

1 **CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

2 **Executive Committee**

3 **DRAFT MINUTES**

4 **January 6, 2020**

5 Present:

Julie Potter Laura Hill-Eubanks Michael Gray
 Dara Torre Steve Lotspeich Janet Shatney
 Gerry D'Amico

6
7 Staff: Bonnie Waninger, Nancy Chartrand, Pam DeAndrea

8 Guests: Stewart Clark, Clean Water Advisory Committee – Worcester, Amy Hornblas, Chair – Clean
9 Water Advisory Committee

10
11 **Call To Order**

12 Chair Hill-Eubanks called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm. Quorum was present to conduct business.

13
14 **Adjustments To The Agenda**

15 It was advised that we will push bylaws ahead in the agenda to allow Amy time to arrive.

16
17 **Public Comments**

18 Stewart Clark of Worcester Planning Commission introduced himself as being a member of Clean Water
19 Advisory Committee.

20
21 **Financial Report**

22 Hill-Eubanks directed the Committee to the information in the packet. There was discussion regarding
23 the number of Aging Receivables and how there has been an overall slowing of State Agency
24 reimbursement; and information provided about the billing process based on the type of grant/project
25 and the impact this has – i.e. task based contracts, approval process for LEPC, product based contracts) .
26 Also discussed were grant estimates (Northfield Water Street) vs. final cost.

27
28 Waninger advised she will be requesting contracted accountant to add columns to the report indicating
29 if invoice has been sent; and if payment has been received.

30
31 *Motion made by J. Potter to accept the unaudited October 31, 2019 financial report; S. Lotspeich*
32 *seconded. Motion carried.*

33
34 **Strategic Plan**

35 Waninger provided an overview of the status of work projects. It was noted that the Regional Plan
36 Committee will be taking the housing proposal out of current plan and change the mapping for

1 Montpelier in order to amend the current plan; and will then move into work on a new Plan Central
2 Vermont.

3 4 **Bylaw Transition Actions**

5 Waninger gave overview of new bylaws changes. The change in the bylaws to a Secretary/Treasurer will
6 change the make-up of the Committee to 3 officers and 4 at large seats. Bylaws also outline the
7 Nominating Committee to be appointed at the January Board meeting.

8
9 Discussion ensued on whether we should move immediately to a Secretary/Treasurer; or wait until next
10 election of officers. It was suggested the Committee could address the Secretary/Treasurer position
11 now with one member holding the Secretary/Treasurer position and one becoming an at-large member;
12 and that a recommendation be made to the Board as to what the transition should be. M. Gray advised
13 that he was happy to become an at-large member.

14
15 *J. Potter made a motion that the Executive Committee recommend to the Board that D. Torre assume the*
16 *responsibilities of Secretary/Treasurer and M. Gray assume the responsibilities of an at-large member of*
17 *the Executive Committee; seconded by S. Lotspeich; a friendly amendment was suggested to add "In*
18 *order to comply with the recently amended bylaws" at the beginning of the motion; which J. Potter*
19 *agreed to. M. Gray seconded the amendment. Motion carried.*

20
21 The role of the Nominating Committee is to recommend a slate of officers for Executive Committee and
22 to recommend make up of all committees that Board elects. Discussion ensued as to how nominating
23 committees have historically been established. Last year Byron Atwood volunteered to chair the
24 Nominating Committee and then recruited other nominating committee members to be nominated for
25 approval at a future Board meeting. Discussion ensued as to whether it would be appropriate for two
26 Executive Committee members to split the role. J. Shatney volunteered to head up the Nominating
27 Committee; M. Gray volunteered to split the role with Janet. J. Potter suggested Lee Cattaneo as a
28 potential committee member. It was agreed that recommendation would be made to the Board at the
29 February meeting for a slate for Nominating Committee membership.

30
31 It was noted that several Policy documents will need updating or to be rescinded since bylaws change or
32 supercede them.

33 34 **Clean Water Advisory Committee**

35 Hill Eubanks welcomed Amy Hornblas, Chair of the Clean Water Advisory Committee (CWAC); and
36 Stewart Clark, CWAC member from Worcester.

37
38 Hornblas advised that the CWAC was coming to the Executive Committee to request approval to bring
39 to the full board, a letter to the Agency of Natural Resources (ANR) which outlines a number of concerns
40 related to the Winooski Tactical Basin Plan. Hornblas noted that there was an oversight in the letter
41 omitting to make note that it was no fault of the people who wrote the plan; recognizing that ANR is

1 following what the EPA has requested them to do. She noted that CWAC feels that there was a laser
2 focus on phosphorus while ignoring other issues which is not going to result in cleaner water; therefore
3 the letter in the packet is what the CWAC agreed upon were important items to bring to the
4 attention of ANR. It was noted that comments were originally sent to ANR, during the planning
5 processes, however they were not satisfied that they were addressed in the final plan. It was
6 confirmed the letter in the packet is an opinion letter and CWAC is asking the Executive Committee to
7 pass letter on to Commission to request approval to take it to ANR.

8
9 Extensive discussion ensued regarding chemical fertilizers, the sectors that contribute to phosphorus
10 loading, required agricultural practices, forest cutting. Noted was that greater funding is needed where
11 phosphorus loading is greatest and if there should be a reallocation of funding.

12
13 There was question if other RPC CWACs were raising similar concerns. DeAndrea advised that during
14 the basin plan review process she is aware of some of the items outlined in the letter being raised.
15 However, ANR can either act on the concerns during the planning process or not. She was not aware of
16 other RPC's following up post the publication of the plan.

