

From: Kelly Coleman
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2017 8:30 AM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: Comments: Act 73 Clean Water Funding Draft Report

Thank you for hearing feedback on the Act 73 clean water report!

However, I have serious concerns about a plan that is so dependant on capital funds. I hope you can revise the report to recommend that the Legislature put in place a plan this year that will create a dedicated new funding source that does not rely significantly on capital funds when the current funding expires in July 2019.

Kelly Coleman
Brattleboro, vt
(Mobile)

From: Joanna Cummings
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 10:11 AM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: Act 73 Clean Water Fund Draft Comments

Hello,

I would like to comment on the draft Act 73 Clean Water Fund plan. First, there should be a representative from the Lake Champlain Basin Program on the working group. I don't understand why an organization that has been distributing program and project funding for over 20 years to protect Lake Champlain is not on the working group. A representative from Watersheds United, Vermont Natural Resources Council or Lake Champlain International would be good choices as well: they are all knowledgeable and capable of making decisions on the distribution and use of funds. There is a business representative on the working group, so there should be an environmental representative on the working group as well. If the working group is going to be made up of mostly state employees, then there should also be a public health representative.

The advisory group has only one representative from an environmental advocacy group, but there should at least two environmental advocacy representatives as members of this group.

The funding sources for the extended clean up that will need to happen over many years need to be stable. Lake Champlain is not just a tax revenue source, Vermonters get their drinking water from the lake. I feel that the plan does not make a stable commitment over the many years it will take to bring all of our state water bodies back from where they are now, nor is the amount of expertise needed to carry out this plan included in decision-making processes.

Thanks for your consideration.

Joanna Cummings

From: Marcy Harding
Sent: Tuesday, October 31, 2017 1:30 PM
To: Ellis, Rebecca <Rebecca.Ellis@vermont.gov>
Subject: Act 73 Clean Water Funding Study Group

Greeting Rebecca,
I'm looking at this website: <http://dec.vermont.gov/watershed/cwi/cwf/future>

I'm not seeing anything about a public comment period but I thought there was an opportunity to comment on the recently released report of long-term funding methods for Lake Champlain cleanup and I think it may have ended yesterday. I was without power all day yesterday (as were many others) and was not able to send in a comment.

I would simply like to add my voice to others who believe that the study committee missed the mark on its charge. Identifying the capital bill as a solution in the near term fails to do the heavy lifting that we've put off for way too long. It is past time to figure out a source of long-term funding, put it in place, and move forward with the long and costly process of cleaning our lake. Identifying the capital bill also short changes all the other pressing requests for capital funds.

If this comment should go to someone else, I hope you'll forward it.

Thank you,
Marcy Harding
Richmond, VT

From: regjones
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 10:04 AM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: Comments: Act 73 Clean Water Funding Draft Report

I believe that clean water is very important to every person in the state and is also a significant factor in encouraging tourism by making Vermont attractive to visitors.

Given the importance of clean water I feel that the long-term planning that is being undertaken should be supported by long-term reliable revenue sources provided by legislative action. I do not support the idea of bonded indebtedness. This is not a one-time fix that should be paid for by borrowing money that then needs to be repaid. Instead this is a problem that has ongoing state-wide impacts and the solutions for which should be funded by state-wide revenues.

Reg Jones
Bennington, VT
Sent from my Galaxy Tab A

From:
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 10:36 AM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: Comments: Act 73 Clean Water Funding Draft Report

Dear Ms.Percival,

I am writing to ask that you change this draft of the clean water funding act so that it provides secure year to year funding. Vermonters and all non-human life require and deserve clean water. Please find a funding scheme that secured funding for the years necessary to implement the changes needed. Thank you for your service to Vermonters and the waters.

Anna Kehler
Greensboro vt
Sent from my iPhone

From: Sylvia Knight
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2017 4:37 PM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Cc: Ellis, Rebecca <Rebecca.Ellis@vermont.gov>; code@leg.state.vt.us
Subject: Draft Water Report- comments

To ANR officials:

I have read most of the Draft Report and am concerned that we do *not* have a firm plan for a long-term sustainable funding source to protect Vermont's waters. Where is the commitment to protect a precious resource needed for life now and by future generations? We owe a debt of life-giving clean water to our children and grandchildren!

I do not support relying for funds on a transmission project that does not yet exist. That is not fiduciary responsibility.

