



## **AGENDA**

### **Clean Water Advisory Committee**

**Thursday September 12<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 8/8/19 minutes (enclosed)
- 4:15 PM: CWAC Resolution Letter to Board (draft number 3 enclosed)
- 5:50 PM: Other Announcements
- 5:55 PM: Wrap-up. Next Meeting Date 10/10/19?

1                                   **CENTRAL VERMONT REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**  
2                                   **CLEAN WATER ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
3                                   **August 8, 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, August 8, 2019 in the Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission Office.  
8

9 Committee Members Present:

10 Amy Hornblas – CWAC Chair, Cabot/Board of Commissioners  
11 John Hoogenboom – Moretown Selectboard  
12 Russ Barrett – Northfield Conservation Commission  
13 Gianna Petito - Winooski Natural Resources Conservation District  
14 Ron Krauth – Middlesex/Board of Commissioners  
15 Stewart Clark – Worcester Planning Commission  
16 Joyce Manchester – Moretown TAC  
17 John Brabant – Calais/Board of Commissioners  
18

19 Committee Members Absent:

20 Larry Becker- Middlesex Conservation Commission  
21 Michele Braun – Friends of Winooski River  
22 Karen Bates – ANR  
23 Corrie Miller – Friends of the Mad River  
24 Brian Shupe – Friends of the Mad River  
25 Dona Bate – Montpelier City Council  
26

27 Others Present:

28 None.  
29

30 **CALL TO ORDER**

31 Amy Hornblas called the meeting to order at 4:04 PM.  
32 Welcome. Rich Turner, new member introduced, alternate member for commission from Williamstown;  
33 appointed last month by CVRPC Board. Rest of CWAC present introduced themselves to Rich.  
34

35 **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

36 None.  
37

38 **CHANGES OR AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA**

39 Gianna would like to share Required Agricultural Practice (RAP) information after approval of minutes.  
40 Stewart – discuss draft prioritization of projects after approval of first set of minutes 5/9/19.  
41

42 **APPROVAL OF MAY 9 MINUTES**

43 Page 2 of 3 Line 31 #1 under criteria. Does not make sense. Please reword to “with established  
44 science”.

45  
46 John H. moved to approve as amended; Ron seconded. Minutes approved as amended.  
47

48 Stew had question about prioritization in the minutes. Have these been shared with the DEC? Pam – not  
49 yet, we need this to be on another agenda. Act 76 may change how we prioritize projects and what  
50 projects we do, so not sure if we want to go through this whole exercise of coming up with a

1 prioritization method. Let's table this until we talk about Act 76, which will need to be on a future  
2 agenda as well.

3  
4 **APPROVAL OF JUNE 13 MINUTES**

5 John B. – need to include his email in the minutes that was referenced within the minutes.

6  
7 Gianna made a motion to approve minutes as amended. John H. seconded. Minutes approved as  
8 amended.

9  
10 **REQUIRED AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES (RAP) – GIANNA PETITO, WINOOSKI**  
11 **NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION DISTRICT (WNRCD)**

12 Gianna shared RAPs summary that she shares with farmers and presented the binder that she uses with  
13 her outreach to farmers. WNRCD helps farmers go through the process of helping them with their  
14 nutrient management plans.

15  
16 Stew – are you limited to cow manure concerns or can you include chemical fertilizers?

17 Gianna – we share with them the RAPs, which are specific about cow manure, but they do talk to them  
18 about other natural resources concerns.

19 Stew – has concern of hemp farm in their town and what chemical fertilizers they may be adding to the  
20 soil.

21  
22 Gianna - Heavy ag conservation districts have been reaching out to Hemp farmers, WNRCD has not  
23 done much with Hemp farmers.

24  
25 John B. - are animals prohibited from wading in streams? Gianna - Not unless a complaint has been filed  
26 and there is a water quality concern. Smaller farms that do not meet the small farm cutoff, no not have  
27 any requirements around animals in the streams unless there has been a complaint and a water quality  
28 concern.

29  
30 Gianna went over each farm classification and what is required by them under the RAPs.

31 Stew mentioned an article in VT Digger on pesticide recording.

32 RAPs - nutrient management planning, discharges, soil health/eroded soil, manure storage, manure  
33 spreading, buffers, mortalities, livestock exclusion.

34  
35 Joyce had a question if the tax department can share information on where farms are. Gianna said no  
36 since that is not public information. VAAFM is working on a map of where all farms are located in VT.  
37 Gianna is hoping to get some grant funding to map farms that are near wetlands and surface waters.

38  
39 Gianna – would love it to have folks to farm visits.

40  
41 Stew – thought that RAPs applied to all types of farms. But it seems like it is slanted to dairy.

42  
43 John B. – can put in Town Plans to direct farmers to NRCS for grants and assistance.

44  
45 **RESULTS OF COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS FOR CWAC**

46 Pam explained the results of the CWAC 2 year term appointments by the CVRPC Board. These  
47 appointments were made at their June meeting.