17
18 Noted was if multiple RPC's had these types of concern it would have more weight if wrapped together
19 and presented through VAPDA. There was discussion if our RPC would need to support the letter before
20 CWAC goes to other commissions; or could they go out singularly to approach other commissions. Since
21 it is a viewed to be in policy arena; it is believed the Board should endorse the letter before it goes to
22 other RPC's. Concern was raised that it may be difficult to get concensus at VAPDA

23
24 CWAC members confirmed their ultimate goal would be to attach the letter to the current Winooski
25 River Basin Plan so it would be noted that questions about the content have been raised; for those
26 utilizing the plan in the future. It was noted that the Basin Plan would need to be amended in order to
27 attach; which may not be an easy task to accomplish.

28
29 Additional discussion ensued regarding the participation of the committee's non-profit organization
30 members as some of that participation appears to have scaled back. DeAndrea noted she was aware of
31 that one had noted the focus on glyfocate not being their mission as well as funding issues be noted as
32 well.

33
34 Clark responded that he doesn't believe that the watersheds group have withdrawn because of work on
35 the letter. He stated people started fading away before the start of letter development. Hornblas noted
36 that CWAC has been working on maintaining outside organization participation.

37
38 Additional discussion ensued regarding stakeholder engagement and education being needed in order
39 to not discourage participation. People are spending a lot of time researching important subjects –
40 understanding what ultimate outcomes might be. Also discussed was funding and how municipalities
41 may be impacted if funding was directed to agriculture vs. roads.

1 Hornblas advised that they don't expect Commission to understand every line of the letter; but want
2 faith of the Committee to allow them to comment that they did not endorse the basin plan. There was
3 recommendation to move forward to full the commission prepared with their presentation and
4 arguments. Suggestion was made to change "Clean Water Advisory Council" to "Clean Water Advisory
5 Committee" and clearly identifying municipal vs. RPC representatives who are signatories on the letter;
6 and then the revised letter could go before the Board. It was also suggested to add a request in the
7 letter that ANR address the concerns in the next planning cycle (five years).

8
9 Hornblas noted she will take these comments back to the Committee at their 1/9/20 meeting for their
10 approval for placement on the Board agenda. Some discussion ensued regarding whether or not
11 placement should be pended to find a Clean Water Expert to present at the meeting; however, no
12 consensus was reached.

13
14 Hill-Eubanks inquired of Hornblas if they felt ready to present to the Board at the January meeting; and
15 she confirmed she felt they were. Potter noted there should be a transmittal memorandum needed to
16 better explain why the letter is on the agenda. There was comment that it might be plausible to have a
17 hard stop on the discussion at the Board meeting for either a motion or continuance to another
18 meeting. Clarification was requested by Waninger of CWAC as to what the desired outcome of the
19 agenda item should be? It was clarified this was a motion to authorize the CWAC send the letter to the
20 ANR on behalf of the Commission. Waninger advised the revised letter could go out as a supplement to
21 the packet on Friday, following the CWAC's 1/9 meeting.

22 23 **Clean Water Service Provider Request For Proposals**

24 Hill-Eubanks directed the Committee to the information in the packet. An RFP is expected to be issued
25 in late January. Waninger advised it is not necessary to make a decision today, but requested the
26 guidance of the Committee before moving forward. Discussion ensued about how a potential contract
27 would be funded recognizing the recent slowing of ANR invoice reimbursement. Additional discussion
28 ensued regarding some of the expectations outlined in the draft RFP. Waninger noted start up grants
29 may be available for designated providers, and it is currently not known what total staffing would be
30 needed if an award were made.

31
32 It was discussed that a proposal could be completed; then a contract would be necessary if designated
33 as a provider; at that time the Executive Committee can authorize a contract or not. Completing a
34 proposal doesn't mean it is to be ultimately endorsed by the Committee. It was noted that clean water
35 is currently a state funding priority and we need to make a decision on the level of commitment we
36 want to put into it in order to maintain appropriate visibility.

37
38 *Motion made by J. Potter that Executive Committee supports having staff develop a proposal to act as a*
39 *Clean Water Service Provider for the Winooski River Basin. Seconded by M. Gray. Motion carried.*

40 41 **Appoint Personnel Policy Review Workgroup**

1 Potter advised she is willing to take on the workgroup and possibly chair it; but clarified it is up to the
2 Executive Committee to appoint members to the workgroup.

3
4 *Motion made by D. Torre to appoint Julie Potter as Chair of the Personnel Policy workgroup; seconded by*
5 *M. Gray. Motion carried.*
6

7 **Annual Evaluation Form**

8 Hill-Eubanks directed the Committee to the new form in the packet. Significant discussion ensued
9 regarding the new template, wanting to ensure that we maintain a 360 evaluation style, appropriate
10 areas to document any performance issues, and project completion. It was ultimately concurred that it
11 would be best to proceed with the new template and revisit its adequacy next year.

12
13 An evaluation schedule was also discussed and it was determined that Nancy would send out a schedule
14 to the Committee.

15
16 **Consent Items**

17 Hill-Eubanks directed the Committee to information in the packet.

18
19 *G D'Amico moved to approve consent items; seconded by D. Torre. Motion carried.*
20

21 **Commission Meeting Agenda**

22 Waninger advised she has invited Dan Currier to the Board meeting for a send-off with appetizers. It was
23 suggested to do a Certificate of Appreciation or Resolution to present. This would mean a 6:00 pm start-
24 time be added to the agenda; also discussed was moving minutes and reports to later to allow more
25 time for CWAC and potentially shortening time for CVEDC.

26
27 *J. Potter moved to approve the Commission agenda for February 3, 2020 with time changes discussed; J.*
28 *Shatney seconded. Motion carried.*
29

30 **Adjourn**

31 *D. Torre moved to adjourn at 6:55 pm; M. Gray seconded. Motion carried.*
32

33 Respectfully submitted,
34

35 Nancy Chartrand
36 Office Manager