



AGENDA

Clean Water Advisory Committee

Thursday January 10th 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: Guest Speaker – Patti Casey, Groundwater Monitoring Program – Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Food and Markets
- 5:15 PM: Approval 10/11/18 minutes (enclosed)
- 5:20 PM: Approval 11/8/18 minutes (enclosed)
- 5:25 PM: Discussion: Winooski Tactical Basin Plan Responsiveness Summary (enclosed)
- 5:55 PM: Wrap-up. Next Meeting Date 2/14/19? Or 2/21/18 due to Valentine's Day?

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.

47

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 VAAFM 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 VAAFM 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.

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, November 8, 2018 in the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission
8 Office.

9
10 Committee Members Present:

- 11 Ron Krauth – Middlesex/Board of Commissioners
12 Stewart Clark – Worcester Planning Commission
13 Larry Becker- Middlesex Conservation Commission
14 Dona Bate – Montpelier City Council
15 John Hoogenboom – Moretown Selectboard
16 John Brabant – Calais/Board of Commissioners
17 Joyce Manchester – Moretown TAC

18
19 Committee Members Absent:

- 20 Russ Barrett – Northfield Conservation Commission
21 Gianna Petito - Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District
22 Corrie Miller – Friends of the Mad River
23 Brian Shupe – Friends of Mad River
24 Karen Bates – ANR
25 Michele Braun – Friends of Winooski River
26 Kristin Balschunat - Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District
27 Amy Hornblas – Cabot/Board of Commissioners

28
29 Others Present:

30 None

31
32 **CALL TO ORDER**

33 Pam DeAndrea called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM.
34 Welcome and introductions

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

37 None.

38
39 **APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 11 MINUTES**

40
41 Did not have a quorum. Could not approve minutes. Will take them up at next meeting.

42
43 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

44 None.

45
46 **CLEAN WATER ROAD MAP**

47
48 Pam presented the VT DEC clean water road map to the committee and showed them all how to zoom in
49 on an area, select a subbasin and see phosphorus loads by land use. We also explored the BMP scenario
50 and how that showed reductions in phosphorus loads.
51

1 **ERP AWARD UPDATES**
2

3 Pam went over the Plainfield Health Center project that was awarded a grant for final design for
4 stormwater mitigation. Pam showed photos from the stormwater planning effort and reviewed where the
5 project was using the Winooski Basin Story Map.
6

7 Ron: Middlesex is putting in a grant for sidewalks in the village. They should probably look at the
8 stormwater as well during this process. He would like to bring that up at TAC. Pam will check in with
9 Dan as well. Moretown went through a similar situation where they got the sidewalk funding.
10

11 **OTHER AVAILABLE GRANTS/APPLICATIONS**
12

13 Pam mentioned that she will be putting in a grant application with the Lake Champlain Basin Program
14 for final design of 3 stormwater projects in Berlin. The Town of Berlin is very supportive of the project
15 and wants to move forward with concept designs that were done as part of the stormwater master plan.
16

17 **PROJECT PRIORITIZATION**
18

19 Pam went over the Draft project prioritization that RPCs created a couple of years ago for weighing in
20 other factors besides phosphorus reduction into project prioritization, such as hazard mitigation and
21 other community needs. The entire group was not on board with it because it seemed like it was getting
22 away from the science. Pam said that this was just an introduction to it at this point and that we would
23 come back to it.
24

25 Stew had a comment that the weighting of socio-economic should be changed from 2 to 1- what people
26 want may not be what is best for the environment. Permit requirement should be weighted higher.
27

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

29 VAAFm visit to explain pesticide monitoring research – Patti Casey will be coming to CWAC meeting
30 January 10.
31

32 **SCHEDULE**
33

34 Next meeting: Thursday, January 10th. No meeting in December.

Appendix G – Responsiveness Summary and Regional Planning Commission Letters of Conformance

Vermont Agency of Natural Resources

Winooski River Tactical Basin Plan

DRAFT PUBLIC COMMENTS RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

December 2018

On October 1, 2018, the Vermont Agency of Natural Resources, Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) released a final draft of the Winooski River Tactical Basin Plan (TBP) for public comment. The public-comment period began on October 1, 2018 and ended on October 31, 2018 and included three public meetings. The public-comment meetings were held on:

