



AGENDA

Clean Water Advisory Committee

Thursday June 13th 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 5/9/19 minutes (enclosed)
- 4:15 PM: CWAC Resolution Letter to Board (draft enclosed)
- 5:00 PM: Completed Stormwater Master Plans – Pam DeAndrea, CVRPC
- 5:45 PM: CVRPC Board Committee Appointment Announcement – Pam DeAndrea, CVRPC
- 5:50 PM: Other Announcements
- 5:55 PM: Wrap-up. Next Meeting Date 8/8/19?

1 **CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
3 **May 9, 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, May 9, 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 – CWAC Chair, Cabot/Board of Commissioners
13 John Brabant – Calais/Board of Commissioners
14 Larry Becker- Middlesex Conservation Commission
15 Dona Bate – Montpelier City Council
16 John Hoogenboom – Moretown Selectboard
17 Ron Krauth – Middlesex/Board of Commissioners
18

19 Committee Members Absent:

- 20 Michele Braun – Friends of Winooski River
21 Karen Bates – ANR
22 Corrie Miller – Friends of the Mad River
23 Brian Shupe – Friends of the Mad River
24 Gianna Petito - Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District
25 Russ Barrett – Northfield Conservation Commission
26

27 Others Present:

28 None.
29

30 **CALL TO ORDER**

31 Amy Hornblas called the meeting to order at 4:07 PM.
32 Welcome.
33

34 **CHANGES OR AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

35 None.
36

37 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

38 None.
39

40 **APPROVAL OF APRIL 11 MINUTES**

41 Stewart moved that we approve minutes as is. Joyce seconded. Minutes approved.
42

43 Stewart comment - Clarification from line 34 & 35 page 2- Pam and Michele reiterated that phosphorus
44 input is from logging operations – actually the input is from soil disturbance from logging operations
45 and other activities.
46

47 **UPCOMING CVRPC BOARD COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS**

48 Pam – Board is in the process of reappointing committee members. Pam explained what seats are up
49 and that there are some other Board members interested.
50

51 Stewart – not sure we should open it up to more commissioners. Should be more of a balance.

1
2 Dona, John H., and Stewart would like to keep it the number of commissioners on the CWAC to 2 and 1
3 alternate and maintain the 5 municipal seats to non-board members. Dona made a motion on this,
4 seconded by Stewart. Motion passed.

5
6 Stewart and Larry would like to stay on.

7 Larry – based on the upcoming legislation, we don't know what our balance should or would be.
8

9 **DRAFT RPC PROJECT PRIORITIZATION**

10 Pam – presented the draft RPC prioritization to the CWAC which was developed two years ago by RPC
11 staff in coordination with the DEC to augment DEC prioritization, which is based on natural resource
12 and water quality benefits. Pam said they can use this prioritization as a jumping off point for CWAC
13 project prioritization.

14
15 Stewart- does not like this because the CWAC is charged with clean water not social factors. We should
16 change this to be more scientific.

17
18 Larry – should we develop our prioritization first or after what the DEC does?
19

20 Joyce – at the TAC, VTrans comes to meetings to let them know their ranking and then TAC can choose
21 among it.

22
23 Dona – having the data from the DEC would help to decide what projects to move forward with.

24
25 John – this needs to be simplified.
26

27 Criteria:

28 Discussion was had by all on what the criteria should be and the CWAC came up with the following
29 criteria categories:
30

31 1. Improves water quality to be validated by measurement or prior evidenced based outcomes on similar
32 projects established science.

33 Larry – like that since it is delivered by metrics.

34 Pam – not sure what you mean about “validate by measurement”; are you suggesting that we
35 sample everywhere or can we use established models/studies?

36 Larry – can we get DEC's criteria?

37 Pam – yes and she will share the STP calculator.

38 Stewart – we need to have the water quality benefits as highest.

39 Joyce – yes but we want to include the social benefits as well.
40

41 2. Hazard mitigation Benefit

42 Larry – river corridor protection is linked to water quality and habitat protection.
43

44 3. Ancillary environmental benefits
45

46 4. Produces positive effects on the groundwater/surface water systems.
47

1 5. Public Benefit; recreational/educational.
2

3 6. Ranked as a high priority project within a previous plan or study, e.g., River Corridor Plans,
4 Stormwater Master Plan.
5

6 **CWAC RESOLUTION TO BOARD**

7 Amy talked about how last time we talked about other water quality concerns and that we may want to
8 share our feelings in a resolution letter to the Board. There are some practices that by implementing
9 them, we are perhaps making the water quality situation worse, such as no till and spraying more
10 pesticides to kill the weeds.
11

12 Larry – phosphorus only? Or other things like groundwater?

13 Amy – it was more about all things contributing.
14

15 Dona – we wrote comments before for the Basin Plan on pesticides, no-till

16 John H – I don't like about what is happening in the forests. Certain industries like power companies
17 and property owners can cut trees indiscriminately.

18 Ron – sometimes they cut trees in a way for the power lines, but does not look right once its cut. Could
19 plan better about what trees would be planted there.
20

21 Joyce – should we target the letter to one thing, or many things?

22 Larry – yes I agree we should limit it.
23

24 Amy – things that we not included in the Basin Plan - bulleted items.
25

- 26 • Pesticides/herbicide use
 - 27 ○ No till, treated seeds
 - 28 ○ Neonics
- 29 • Cutting forests/trees for power company/industry & property owners
 - 30 ○ Removing trees disturbs the soil – not just loggers
- 31 • Groundwater/surface water interaction
32

33 Ron - Solutions may have problems down the road and should be considered.
34

35 Pam will draft a letter for review include in the packet to review at the next meeting.
36

37 **SCHEDULE**

38 Next meeting: June 13, 2019.
39

40 Meeting adjourned at 5:55 pm.



June 4, 2019,

RE: Resolution Letter from CVRPC Clean Water Advisory Committee

Dear Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission Board Members,

Members of the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission (CVRPC) Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC) would like to present to the Board of Commissioners a resolution of the following concerns:

1. That the programs the CWAC is charged with encouraging in order to reduce phosphorus may, in fact, lead to the water being contaminated by other dangerous chemicals. In the same way federal policies may encourage farmers to use nutrients through subsidies, those same policies and programs may encourage the heavy use of pesticides, herbicides, chemical fertilizers and genetically modified (GMO) seeds, none of which will help us create local food security, help the farmers to thrive, or clean the water. By encouraging one type of practice to reduce one type of pollution, we may actually be introducing another type of pollution.
2. The CWAC would like to be cautious about encouraging policies and practices that could increase other kinds of water quality impacts and possible ecosystem damage. The CWAC's main concern is pesticides, such as Glyphosate (aka Roundup). The use of this product has been increased in recent years and will continue to increase as farms use it as part of practices like no-till, which is encouraged to reduce sediment and phosphorus runoff.
3. Water quality improvement policies and strategies are focused on sectors that not only make the smallest contributions to the phosphorus problem, but also can least afford the added expenses, such as small farms and municipalities.
4. Groundwater quality and the interaction between groundwater and surface water is not factored into the surface water management strategies. Since it is not a closed system, the CWAC is concerned of the exclusion of groundwater in the planning and strategies for surface water quality improvement.