

**CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE
January 9, 2020
Meeting Notes**

A meeting of the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission's Clean Water Advisory Committee was held on January 9, 2020 in the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission Office.

Committee Members Present:

Amy Hornblas – CWAC Chair, Cabot/Board of Commissioners
Stewart Clark – Worcester Planning Commission
Larry Becker- Middlesex Conservation Commission
John Hoogenboom – Moretown Selectboard
Dona Bate – Montpelier City Council
Joyce Manchester – Moretown TAC
Ron Krauth – Middlesex/Board of Commissioners (on phone)

Committee Members Absent:

John Brabant – Calais/Board of Commissioners
Russ Barrett – Northfield Conservation Commission
Rich Turner – Williamstown Planning Commission/Board of Commissioners
Michele Braun – Friends of Winooski River
Karen Bates – ANR
Corrie Miller – Friends of the Mad River
Brian Shupe – Friends of the Mad River
Gianna Petito - Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District

Others Present:

None.

CALL TO ORDER

Amy Hornblas called the meeting to order at 4:07 PM.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

CHANGES OR AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None.

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 12 MINUTES

- Stewart- line 10, page 3- Joyce was questioning why we should say funding would be allocated by sector- intent was that we want it to be allocated with respect to the phosphorus contribution from each sector. Stewart- add phosphorus contribution by sector.
- Stewart- motion to approve as amended. Larry and Ron- seconded. Motion carried.

UPDATE ON EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

There was an in-depth discussion among all members on the presentation of the letter to the Executive Committee, the EC response to the letter, and next steps to prepare to present the letter to the Board of Commissioners on Tuesday, Jan 14th. A summary of the discussion is provided below.

There was general discussion of the content of the letter. Some members noted that the process of writing the letter has been valuable to voice concern and focus attention but feels like the EC misinterpreted the letter and didn't realize that EC needs to approve the letter and that the letter would be coming from them (as opposed to coming from the CWAC). Pam noted that the letter needs the approval of the Board because CWAC is a committee of the board, and it is CWAC's charge to bring things to the Board. To be behind the letter, they need the backup information for some statements in the letter. She noted that the plan did address some concerns about pesticides but maybe not to the satisfaction of some members and she thinks the question from the EC is that the CWAC already had an opportunity to express concern, so they are concerned about this extra process step.

There was discussion among members of whether people had left CWAC because of the letter. Amy- feels that the email memo they're attaching to the letter (in the BOC packet) insinuates people have left CWAC because of the letter. She stated that she sent a Dec 7th email to CWAC members and got 3 responses, Michele responded that it was funding and did insert a paragraph about glyphosate.

Pam- recalled the meeting where Michele was trying to move past glyphosate issue and voiced it was not in her mission. Patti Casey reiterated glyphosate is not being found in groundwater. Michele from a scientific standpoint and from a mission standpoint feels that she could not spend time discussing the letter or putting her signature on it. She noted that she knows Gianna didn't feel comfortable putting her signature on it either- she was trying to help us understand that glyphosate is used in some instances to eradicate knotweed and also works with farmers. She noted that to say that this letter is not a reason why watershed groups aren't coming anymore is not entirely true. This is something CWAC needs to deal with since they are valuable partners for the CVRPC. The reason is funding too of course, but it is also this letter for some. Gianna was fine with the CWAC creating a letter but didn't want to be included in the signatures. She's really not coming because of funding. Corrie's not coming because of funding and distance. The whole start of the conversation of a resolution letter after basin plan was finalized was part of Michele not coming anymore, but funding was also an issue for her. It's not a priority for her mission for her organization to deal with a lot of these other issues. With basin planning funding through WUV, maybe this will help them come back to the table. With watershed groups for them to come here to meet their mission and make it valuable for them, we should be project focused.

Dona- said she thinks it's important to note that the memo is not accurate- only one person does not want to come because of letter.

There was discussion among members of whether to present the letter to the Board for approval or just raise awareness of their concerns and ask for direction from the Board.

Stewart- suggested members give the Board a better explanation of where the information came from and be prepared with answers to the questions. He noted members were seeking awareness

1 and want people to be aware of these problems as they work with the Tactical Basin Plan.

2 Amy/Dona-noted the Basin Plan is a federal government document and it's mandated to only
3 focus on phosphorus and that needs to be part of the discussion. They suggested the Plan could
4 get an addendum. Stewart noted he also suggested an addendum to the EC.

5 Joyce- said she would prefer explaining why their concerns with the Basin Plan using some of
6 the points from the letter and not worry about getting the letter approved.