I cannot support permits to wastewater treatment plants that allow more pollution into waters of the State, rather than reducing that pollution!

I do support the development of a Clean Water Authority to administer funds for infrastructure and watershed projects.

I do support the concept of asking Vermonters to pay a small amount annually for water infrastructures- - a concept not included in this report.

I question the wisdom of escalating technology for an industry that is basically unsustainable and unhealthy for humans and Earth Community because of pesticides used, contamination of surface and ground water, contamination of atmosphere, contributions to climate chaos, heavy farm debt, and exploitation of laborers.

I look forward to the day when such planning processes include strong representation by those who care about water as a shared gift for life and those who care about the kind and quality of food we eat. Otherwise we will not develop a strong plan for communal protection of water for this generation and for future generations. I hope for a new generation of agriculture that cares for the Earth we all share, for the people who work on farms, and for the people who consume the food produced on those farms.

Respectfully,

Sylvia Knight
Earth Community Advocate and Researcher
Burlington, VT

From: Debbie Landauer
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2017 8:33 PM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: Comments on Water Quality Plan

Dear Ms. Percival

I have been reading about the draft of the water quality plan and am much dismayed and disappointed in its failure to work strongly to get our waters clean. I live very near Lake Champlain and have first hand knowledge of how critical the need for direct and aggressive action from the state is. We have had closed beaches, ugly looking water, and algae blooms. Climate change is only going to make things worse.

I hope you and your department will take this issue more seriously and give the plan to address this a higher bar, stronger teeth, and the necessary funding.

Sincerely,
Debbie Landauer

From: Judy Larson DiMario
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 11:31 AM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: Comments: Act 73 Clean Water Funding Draft Report

Aside from AIR, WATER is the most important single thing on which we depend to live. Its protection and freedom from pollution are essential!

Judy (Larson) DiMario, Fayston, VT

•

--

Alex MacDonald
Silver Maple Construction LLC
Project Manager

From: Jared Pendak
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 11:04 AM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: water quality initiatives

Penny,
Perhaps nothing is more important to protecting Vermont's natural heritage than putting forth every in favor of clean water initiatives. Please vote and act accordingly. Thank you!
-Jared Pendak, Bradford

From: Gianna Petito
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2017 9:47 AM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: Public Comments on Act 73 Clean Water Funding Draft Report - Petito

Dear Act 73 Working Group,

Thank you for your efforts spent this year on analyzing clean water funding. While I do not have the benefit of having attended the Working Group meetings, I have reviewed the draft report and have some concerns I would like to raise. Please excuse any misinterpretations in the draft language or data that I may have made.

It appears that the Group re-estimates the short-term funding gap based on questionable assumptions and doesn't acknowledge such implications for Vermonters. On page 18 of the report, the Working Group suggests that the annual average gap in funding is really only \$5M over the next five years instead of about \$62M. This is disconcerting for a few reasons.

- First, the Group assumes consistent federal funding and state capital bill allocations over the next five years, neither of which are well-known to be stable or consistent.
- Second, the Group lowers the gap estimate by allocating costs (about 14%) to private parties. While it's clear that the private sector and individual Vermonters will need to shoulder some of the burden, it can't really be counted as a known revenue source. Private payments are not a dedicated revenue stream. It's both an unknown how much individuals can shoulder, as well as a policy question how much Vermont wants individuals to shoulder this burden. It appears, therefore, that you've buried this political decision into your gap estimate.
- Finally, since the total gap estimate annualized over 20 years is closer to \$62 M/yr, I'm worried what the years 6-20 annual gap would be in your scenario. Is this just shifting all huge costs down the road? As a (relatively) young Vermonter, I don't quite appreciate this.
- We already know that the Treasurer's gap estimates fell below the likely true costs because they did not include operations or maintenance costs. I'm not clear of the benefit of further underestimating these or shifting costs to the future to make current short-term conditions palatable/sufficient.

I do not believe you have met your statutory obligation through this report. Act 73 tasked this Working Group with developing draft legislation for equitable and effective long-term funding methods. The Group appears to have declined this request and I did not see any draft legislation.