- October 2, 2018 – 6:30-8:00 PM – Williston, VT
- October 9, 2018 – 7:00-9:00 PM – Berlin, VT
- October 17, 2018 – 6:30-8:00 PM – Essex Junction, VT

The DEC prepared this responsiveness summary to address specific comments and questions and to indicate how the plan has been modified. Unless otherwise noted, the comments were received from the Chittenden County, Central Vermont and Lamoille Regional Planning Commissions’ Clean Water Advisory Committees and/or Board members through their staff. The comments below (in bold) may have been paraphrased or quoted in part. The full text of the comments is available for review or copying at the Essex Junction Regional Office of the Department of Environmental Conservation, 111 West Street, Essex Junction, VT.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED BY THE VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION (DEC):

Project Prioritization

1. **Comment: Project prioritization method should be based on high phosphorus removed benefit per cost ratio and consider co-benefits such as other TMDLs hazard mitigation, transportation improvement, aquatic organism passage. Projects listed in municipal comprehensive plans and capital plans should also receive additional consideration in making funding decisions.**

Response: The DEC is refining the project prioritization process based on environmental outcomes that incorporate water quality data, the outcomes of sector-based assessments, and BMP and land use modeling scenarios. Often the cost estimates associated with projects identified through sector-based assessments are not quantified until the projects go through preliminary and final design engineering, which can then be compared to potential pollutant load reductions that are calculated

using the [Stormwater Treatment Practice](#) (STP) calculator and/or once implemented using the [Lake Champlain BMP Accounting and Tracking Tool](#) (BATT). The mechanism for incorporating local (municipal) regional priorities, as well as co-benefits is under development through a stakeholder interface with the [Watershed Projects Database](#) (WPD) that will allow statutory partners to integrate these additional priority project scoring. Many projects identified in the WPD already have co-benefit scoring that reflect the project values that address the ten priority stressors identified in the [Vermont Surface Water Management Strategy](#).

- 2. Comment: Given that phosphorus-loading concerns are the most critical problem in the watershed and given the requirements in the Lake Champlain TMDL are the most pressing, the Basin Plan should make it clear that some of the 11 “Top Objectives and Strategies” are more important than others.**

Response: State and federal legislation require that surface water management plans, like the tactical basin plan, identify strategies that will achieve the “fishable and swimmable” goals of the federal Clean Water Act, as well as attaining the criteria set out in the Vermont Water Quality Standards for designated and existing uses for all surface waters. A surface water that has an approved TMDL will have more explicit goals established regarding pollutant load reductions and the timeframe associated with achieving those reductions. This may result in more resources directed towards implementation actions that will help to achieve the pollutant load reductions for that waterbody surface water. This may be enhanced by State and federal legislative actions that identify and support additional technical assistance, funding as well as new regulations. The Winooski River Tactical Basin Plan emphasizes the actions and attendant resources needed to achieve the goals and target load reductions set forth by the Lake Champlain Phosphorus TMDL in Chapter 3.

- 3. Comment: Development of projects in Critical Source Areas for phosphorus loading should receive priority.**

Response: Critical Source Areas (CSA) may be given priority by funding sources, such as currently established by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation District for EQUIP funding. At this time, projects in CSA are not prioritized in the tactical basin plan; however, assessments in CSA are supported. For example, AAFM will prioritize inspections in agricultural CSAs.

In addition, a list of highest priority catchments (the area draining to a surface water with an average size of 5 square kilometers) has been identified through the downscaled Soil and Water Assessment Tool, or “SWAT” modeling analysis, which allows geographic targeting as the highest priority for project (“BMPs” or best management practices) implementation, and the prospective locations for practices in a general sense (see [Winooski Tactical Basin Plan](#) Figures 15-20).

- 4. Comment: The Regional Planning Commissions, through their Clean Water Advisory Committee should be allowed to provide input to DEC’s prioritization scoring system as intended by statute: Title 10, Chapter 47, §1253(d)(3)(D) ... [the regional planning commissions are to] assist the Secretary in implementing a project evaluation process to prioritize water quality improvement projects within the region to assure cost effective use of State and federal funds.**

Response: The mechanism for incorporating local (municipal) regional priorities, as well as co-benefits is under development through a stakeholder interface with the Watershed Projects Database (WPD) that will allow statutory partners to integrate these additional priority project scoring.

