



## **AGENDA**

### **Clean Water Advisory Committee**

**Thursday May 9<sup>th</sup> 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 4/11/19 minutes (enclosed)
- 4:20 PM: Upcoming CVRPC Board Committee Appointments
- 4:30 PM: DRAFT RPC Project Prioritization (enclosed)
- 5:30 PM: CWAC Resolution Letter to Board
- 5:50 PM: Wrap-up. Next Meeting Date 6/13/19?

1                                   **CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**  
2                                   **CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
3                                   **April 11, 2019**  
4                                   **Meeting Notes**

5  
6 A meeting of the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission’s Clean Water Advisory Committee  
7 was held on Thursday, April 11, 2019 in the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission Office.  
8

9 Committee Members Present:

- 10 Stewart Clark – Worcester Planning Commission  
11 Joyce Manchester – Moretown TAC  
12 Amy Hornblas – Cabot/Board of Commissioners  
13 John Brabant – Calais/Board of Commissioners  
14 Larry Becker- Middlesex Conservation Commission  
15 Gianna Petito - Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District  
16 Dona Bate – Montpelier City Council  
17 Michele Braun – Friends of Winooski River  
18

19 Committee Members Absent:

- 20 Ron Krauth – Middlesex/Board of Commissioners  
21 Russ Barrett – Northfield Conservation Commission  
22 John Hoogenboom – Moretown Selectboard  
23 Karen Bates – ANR  
24 Corrie Miller – Friends of the Mad River  
25 Brian Shupe – Friends of the Mad River  
26

27 Others Present:

28 None.  
29

30 **CALL TO ORDER**

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

34 **CHANGES OR AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

35 Bring minutes approval to beginning of meeting.  
36

37 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

38 None  
39

40 **APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 21 MINUTES**

41 Line 42, change comment regarding Cabot to “industries are allowed to spray on fields”.  
42 Stew moved that we approve minutes as changed. Dona seconded. Minutes approved.  
43

44 **APPROVAL OF MARCH 14 MINUTES**

45 Amy moved that we approve minutes as is. Dona seconded. Minutes approved.  
46

47 **OPEN MEETING LAW, CWAC NOMINATIONS?**

48 Pam and Dona explained the public meeting law and the group discussed what the requirements are if  
49 there is a quorum of people outside the meeting, communications, and public records requirements.  
50 Stew had some questions and Dona, Pam, Michele, and John provided response.

1 Chair: Pam went over that we need a chair. John nominated Dona, but she declined. Dona nominated  
2 Stew, declined.

3  
4 Stew nominated Amy. Larry seconded. Amy was nominated as chair.

5  
6 **CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION – CWAC PURPOSE & DIRECTION**

7 Pam went over the activities in the CWAC rules and procedures. Joyce mentioned that we should add  
8 bringing info to municipalities on clean water legislation and activities at the state. Important on this list  
9 is the prioritization and the implementation of projects, which will be actionable.

10  
11 Prioritization framework is really important to be choosing projects. Don't know if we would want to  
12 move forward without that. Pam will bring to the next meeting the DRAFT RPC prioritization for  
13 branching off.

14  
15 John, do we want to explore the Farm Bill and if there is money there for landowners for farm runoff?  
16 Should we assist municipalities in getting this info out to the landowners on the availability of these  
17 funds?

18 Gianna – getting information from towns as to what their priority issues are would be really valuable.  
19 Michele echoed that. Gianna said it would be a great way to let their neighbors know to reach out to  
20 WNRCD or to let Gianna know about farms they are concerned about.

21 John mentioned foresters know about these programs and can let farmers know about this and Gianna  
22 said that's great when foresters and farmers talk to each other about programs.

23  
24 Michele and Pam shared the Water Wise Woodlands project.

25  
26 Gianna – purpose of the CWAC – can we make it an activity to identify priority topics to be shared with  
27 the public.

28  
29 Stew – we have brought in a lot of information and we have conflicting pieces of information. When  
30 you add roundup to soils, you are adding phosphorus. When soil erodes there would be more  
31 phosphorus. People here have said that it is minute. Stew if we are concerned about phosphorus in  
32 forests, why are we not concerned about glyphosate.

33  
34 Michele and Pam reiterated that the input of phosphorus from forests is from logging operations. She  
35 talked about TMDL and Basin Plan implementation.

36  
37 Gianna pointed out that the use of glyphosate is weighed as “worth it” by environmentalists to use for  
38 invasive control than the phosphorus input that would result from erosion from the presence of Japanese  
39 knotweed not being able to hold the banks.

40  
41 John – this discussion started with not just glyphosate but was concerned about pesticides in general.

42  
43 Stew – still frustrated – if we are adding something that adds phosphorus. If manure is 200 times more,  
44 then glyphosate is 0.5 percent.

45  
46 Pam – we need to be science-based. So if we don't have the data on specific to glyphosate, then we  
47 don't have actionable strategies based on science.

1  
2 Michele – the practices will be the same if it is managing the farm fields.

3  
4 Gianna – concerns are valid but if our purpose is project prioritization, you may still feel unheard. Can  
5 incorporate concerns from glyphosate use into project prioritization.

6  
7 Pam – CWAC is encouraged to offer input on local and regional concerns. Resolutions would have to  
8 be approved by the Board.

9  
10 John – what glyphosate does is allows tiny farms be on the same scale of larger farm operations.

11  
12 Michele – can we move on past this issue?

13  
14 John and Amy – we need to discuss it.

15 Larry – we can do both.

16  
17 Larry – prioritization – can be a way to provide check and balances.

18  
19 **CVRPC CODE OF CONDUCT & CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY**

20 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

21 All committee members present signed the acknowledgement form that had not signed it yet. Still need  
22 Russ to sign.

23  
24 **SCHEDULE**

25 Should we go to every other Month? Skip July & August? Next meeting: May 9, 2019.

26  
27 Agenda items – prioritization, drafting of resolutions. Will not meet in July.

28  
29 Other announcements: WNRCD – UVM Septic Solutions conference May 9, 2019.

30 Erosion control workshop June 12 in Richmond.

31  
32 Pam – CVRPC has pre-qualified 4 firms for stormwater planning and engineering work. This will help  
33 streamline project implementation.

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