- By reading the report, it appears as though the Group was satisfied with lowering the near-term estimated gap and judging assumed revenues to be “adequate.” It seems silly to have to mention this but just because short-term revenues are “adequate” (with assumptions about private dollars and federal support), doesn’t mean you have met your responsibility to come up with long-term funding and legislative language on that.
- On page 35 the Working Group recommends that the state maintain existing levels of funding through the capital bill and clean water fund. Putting aside the obvious limitations associated with bonded dollars, as well as the true questions they raise about cost effectiveness in terms of dollars spent per pound of phosphorous/sediment/pollutants avoided, the political practicability of this suggestion runs counter to your statutory obligation. There is tough competition for bonded dollars every year and this ‘recommendation’ hardly leads to a sustainable or reliable funding mechanism.
- Interestingly, the Working Group even acknowledges a need for this long-term funding solution, calling for private consultants or the Legislature to do the work. Page 37 says the Legislature should consider various funding models including impervious surface fees, parcel fees, and phosphorous banking. It also recommends that the state issue an RFP for a consultant to “further investigate, and ultimately recommend, a service delivery model for creating sustained capacity for clean water implementation. The investigation should consider models for collecting and disbursing funds, as well as increasing project management capacity, that could be housed either inside or outside state government.” It must be obvious to most of you that this is exactly what you were tasked to complete over this year. In fact, I was heartened by the early meeting minutes where Working Group members clearly attempted to explore these options and the relevant costs and policy decisions associated with each. Of course, as more groups requested not to have the responsibility of collecting an “unpopular tax,” or presented administrative cost estimates it appears that enthusiasm for your duty waned. This past winter I sat in numerous committee meetings and watched H.516 through its painful development. One could see the Legislature was overwhelmed by the technical nature of a possible per parcel fee and decided to delegate authority to a Working Group who would have the time and resources to dig into the science and technical questions, and accept that there would be compromises and necessary negotiations. Disappointingly, it appears you have shirked this duty.

Finally, I recognize that administrative cost estimates for some type of per parcel or impervious surface fee approached 20% of expected revenues. This does sound expensive but it also raises a lot of questions. How do these costs compare to the total costs of water quality management? How do they compare to the benefits? Is there any expectation these costs might decrease over time with a learning curve? How could these costs be shared across the state? The Group then recommends a fee paired with an existing billing system. What is that if not through the state tax department or municipal collection office? Perhaps these questions are answered in an appendix I did not read but some discussion of this, if not present, would be valuable. It doesn't appear sufficient at face value to say "it will be too expensive" and then walk away from the option.

In closing, I will quote the Working Group. It’s generally accepted that “Vermonters will want a funding system that is rational (nexus), fair (enforceable) and efficient (low administrative costs).” Development of this system is no doubt challenging technically and politically, and requires significant honest discussion of challenges and acceptable compromises. It doesn’t mean it’s impossible. Statewide parcel data is due to come online by 2020, and Vermont can raise more than necessary to meet the gap needs. You were given a year that the Legislature didn’t have to do this critical work. Time is short and funding will end, but problems will not.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Should the Working Group reconvene in the future I look forward to seeing what responsibilities it chooses to accept for the good of the state and the welfare of its people and environment. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Gianna Petito
Concerned citizen

From: MARY PRATT
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 10:10 AM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: Comments: Act 73 Water Quality Funding Report 10.18.17

I am not at all an expert in the complicated matter of funding things like water quality. However, in my own household budget, I like to keep things simple, and I regularly set aside chunks of our income for expenses that I know will be coming up. Capital funds will, I presume, run out, and who knows these days what will be happening with federal funds? How about a dedicated funding source?

As a fixed-income, retired life-long Vermonter who lives in an area surrounded by factory farms (Addison County) where there is often corn planted right up to the ditches that drain into Otter Creek, I would be perfectly happy to pay higher state taxes to help fund clean water.

From: Damon Reed
Sent: Thursday, November 2, 2017 7:09 AM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Long Term Funding of the Vermont Clean Water Effort

Dear Ms. Percival,

Vermont's ability to restore the quality of its surface waters so they meet Federal Clean Water Standards is simply a matter of having enough money and the will to do so.

It is estimated the total cost to bring all surface waters of Vermont into compliance with federal clean water standards is one billion dollars spent over a twenty year period.

This translates to fifty million dollars spent per year for twenty years.

Raising fifty million dollars per year is doable if we just think outside the box a bit.

Fifty million dollars divided by 625,000, the total number of Vermont residents, is \$80.00 per resident per year.