Pollutants other than Phosphorus

- 5. Comment: Include strategies and projects that address pesticides/herbicide, toxins, and nitrate from groundwater entering streams and wetlands that may impact water quality and aquatic life health.**

Response: The TBP includes specific strategies that address known or suspected sources and causes of impairment, alterations (from flow modification, etc.), and where there are known “stressors” to surface water quality, see the [Vermont Surface Water Management Strategy](#). These would include the above-mentioned pollutants where they result in impaired or stress surface water. At this time, there are no known sources of impairments or suspected impairments to surface waters from pesticides, herbicides, or other toxins. In response to interest expressed by partners in reducing use of toxins, the Implementation table does include the following general strategy: Assist land managers in managing or reducing use of toxins that adversely impact aquatic biota

To determine the potential for these pollutants to be the source of surface water impairment, the DEC depends on state-wide monitoring or assessment of these pollutants. Programs that support monitoring of the above pollutants include the [Agency of Agriculture Food and Markets Pesticide and Groundwater Monitoring Program](#), which supports the monitoring of wells adjacent to agricultural operations to identify any potential threats to human health.

In the Lake Champlain Basin, several investigations over the last 20 to 30 years area on Organic contaminants of Emerging Concern has also inform DEC’s monitoring work. The work is summarized in [“Organic Contaminants of Emerging Concern in the Lake Champlain Basin: A Review of Current Knowledge”, 2016, LCBP Technical Report #85.](#)

The public can also bring any concerns to the [Vermont Pesticide Advisory Committee](#) for additional discussion regarding support of additional monitoring.

6. Comment: Implementation table should address other stressors such as chloride, mercury, thermal stressors and flow alteration.

Response: All of the degraded surface waters in the basin are listed in Table 4, along with the associated stressors, including those listed above. In addition to listing degraded surface waters, Table 4 includes the ongoing regulatory action to address the identified stressors. Additional explanation of how stressors are addressed are outlined in the [Vermont Surface Water Management Strategy](#).

The Implementation table (Table 37) includes strategies that are in addition to actions supported by regulatory programs and therefore do not include remediation or protection strategies for all of the degraded surface waters in the basin. Chloride (Toxins) and thermal modification are two of the above stressors that are identified in the Implementation table.

7. Comment: Toxins related to commercial and industrial pollution should be included.

Response: Commercial and industrial entities that discharge polluted waste water to rivers are required to meet the federal permit process (NPDES) that is managed by Vermont as a NPDES-delegated state. In addition, they would be required to meet the State [Multi-Sector General Permit Stormwater Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity \(MSGP\)](#), which authorizes operators of stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity to discharge to waters of the State. The permit requires industrial facilities in 29 different industrial sectors to, among other things, implement control measures and develop site-specific stormwater pollution prevention plans (SWPPPs) to comply with NPDES requirements. The DEC Environmental Assistance program also works with businesses to facilitate compliance as well as to consider additional voluntary pollutant reduction actions. The TBP acknowledges in Chapter 3 that these processes exist and are in place to ensure surface water protection. No additional strategies are needed.

Commenter: Kai Mikkel Forlie

8. Comment: Plan doesn't mention any of the thousands of non-nutrient-related contaminants commonly associated with wastewater treatment plant effluent like antibiotic-resistant bacteria, pharmaceuticals, regulated and unregulated industrial chemicals, radionuclides, etc. Is there a plan to tackle these issues in some other report? If so, what is the rationale of leaving them out entirely from the one document that is supposed to be comprehensive in its coverage?

Response: The contaminants noted above are referred to as Contaminants of Emerging Concern (CEC). These CECs from wastewater treatment facilities (WWTF) are of statewide concern and will be regulated through the State wastewater discharge permits as we determine the acceptable level of risk to human health and the environment and as advanced treatment options are developed. The [Vermont Surface Water Management Strategy](#) includes discussion of these Contaminants of Emerging Concerns as well as the State's efforts to

continue monitoring to assist in determining risk to human health and the environment (see response to comment 5 for additional explanation).

