



AGENDA

Clean Water Advisory Committee

Thursday November 8th 4:00 – 6:00 PM
Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission,
29 Main St., Suite 4, Montpelier, VT

- 4:00 PM: Welcome and Introductions
Public Comments
- 4:05 PM: Changes to agenda
- 4:10 PM: Approval 10/11/18 minutes (enclosed)
- 4:20 PM: Clean Water Road Map - Pam
- 5:00 PM: Update on ERP award, Plainfield Health Center – Pam; Other ERP awards?
FWR? Others?
- 5:20 PM: Other available grants/applications - Pam
- 5:40 PM: Project prioritization (enclosed) – Pam
- 5:55 PM: Wrap-up. Next Meeting Date 1/10/19. No December meeting! Happy Holidays!

1 **CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
3 **OCTOBER 11, 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, October, 11, 2018 in the Memorial Room in the Montpelier City Hall Building.
8

9 Committee Members Present:

- 10 Ron Krauth – Middlesex/Board of Commissioners
11 Stewart Clark – Worcester Planning Commission
12 Larry Becker- Middlesex Conservation Commission
13 Dona Bate – Montpelier City Council
14 John Hoogenboom – Moretown Selectboard
15 Gianna Petito - Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District
16 Corrie Miller – Friends of the Mad River
17 Russ Barrett – Northfield Conservation Commission
18 John Brabant – Calais/Board of Commissioners

19
20 Committee Members Absent:

- 21 Joyce Manchester – Moretown TAC
22 Brian Shupe – Friends of Mad River
23 Karen Bates – ANR
24 Michele Braun – Friends of Winooski River
25 Kristin Balschunat - Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District
26 Amy Hornblas – Cabot/Board of Commissioners

27
28 Others Present:

29 None

30
31 **CALL TO ORDER**

32 Pam DeAndrea called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM.
33 Welcome and introductions

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

36
37 If we have time, show Winooski Basin Plan Story Map

38
39 **APPROVAL OF AUGUST 16 MINUTES**

40 Page 1, line 7 – changed date to August 16.
41 Page 2, line 3 – changed “Stew- confused why we are going through the plan more when other agencies
42 have needed a draft.” To “Stew- confused why we are going through the plan when other agencies
43 continue to draft changes.”

44
45 Dona made motion to approve August 16 minutes with the above changes. Ron seconded. Minutes
46 voted yes for approval.

47
48 **APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 20 MINUTES**

49 Page 2, lines 4-5 – Added that Larry thought that the water quality problem with of the organics
50 contamination from the railroad could be engineered. Changed the wording as follows:

1 “Dona – could the runoff be treated someway – Nat – would have to tear up railroad bed or have
2 expensive linear treatment and it would still get into groundwater. Larry – can’t this be engineered in
3 some way though to treat what’s coming off the railroad bed prior to making it to the stream in that area
4 in Montpelier Junction?”

5
6 Page 2, Line 43 – say “longest undammed river”, not just “longest river”.

7
8 Larry motioned to approve the minutes with the above changes. John B. seconded. Minutes for 9/20/18
9 were voted as approved.

10
11 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

12 None.

13
14 **FOLLOW UP ON CVRPC BOARD MEETING ON 10/9/18 ON THE BASIN PLANS**

15 Pam went over how the review of the conformance letters went with the CVRPC Board. She mentioned
16 the suggested changes in the conformance letters to be sent to the ANR Commissioner, Emily
17 Boedecker. Folks agreed that putting the changes that are noted at the end of the Winooski
18 Conformance letter into the White River Conformance letter makes sense. This was suggested by John
19 Brabant at the Board meeting. Larry thought that we should add mention of pesticides/herbicides
20 though too in these comments in the third bullet. Pam will update the letters to reflect this before they
21 are sent to the Commissioner. Pam mentioned that we can maybe bring VAAFMs Patti Casey to come
22 talk to us about pesticide/herbicide monitoring in groundwater. She has reached out to her but has not
23 heard from her yet.

24
25 Larry-Can we get GIS data and lab results from VAAFMs on the pesticide/herbicide monitoring? Pam
26 will ask Karen again if we can get that data.

27
28 John B. talked to the discussion on distance to ponds and lakes for septic systems that he brought up at
29 the Board meeting. There could be improvement in the 2002 policy in addition to just a 50 foot buffer
30 distance since even though a system is far away it can still be piped and cause potential water quality
31 impacts.

32
33 **LAST MINUTE COMMENTS ON DRAFT WINOOSKI RIVER TACTICAL BASIN PLAN:**

34 The group would like to see data that they requested from Karen regarding pesticides/herbicides.

35
36 Building in river corridor. Seems like that too much is being allowed. We could propose strategies be
37 included to limit development in the floodplain/river corridors. Project prioritization give more weight
38 to those communities wanting to do more with river corridor protection.