However, of the 625,000 total population, 109,000 Vermont residents are age 65 and older, and 120,000 Vermont residents are between the ages 1-17.

Thus, only 396,000 Vermont residents are between the "working" ages of 18-64. For the sake of discussion, if we exclude the 65 and over and 17 and under age groups from paying for the cleanup, each member of the remaining 18-64 "wage earner" group will need to pay \$126.00 per year for the cleanup. (50 million divided by 396,000 = \$126.00)

The question: How to lessen a \$126.00 per capita annual tax burden which will not sunset for 20 years ?

Answers:

a. There are approximately 43,000 "second/vacation" homes in Vermont, mostly owned by non-

residents. If we assume a minimum of two individuals occupy each home, the second home owner segment of our state population totals 86,000 individuals.

b. There are approximately 250,00 motor vehicles registered each year in Vermont. Roads these vehicles operate on are a major cause of surface water pollution. How much of a "water cleanup fee" could we add to the present cost of a vehicle registration? \$5.00? That would raise over a million dollars per year.

c. There are 549,000 licensed motor vehicle drivers in Vermont. How much of a "water cleanup fee" could we add to the cost of a driver's license? \$5.00? That would raise almost \$2,750,000 per year.

d. In 2015 a total of 152 million dollars "rooms and meals" taxes were paid to the VT Department of Taxes. If we round up the present 9% "rooms and meals" tax to 10% so it matches the present 10% alcohol tax, and earmark the 1% increase as a "water cleanup fee", we can raise \$17,000,000. per year.

e. And then there's the big unknown...Will the Feds contribute to the effort, and if they will, how much?

Assuming we receive NO help from the Feds, the monies raised from Vermonters and others per year might look like this:

86,000 second home owners at \$60.00 each = \$5,160,000.

250,000 motor vehicle registrations at \$5.00 each = \$1,250,000.

549,000 drivers licenses at \$5.00 each = \$2,745,000.

1% increase in "rooms and meals" tax = \$17,000,000.

396,000 Vermont residents age 18-64 at \$60.00 each = \$23,760,000.

Total amount raised \$50,000,000.

Everyone using the waters of Vermont; resident, non-resident, visitor, must contribute to the cost of the cleanup.

We can no longer delay the funding of the cleanup effort. The Legislature must put a plan in place that guarantees long term funding sources.

Damon Reed
Warren, Vermont

From: Charles Ross Jr
Sent: Friday, November 3, 2017 11:09 AM
To: Ellis, Rebecca <Rebecca.Ellis@vermont.gov>;
Cc: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: FW: comments on draft
Importance: High

Rebecca,

Here are some comment for your consideration for the report. Feel free to call or email me if you have questions.

My comments fall into 4 categories:

1) Role of Agriculture

The public dialogue and regulatory response with respect to water quality has made it clear agriculture is the single largest contributing source of phosphorus to Lake Champlain and other waters. The report does not make it absolutely clear that the actions being implemented now and in the future by the agricultural community will generate the greatest reductions to phosphorus, both in tonnage and percentage. The agricultural community will in fact contribute the largest percentage reduction of any sector and their percentage reduction will be well above their percentage contribution. Their disproportional contribution to the phosphorus reduction needs of the state will make up for reductions unable to be achieved by other sectors on a proportional basis. The absence of this conversation loses track of the critical point that investment in agriculture is a cost effective and worthwhile investment on behalf of the public's interests.

This role as the disproportionate contributor to the solution is not highlighted in the report. Failure to highlight this role as a disproportionate contribution or may unfairly leave the spotlight on agriculture as only a problem and does not demonstrate to the public that ag is and will contribute a proportional share to the solution.

Failure to recognize this role also undermines the understanding and justification for the public's contribution to the ag sector to help underwrite the expenses associated with their efforts. As we know, agriculture is the most cost effective place to make progress and the public should understand why their investment of taxpayer dollars is in their interest since it will help farmers achieve the most cost effective reduction in phosphorus that is well beyond their proportional contribution.