The tactical basin plans are required to address documented impairments or stresses to surface waters and describing current or proposed actions to protect or remediate surface waters.

9. Comment: Discuss impact of Chloride use and alternatives in plan.

Response: Table 37, the summary of implementation actions, does include a strategy that supports education and outreach about appropriate winter management with the goal of reducing chloride use. Alternatives to chloride would be included in educational material. The plan directs the reader to Vermont Surface Water Management Strategies for background information and the VSWMS includes a discussion of chloride in Appendix B.

10. Comment: Note impact of beaver dams on fish habitat and spawning in the plan

Response: The focus of the plan is to address the physical, biological and chemical condition of surface waters that in turn allow the surface water to protect uses, which does include aquatic habitat. The question as to the impact of beaver dams on fisheries would be more appropriately discussed in a [fisheries or wildlife management plan](#), which would address the specific threats to fisheries that were outside the monitored and assessed condition of surface waters.

Format of Plan

11. Comment: Incorporate more lay-person language to increase readability and understanding by the general public. Especially avoid using acronyms, such as TMDL or TP.

Response: The TBP has been developed to meet State and federal requirements, which require the use of terms that may be unfamiliar to the lay person. To enhance the readability of the plan, the plan includes a link to a glossary as well as a list of acronyms.

12. Comment: Add conclusion statements at the end of each chapter or section that would provide a summary of the data and provide a basis for the subsequent objectives and actions.

Response: The immense amount of information provided by the assessments and monitoring data would make it difficult to summarize in one paragraph. A reader may look to the [VSWMS](#), which provides the basis for the strategies that are identified through water quality monitoring data, sector-based assessments, and through modeling and tracking tools.

13. Comment: Organize the Top Objectives and Strategies listed on page ix with those listed within Table 36 (on page 139) would also help strengthen and reiterate the desired outcomes of the plan. Both page ix and Table 36 list objectives and strategies but they are not consistent. The

next table, Table 37 is more detailed but does not necessarily line up with the other tables. It can be confusing to the reader to decipher which are the strategies and the priorities.

Response: Each of the lists have a different purpose. The top objectives and strategies are a subsection of Table 37, which includes all objectives and strategies. Table 36 focuses on identifying general strategies that are associated with each of the objectives in Table 37.

14. Comment: Clearly identify and highlight priority locations for treatment and resource protection, to ensure alignment of local and regional resources investment.

Response: The Summary of Implementation Actions (Table 37) includes geographic specificity where available. Where towns are required to direct resources through legislative mandates, they will have the specific assessments and prioritization process that allows them to determine resource needs and to provide documentation to request additional regional assistance, e.g., Road assessments for the State Municipal Road General Permit and the Flow Restoration Plans to meet the federal Stormwater (MS4 stormwater) permit.

15. Comment: Two basin plans are being developed concurrently within the region and while these plans only overlap in three of our towns, if the plans followed the same format it would increase the relationship between the plans and the objectives they strive to attain. Similar formats would also decrease confusion within those communities.

Response: DEC is in the process of revising the TBP format to ensure consistency and across all TBP Plans going forward.

Resource Allocation

16. Comment: Soften language in below sections to make it clear that only a relatively small proportion of the actions can be implemented given not only the relatively low level of funds available but also the sheer human capital needed to scope, design and implement the projects within the next five-year period.

“t)he Tactical Basin Plan actions are described in Chapter 5’s implementation table summary and the Watershed Projects Database and will be addressed over the five-year life of the Winooski Basin Tactical Basin Plan.” (p.2) and “(i)t is envisioned that the action items currently in the database as of the signing of the plan will be accomplished within the next five years as resources allow.” (p. 135).

Response: Additional language will be added to clarify that completion of projects is dependent on resources that include landowner support, as that is an additional limiting factor to consider. Overall, the tactical basin planning process cannot predict future decisions of the legislature or partners regarding resource allotment to address actions. The intent of the above quoted language

is to set an expectation that the extent of project implementation over the next five years is dependent on available resources, include funding sources and partner support.