7 There was discussion of using the CWAC Rules of Procedure (points #1, #4, and #6) to
8 underscore their motivation for the letter. Point #6 in the ROP is to focus on solutions and #1 is
9 to oversee programming.

10 Dona- suggested creating a 1-pager with specific points from the Rules and then stating their
11 concerns using the five points in the letter and that they were concerned the comments didn't get
12 due attention. Amy said she would put that 1-pager together. Dona said she would prefer to make
13 this letter and this request to the Board and have them vote on it.

14
15 There was discussion among Dona, Pam, and Stewart about how EC had stated that the CWAC
16 had spent a substantial amount of time on the letter. Pam noted that it's more that we're spending
17 many meetings on the letter than the # of minutes.

18
19 Larry asked Pam whether people believe phosphorus is a toxin. Pam noted that from a chemistry
20 standpoint phosphorus is a nutrient and that Karen added a strategy at the end of the plan that
21 says we'll deal with toxins, and that was supposed to be the lump of everything else besides
22 phosphorus that members had concerns over.

23
24 John said that his concern with the letter is that the whole key is scientific evidence and a lot of
25 the letter is opinion. But we are asking them to approve a letter when we really don't have all the
26 backup information. Maybe we should turn things around and take a different role and going
27 forward, ask what they would like us to do.

28
29 Dona/Joyce- said they could still present the letter and ask the Board to direct them.

30 Pam- noted that someone may point out that the plan is based on implementing strategies based
31 on available data, so if they don't have specific data there's not going to be a specific strategy to
32 address it. She said that could be a strategy itself moving forward with ANR, perhaps specific
33 toxins should be monitored. That was Karen's original response to some of the CWAC's
34 concerns, they can't put anything in the plan unless they have the water quality data to inform.

- 35 • Joyce- "Expenditures should be roughly"...I don't think expenditures should be roughly
36 equal to phosphorus source contribution. Start with "consideration should be given..."
- 37 • Amy- Also add town and role and identify who is commissioner.
- 38 • Joyce- Page 5, 2nd bullet on point 1 – strike
- 39 • John- Introductory sentence –strike the word significant.
- 40 • Stewart- And take dates out

41
42 Amy made a motion to approve letter as amended. Stewart seconded. Motion carried.

43
44
45

REVIEW CWAC RULES OF PROCEDURE

- Pam- We need to talk about membership to be prepared for when the Board appoints members in the spring.
- Larry- 1st page- “advice of this committee where possible should be science based”- questioning why “where possible” is needed.
- Pam- Happy to drop that.
- Dona- I would say we can include personal experience
- Joyce- “and not” instead of “,not”
- Larry- But letter isn’t backed up by reams of references and full report. Something other than “where possible”.
- Dona- Depends on how you define science based- usually talking about published study.
- Stewart- I was thinking more basic science like law of gravity, not individual studies.
- Pam- You had wanted to look at the rules of procedure again and maybe change them before the Board reappoints members in the spring.
- Dona – We shouldn’t change the membership as much, but perhaps who is voting and who is not a voting member should possibly be revised.
- Ron – There can be multiple interpretations on scientific studies. Maybe we should drop the “whim” from the statement on page 1.
- Larry – Perhaps we should say we have “Prevailing” concerns in addition to science based

CVRPC GRANT APPLICATIONS TO DEC AND LCBP-

LCBP grant - Pam gave an overview of the grant application CVRPC submitted today to the Lake Champlain Basin Program for an outreach and education grant. This grant would expand CVRPC’s 2018 work with High Meadows on Water Wise Woodlands program, which focused on educating forest landowners on the importance of intact forested headwaters for water quality and flood resilience. We will work with conservation commissions of Plainfield, Marshfield, and Cabot to pinpoint private landowner focus areas for outreach on future neighborhood scale or multi-property forest management plans. To help the CCs with focus area identification, the CVRPC will use maps developed as part of Water Wise Woodlands, which identify parcels not currently enrolled in Current Use that would benefit from being retained as forests due to certain properties (proximity to a waterbody, hydric soils, and steep slopes). The CVRPC will help the communities have three hands on walk in the woods events and distribution of materials on the importance of forested headwaters.

Partnership project development grant to DEC – The CVRPC will be submitting a grant next week to the DEC in collaboration with Lamoille County Planning Commission (LCPC) to help both RPCs develop projects for further funding for either design or implantation.

OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

SCHEDULE

Next meeting 2/13/20. Ideas for future CWAC meetings. Project development. Information that the health department is collecting on private wells. Jon Kim perhaps to come and present on PFOAS and radioactivity distribution.
Meeting adjourned at 6:05 pm.