1 Amy Hornblas (Commissioner)  
2 Rich Turner (Commissioner alternate seat)  
3 Larry Becker (municipal representative)  
4 Stewart Clark (municipal representative)  
5 Joyce Manchester (interested stakeholder)  
6

7 John H. - Discussed to possibly remove Friends of Mad River be removed from the CWAC since they  
8 never come to the meetings and they sway their quorum to need too many people.  
9 Pam – since the board just appointed committee members, we would have to wait until next year to do  
10 so, but it would make sense since it does affect our quorum. John B. – they could be members at large  
11 and that way they would not affect our quorum.  
12

### 13 **LAKE CHAMPLAIN CLEAN UP FUNDS DISCUSSION – STEWART CLARK**

14 Stew – based on this article that it seems we are spending more on stormwater than ag.  
15 Joyce – she listened to the Secretary of ANR on the radio and she explained that it was more about the  
16 time of when the money was available did not line up with specific sectors.  
17

18 Stew - Does the political component direct funds more at towns than at farms?  
19

20 Ron – you never hear on news about farm fields washing away during a large storm, you hear about the  
21 treatment plant over flows.  
22

23 Amy is worried that money will be spent and then not available in the future for other projects.  
24

25 Ron – point sources are easier to measure so that’s why it is focused on more.  
26

27 Gianna – budget; capital money – can only be used on infrastructure type projects, e.g., stormwater and  
28 wastewater.  
29

### 30 **CWAC RESOLUTION LETTER TO BOARD (DRAFT NUMBER 2)**

31 Pam drafted a second resolution letter which is included in the packet.  
32

32 Concern #2 – needs revision.  
33

33 Stew – suggested that we reword the sentence that starts with “Water quality improvement...” to remove  
34 the text “such as developed lands” and “not only” so the sentence would read: “Water quality  
35 improvement policies and strategies are focused on some sectors that make the smallest contributions to  
36 the phosphorus problem.”  
37

38 Joyce – the first sentence that identifies the sectors should line up with the sentence that describes the  
39 phosphorus loading from each sector. Pam will revise this to be clearer.  
40

41 Concern #3 – John B. and others suggesting rewording the second sentence to read “The CWAC is  
42 concerned with excluding the interaction of groundwater and surface water in the planning and strategies  
43 for surface water quality improvement.”  
44

45 Concern #4 – Needs revision:  
46

46 Russ – The first sentence is not valid. Commercial operations do have to meet AMPs. They would be  
47 subject to fines if they were found to be declining water quality in surface waters.

1  
2 Gianna – there is some non-regulatory dialogue happening to plant meadowland vegetation under power  
3 lines.

4  
5 Joyce - we should revise to “The CWAC is concerned that commercial or infrastructure operations, such  
6 as power companies, may not always follow Accepted Management Practices when cutting trees.  
7 Additional outreach and if necessary enforcement may be needed.”

8  
9 Stew – would want to add in other concerns: PFOAs and Radioactivity.

10  
11 Pam – you really need to finish this letter up for presentation to the Board, so if you are adding concerns  
12 please finalize them at the next meeting.

13  
14 **OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS**

15 Pam – Act 76 – Pam went over that the legislature passed a new act for the provision of water quality  
16 services. This law will affect how water quality funding is delivered to organizations like WNRCD,  
17 CVRPC, and watershed groups and how projects will be prioritized for funding. It will also change the  
18 makeup of our CWAC. We do not yet know the specifics as it has not gone through rulemaking yet.

19  
20 Pam – It would be good to put this on our next agenda to discuss the rule and whether or not it would  
21 even make sense to finalize a prioritization process for projects in the region.

22  
23 **SCHEDULE**

24 Next meeting: September 12, 2019.

25  
26 Meeting adjourned at 6:02 pm.



August 9, 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 water quality degradation by other chemicals. Management practices that are aimed at reducing one type of pollution, such as nutrients, may result in the use of products that would cause another type of impact to water quality or aquatic organisms. 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.
2. Phosphorus load allocations and reduction targets set for the Winooski River Basin are categorized by the following sectors: Forest, Stream Channels (i.e., erosion from streambanks), Agriculture, Developed Land (roads and impervious surfaces), and Wastewater. Water quality improvement policies and strategies are focused on some sectors that make the smallest contributions to the phosphorus problem. Phosphorus loading by land use type for Lake Champlain have been modeled and are included in the Winooski Basin Plan. The largest contributor of phosphorus is agriculture, with 48% of the loads. Forests contribute 18% of the loads, while developed lands contribute 15%. The remaining percentages come from unstable river channels (9%), unpaved roads (6%), and sewage treatment plants (4%). Municipalities are being burdened with the cost of the clean-up from sectors with low percentages of phosphorus contribution. The CWAC is concerned that the cost of phosphorus mitigation is not proportional to phosphorus loading contributions and is therefore out of balance and unfair to certain sectors.
3. Groundwater quality and the interaction between groundwater and surface water is not factored into the surface water management strategies. The CWAC is concerned with excluding the interaction of groundwater and surface water in the planning and strategies for surface water quality improvement.
4. The CWAC is concerned that commercial or infrastructure operations, such as power companies, may not always follow Accepted Management Practices (AMPs) when cutting trees. Additional outreach and, if necessary, enforcement actions may be needed.

Sincerely,

---

Amy Hornblas  
CVRPC CWAC Chair

## Pam DeAndrea

---

**From:** Russ Barrett <russbar67@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 2, 2019 10:13 AM  
**To:** Pam DeAndrea  
**Subject:** Re: September meeting

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Pam - won't be able to make it on October 10th. Will be checking lake out very closely from a duck blind!

On other business: I would like to recommend again that we remove item 4 from our letter to CVRPC. All commercial and infrastructure operations are presently required to comply with same AMP's as logging operations. Power companies, in particular WEC and GMP, have foresters on board to assure their operations comply with all State regulations. Simple call to these foresters should quickly resolve any noted infractions.

On Thu, Aug 29, 2019, 12:53 PM Pam DeAndrea <[DeAndrea@cvregion.com](mailto:DeAndrea@cvregion.com)> wrote:

Hi folks,

I will have to cancel our September meeting to reconvene in October. Let's plan on meeting Thursday October 10 same time, same place.

Best,

Pam

*Pam DeAndrea*

Senior GIS Planner

Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission

29 Main Street, Suite 4  
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

[deandrea@cvregion.com](mailto:deandrea@cvregion.com)



Phone: (802) 229-0389

Web: [www.centralvtplanning.org](http://www.centralvtplanning.org)