- 17. Comment: Allot more funding towards project development at this early stage so that in subsequent years it will be easier to determine which projects reduce the most phosphorous per dollar.**

Response: The intent of the plan is to support project development, which is reflected in strategies (Table 37) that include the identification followed by remediation or restoration activities; however, the allotment of funding is established by processes outside of the tactical basin planning process. Examples of funding are those programs overseen by the Vermont Clean Water Fund Board, as well as NGOs, and State and federal legislation.

- 18. Comment: Provide mechanisms for municipalities and other property owners with permits to invest in Natural Resource or Agriculture sector phosphorus reduction, which would clearly provide for much more phosphorus reduction per dollar spent. While the “all-in” approach to phosphorus reduction has a certain marketing appeal, it is clear both from a financial efficiency and efficacy standpoint that requiring multi-million-dollar upgrades to municipal wastewater plants to remove a relatively low amount of phosphorus is counterproductive to achieving the targets established in the Lake Champlain TMDL. Simply put, the imposition of additional costs (at a poor phosphorus per pound removal rate) on municipal wastewater systems (and to some extent municipal stormwater systems) will make it difficult for Chittenden County communities to develop appropriately and to meet key Strategies outlined in the 2018 ECOS Plan.**

Response: The State legislature has acknowledged this need with the passing of Act 185 in 2018, which will allow municipalities to support natural resource restoration projects at a substantially reduced cost through loan forgiveness over time when upgrading wastewater and infrastructure through the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund and [DEC’s “Sponsorship” Program](#). This new program will be added as a funding source to appropriate strategies in the Summary of Implementation Action (Table 37).

Act 185 expanded the previous definition of “water pollution abatement and control facilities” to a more inclusive “clean water project” definition. This definition encompassed the previous eligibilities, added natural resource project definition, and included projects that provide water quality benefits. The definition for natural resources project, under section 4752 (17) reads: a project to protect, conserve, or restore natural resources, including the acquisition of easements and land, for the purposes of providing water quality benefits.”

- 19. Comment: Many towns do not have the ability to pay match requirements for expensive stormwater remediation projects beyond in-kind contributions. Reduce the match to make funding through grant programs more accessible to these municipalities.**

Response: Although, the plan does include strategies to support municipalities in their efforts to remediate and protect surface waters, grant programs and supporting legislation or organization boards determine match requirements. See the [DEC Clean Water Initiative Program funding policy](#), which is (in part) determined by the legislature

Additional Comments

20. Comment: Separate out surface water in tables to low, middle and upper region of watersheds

Response: The grouping of surface waters is helpful to the reader who may be interested in a region. For that reason, most strategies are organized by subwatersheds that tend to encompass communities that are united by geography or organizations. The Mad River may be the best example, where a regional planning entity, the Mad River Planning District supports economic and natural resource planning in a valley. To assist the reader who may be more focused on municipal boundaries, the plan identifies the town associated with surface water. As lower, middle or upper regions in the basin are not called out in any planning documents, the regions may not be as of interest to communities as the town or smaller subbasin.

21. Comment: Regarding Table 12, split into separate tables based upon TMDL status rather than lumping together, delete Agriculture as a Priority Stressor on MS4 impaired streams if it is not a priority stressor; Split Cobb and Hollow Brooks into two separate rows if issues are different.

Response: Recommendations were considered but were not incorporated into plan. Regarding the first and last question, the surface waters in the table are broken out by geographic proximity and not cause of impairment, which the TMDL would refer to. Agriculture is a priority stressor in some sections of streams located in MS4 communities.

22. Comment: Chapter 3, Lowland “Urban” Watersheds section: flesh out section and made more prominent by inclusion of Table showing the 4 impaired streams, which towns are affected, the date of the respective FRP and the status of PCP development for each of the MS4 towns in the watershed.

Response: A reference to Table 4 will be added to this section, which identifies stormwater-impaired streams and provides some of the above additional information. The previous paragraph also includes a link to the [Stormwater TMDL page](#), where all of this information would also be available.