39
40 Corrie – that is good idea but then it may not be fair to towns that can’t get the vote through.
41 Perhaps a strategy that lays out a way to encourage communities to adopt river corridor zoning and not
42 just the ERAF incentive.

43
44 Ron – what he would like to see – an overlay of surficial geology map. Would be nice to see the
45 relationship between the glacial deposits and the problems. Pam – this is coming from the VT
46 Geological Survey – they are combing quadrangles as digital overlays.

1 **LAST MINUTE COMMENTS ON DRAFT WHITE RIVER TACTICAL BASIN PLAN:**
2

3 No specific comments about the plan, but John H. – attended the VT Clean water network meeting. All
4 of VT, not just LC Basin. It was good for us to look at the White River plan because it helped us to get
5 out of the Lake Champlain. ECHO runs the VT clean water network. John H. put out that we need to
6 be less fragmented.

7
8 We need to communicate more. We need to have a list of Water Quality organizations on the CWAC
9 info page. Pam will work on that with Nancy C. and other updates to the watershed program webpage
10 this winter.

11
12 **FOLLOW UP ON NAT SHAMBAUGH'S PRESENTATION**
13

14 Larry - Montpelier Junction – we should pursue that as a project/problem.

15 Larry - Neonics – if it is ubiquitous, does not break down in dark; when we have the groundwater
16 feeding the surface waters then these are probably getting in the streams.

17 We can ask Patti Casey from VAAFAM if they can include neonics in their monitoring program.
18

19 Went over updated Winooski Basin Plan story map. The group was very happy with the project
20 explorer map and thinks it will be a great tool as we move forward.

21
22 **JANUARY ERP ROUND APPLICATION WISH LIST**

23 We did not have time for this topic.
24

25 **TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)**

26 ERP and LCBP grant applications.

27 VAAFAM visit to explain pesticide monitoring research – no word yet from Patti Casey.

28 Water quality classifications.
29

30 **SCHEDULE**
31

32 Next meeting: Thursday, November 8th. No meeting in December.

DRAFT RPC Project Prioritization Process Sec. 26. 10 V.S.A. § 1253 (d)(3(D)).... assist the Secretary in implementing a project evaluation process to prioritize water quality improvement projects within the region

Criteria Scoring For discussion who scores projects (RPC staff; + RPC subcommittee?; + some non-RPC reviewers?)	Score (Variable, 0-3)	Weighting (Fixed, 1 or 2)	Score
Hazard Mitigation Benefit (reduces vulnerabilities): 1 point: Identified in municipal Hazard Mitigation Plan 2 points: Same as above plus has significant hazard mitigation benefits and/or addresses repetitive damage concern 3 points: Same as above plus has FEMA BCA ratio greater >1		2	Max 6
Transportation Benefit 1 point: Improves transportation efficiency, capacity, and/or reduces ongoing maintenance of facilities/infrastructure 2 points: Same as above plus supported by the Region's long-range transportation plan (e.g. TIP, Regional Plan, etc.) listed as "candidate" in TIP/STIP or VTRANS Capital Plan (or prioritized by County TAC) 3 points: same as above plus in TIP/STIP/Capital Plan and identified for project implementation within next 2 upcoming years		2	Max 6
Socio-Economic Benefit 1 point: Improves or protects existing community social/economic asset 2 points: Creates new community social/economic asset 3 points: Either of above plus has public demonstration benefit		2	Max 6
Implements municipal capital plan or similar asset management plan 1 point: Identified in capital plan or asset management plan 2 points: identified in Plan but beyond 2 year window 3 points: identified as Capital Plan item in next year or following year		1	Max 3
Addresses a Permit Requirement: MRGP, FRP, PCP, 3-acre, wetland, lakeshore 1 point: Identified but not ranked to be done in next 5 years 2 points: identified in next 5-year Plan but not top 3 project 3 points: Identified in next 5-year Plan and in top 3 projects		1	Max 3
Community Support 1 point: Identified in existing community planning effort (Comprehensive Plan; Open Space Plan; Natural Resources Inventory; etc.) 2 points: Same as above plus identified in Regional Plan 3 points: either of above plus involves major local partner		1	Max 3
Part of multi-faceted initiative 1 point: A project that addresses surface water stressors and is part of a larger effort (e.g. several culverts upsized on one stream; ; brownfields; streetscape or bike-pedestrian improvements; 2 same as above but has significant non-municipal staff support....etc. E.g. 3-points if same as above and also multi-town project, etc.)		1	Max 3
Bonus points for other criteria not captured above 1-3 points [this must be clearly defined; be used sparingly and be equally available/applicable to all the municipalities within your RPC)		1	Max 3
		Score>>	
		MAX	33