed a draft.

4 Karen - It is a work in progress and she is getting drafts to different groups at different times to get their  
5 feedback. Pesticides: looking at aquatic biological markers helps to see what factors may be influencing  
6 them. Urban: stormwater management will deal with the pesticides getting in. Agriculture: nutrients are  
7 tested for but not pesticides. John commented that you cannot see what the impact is on the micro-level.

8  
9 The group had a lengthy discussion about pesticides/herbicides and their potential impact to aquatic life:  
10 Karen – understand what pesticides could do and then decide what to study. Fisheries biologists are  
11 looking in the Missisquoi for impacts from pesticides/herbicides. If there can be a correlation between  
12 impacts to fish biology and time of spraying then water quality monitoring and management programs  
13 may change. That needs to change at the statehouse level. Need research to drive those changes.

14  
15 Stew - Establishing a cause and effect link seems problematic. We should be monitoring the water  
16 before the impacts are seen.

17  
18 Karen- can have Rick Levy to come and talk. In terms of this Basin Plan, if there was one area that was  
19 a source of pesticides where we need a study, we can put that in the Basin Plan. Small demonstration  
20 projects can then be put forward for change in legislation.

21  
22 Larry – could you do an analysis that shows where bugs are bad and correlate it with pesticide use?  
23 Would want to look at what those vectors may be. Karen – that would be a great UVM study.

24  
25 John – wetlands are waters of the state, and we should be looking at the streams that flow from the farms  
26 into the wetlands to protect the wetlands as well as streams.

27 Karen - Wetlands program is currently trying to figure out their priorities so they could perhaps look at  
28 runoff from farms into wetlands.

29  
30 Michele - Agency of Ag did a report to the legislature – atrazine – they don't look for the specific  
31 chemicals, they look for the effects. They cannot connect it to just atrazine due to all the other  
32 chemicals that cause endocrine disruption. They could not attribute the fish damage alone to atrazine.  
33 USGS is going to continue the research.

34  
35 Karen – what can we do in the Winooski Basin?

36 Pam – can we put it in as an item in the plan?

37 Karen – if there is no tool in the plan to use for a strategy, it is difficult to put in the plan. Karen can talk  
38 to Rick to see if there is anything in the works for the future. Are pesticide levels high enough that the  
39 water is not healthy for us?

40 John – it would be good to know what the base levels are.

41 Karen – how do you develop a monitoring strategy?

42 John – Calais Conservation Commission and selectboard may fund a study to monitor inlet to Sodom  
43 Pond and its outlet in East Montpelier.

44  
45 Larry – can you have in the plan to look at DEC and agency of Ag data? Karen – yes we can have it in  
46 there to look at previous data collection efforts.

1 Karen – we could perhaps get Ned Shambaugh to get involved. We could invite him to a meeting. We  
2 have to have a good enough argument to monitor.

3  
4 Stew – North Montpelier Pond. Pesticides may be an issue there due to the farms upstream.  
5 Karen will talk to Rick about concerns and she will email us about that.

6  
7 John – can we have maybe a section in the plan like an appendix?

8 Pam – we can include it as a formal recommendation from the Board.

9 Karen – She can put it in the watershed projects database.

10 Dona – would like our recommendation to come back to somewhere in the plan.

11 Larry – put in the plan that it is an objective to do more research on pesticide effects.

12 Michele – start with what they did in the Mississquoi do the same for the Winooski.

13  
14 Karen - WWTF may be the big source in the Winooski vs. ag in the Mississquoi.

15  
16 John – spreading sewage on ag fields is a big problem. Stew: Dog River fields also in the past.

17 Ron: we should investigate a solution to spreading the sewage more.

18 Amy – for example no till is a strategy that has unwanted repercussions

19 .  
20 Kristen – basin plan brings together all the studies together. Karen – yes but we can go above that where  
21 we will actually have assessments and monitoring. ANR then has a list where all the problems are and  
22 also what we need to do in the future.

23 Kristen - Maybe WNRCD could be a source for monitoring through their program. How can she tap in  
24 with what is needed?

25 Karen – when ANR gets info on impacts, then they will look at what data is out there and if not maybe  
26 implement more monitoring.

27  
28 **DRAFT WINOOSKI TACTICAL BASIN PLAN TABLE REVIEW:**

29  
30 Tables review summary:

31  
32 Karen: Table 4 – list of waterbodies are listed and their associated stressors. Provide me with info if we  
33 have missed anything.

34  
35 Table 5 – Lake Assessment – resource for folks to find information on any individual lake.

36  
37 Table 11 – Monitoring and assessment needs – water quality assessment needs.

38 Larry – can we add the pesticide issue into the plan in this way?

39 Russ – having it mentioned in the plan itself it would help for funding of groups wanting to do more  
40 monitoring.

41 Amy – and can we put in there monitoring the solutions.

42 Karen – since it is in our strategic plan to identify those waters that do not meet standards, and that we  
43 cannot allow a waterbody to degrade, then we can have specific actions in the plan to address the  
44 streams that do not meet standards.

45  
46 Stew had a question about classification – Karen explained classification. Pam suggested agenda topic.  
47

1 **CLEAN WATER FUND PROGRAMS:**  
2

3 Pam went over the grant programs and the questions over private vs. public land and that it was still a bit  
4 unclear as to whether stormwater projects on private land are fundable.

5 Karen mentioned that so many projects were not taken care of and that is why the agency is careful.

6 Pam mentioned that Ally from the ANR indicated that if there is municipal support and O&M  
7 commitment for a project on private land, ANR can fund it through the ERP program.

8  
9 **TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING**

10  
11 Pesticide/herbicide monitoring: invite Rick Levy and Ned Shambaugh,  
12 Water Quality Classifications

13  
14 **SCHEDULE**

15  
16 Next meeting: Tuesday, September 18? Pam will do doodle poll to be sure.

DRAFT