- 23. Comment: Include language within the Basin Plan that recognizes the presence of historic Regional and Town (and Village) Centers in river corridors and floodplains and clarify how DEC will work with regional organizations and municipalities to accommodate these special circumstances. Add recognition of historic development pattern on page 10, within the Rivers section and on page 32, within the Stream Geomorphic Assessment section.**

Response: The following language will be added in Chapter 3, Flood Resilience Efforts section on Page 117:

“DEC recognizes that Vermont’s historic settlement have resulted in a significant level of river corridor encroachment in densely developed areas. The DEC model hazard bylaws contain provisions to facilitate infill and redevelopment in designated centers and densely developed areas within river corridors and flood hazard areas. DEC regional floodplain managers routinely provide technical assistance to municipal and regional planning staff on incorporating these provisions into town regulations.”

The DEC encourages communities to take protective measures that will restore, maintain and enhance water quality in all areas, and plan strategies do not preclude any development that is consistent with municipal bylaws, regional and municipal plans, and with applicable state and federal regulations.

- 24. Comment: Include further discussion and analysis of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) base requirements compared to the recommendations of the State River Program model flood hazard regulations and model river corridor regulations. The model river corridor regulations make an allowance for infill within state designated historic downtowns and villages. This information could be added into the Flood Hazard Regulation section on page 121.**

Response: A comparison of NFIP requirements relative to those recommended by the Rivers Program is beyond the scope of the Plan. The DEC Hazard Area Bylaws and Emergency Relief and Assistance (ERAF) section of the Plan (page 117) does provide a link to the [model hazard bylaws webpage](#) where a “Higher Standards Cross-walk” document provides a side-by-side comparison of NFIP minimum standards and the higher standards recommended by the Rivers Program:

https://dec.vermont.gov/sites/dec/files/wsm/rivers/docs/rv_ModelFloodHazardBylaws_HigherStandardsCrosswalk_2018.pdf. See responses above for additional text appended to *Chapter 3, Flood Resilience Efforts section, page 117*

- 25. Comment: Recommended edits to clarify definition of public water supply class A2**
- a. In table 31, expand on the A2 classification definition of use by noting it can be a water supply in active use or previously used**

- b. Modify the title of Table 32 to read “surface waters classified as A(2) that are currently managed as public drinking water supplies**
- c. Modify the title of Table 33 to read “Basin 8 waters previously used as a public or emergency water supply**

Response: The recommended changes were made to the plan.

- 26. Comment: Stormwater master planning (SWMP) should not be limited to very developed municipalities such as Waterbury and Williamstown. More rural municipalities could benefit from stormwater master planning in addition to road erosion inventories that address compliance with the Municipal Roads General Permit. Many of the rural towns in our region without a stormwater master plan have villages that have impervious surfaces in need of stormwater management, such as Worcester and Middlesex. Furthermore, more complex road projects can be addressed through stormwater master planning, such as those needing dry well design to help slow and infiltrate runoff from steep roads.**

Response: There are [SWMP templates](#) for regional or multi town approach with rural road focus and incorporated into the [SWMP guidelines](#) and projects identified through this process are eligible for funding through the [Better Roads Program](#).

- 27. Baseline monitoring should be incorporated into water quality monitoring strategies within the plan.**

Response: The DEC supports the Monitoring, Assessment and Planning Program (MAPP) of the Watershed Management Division to provide baseline monitoring as well as analyze data and the support additional work by volunteer groups through the LaRosa Lab Partnership Program (discussed in Chapter 2). Where we understand that Best Management Practices (BMPs) may be installed, WSMD also supports baseline monitoring before installation to help determine the benefits and effectiveness of BMPs.

- 28. The water quality benefit of development limitation of landslide hazard areas should be stated.**

Chapter 2, in Landslide Hazards section, describes impact of landslides on water quality at end of first paragraph. A second sentence will be included at the top of page 31 to provide the connection between water resource protection and town planning: “The result could work towards placement of infrastructure away from landslide prone areas, reducing damage to future infrastructure as well as protecting water resources.”

Commenter: Brian Fitzgerald

- 29. Recommendation to add Camp Wihakowi Dam, on Bull Run in Northfield to Table 9. Preliminary engineering for removal has been completed. Friends of the Winooski is leading the project, the owners want to pursue removal, and I believe the town is supportive.**

The dam will be added to Table 9.