2) 5 million dollar gap in funding

The 5 million dollar shortfall in funding for agricultural activities causes two concerns:

- a) Since agriculture is the most cost effective method to reduce phosphorus and a gap of funding for the implementation of agricultural conservation practices is likely to result in a disproportionate reduction in phosphorus as is required within the modeling and goals of the TMDL
- b) This shortage of funding could also unfairly amplify the existing perception that the farming community is not doing enough since there will not be the resources to support the activities envisioned by the TMDL and legislative goals. This failure to identify and create the funding stream leaves the issue for another day, may increase the likelihood that the gap will not be addressed and rather be left to the agriculture community to fund these costs later without the public support that is understood today to be a worthwhile investment.

3) Streambank Erosion

The plan does not identify a set of practices or funding in the detail necessary to understand how stream bank erosion will be mitigated. Recognizing that it is 20% of the contribution to the total problem means that inadequate funding and or insufficient practices will either fall short of the effort necessary

or shift the burden to other sectors. This coupled with a 5% funding shortfall for ag practices could once again create disproportionate expectations and impacts on the agricultural community to achieve reductions from another source .

4) Alternatives

It seems that it would be beneficial to at least itemize the range of real and prospective practices and implementation strategies that are or may be available in the future to help address phosphorus reductions. It could be helpful to more fully explore and explain these real and potential options ranging from multi-farm digesters with phosphorus removal; market development for phosphorus extracts from manure; phosphorus trading; land acquisition and land use changes for high contributing parcels. While these activities and options may not have been included in Act 64 or the TMDL plan, they may be realistic options to employ or pursue that could make meaningful contributions to goals of Act 64 and the TMDL. This could help direct future efforts to supplement the currently efforts to meet the goals of the TMDL and Act 64.

It may also be helpful to support the exploration of these existing and prospective approaches by establishing a group whose job it would be to identify, evaluate and recommend viable technologies, strategies and practice to be part of the solution matrix. Once recommended either this new group or existing groups could help to fund or promote the funding of these new approaches so they can be implemented and help achieve the goals of the TMDL and Act 64.

From: Peter Schuyler

Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2017 11:46 AM

To: Ellis, Rebecca <Rebecca.Ellis@vermont.gov>

Cc: Dolan, Kari <Kari.Dolan@vermont.gov>; Catherine Rader

Subject: 2017 Act 73 Working Group on Water Quality Draft Report

Dear Rebecca,

I am not sure where to address the League of Women Voters comments on the 2017 Act 73 Working Group on Water Quality Draft Report, so I am writing to you.

The serious water quality problems in Vermont lakes and streams have developed over more than 200 years, so the solution will also take a long time. The reservoir of phosphorus and other nutrients in our lakes will take a very long time to decline, so the public may not see improvement as the investments are being made. It is imperative that a long term commitment is secured. The Working Group report recognizes well the need to secure funding for a very long time. Certainly, maintaining the Capital Bill investment of at least the \$22 million is vital. Recommendation number 3, which would expand loan eligibility, funding of private projects, and exploration of a private activity bond, is very important. The adaptive management approach is also very important to make sure the investments in clean water are targeted at the most pressing problems.

We are concerned that the funding proposals with specific dollar amounts are sufficient for the job, and look forward to the discussion of the final report during the Legislative session.

Sonja Schuyler
State Board

League of Women Voters of Vermont

From: Henry Swayze

Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2017 1:07 PM

To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>

Subject: thoughts on more cost effective economic process for cleaning water

My name is Henry Swayze from Tunbridge. I am a member of the Vermont Healthy Soils Coalition. Each 1% of added organic material in the soil increases its water holding capacity by 28,000 gallons per acre. That reduces runoff and a better Soil-carbon-sponge is also a better filter for what does come through the soil. We do not yet have an easy way to track soil improvement but we can encourage it. I believe giving incentives to landowners- especially farmers for doing practices directly aimed at build the soil-carbon-sponge would be a cheaper method of reducing pollution than many of the other pats we are planning. After a measurement system can be developed we could actualy pay for ecco services at a higher level of reimbursement. In perhaps 5 years after an incentive program is in place we could phase in a charger of practices that are reducing soil organic matter (plowed fields left bare for instance)
Thanks Henry Swayze

From: Jeff van den Noort

Sent: Monday, October 30, 2017 2:56 PM

To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>

Subject: Comments re: Act 73 Clean Water Fund

I am very troubled by the state of Lake Champlain. I have a property on the lake and blue green algae has started to restrict what I can do on the lake in the late summer. It has gotten so bad, I am considering selling and moving out of state. I am getting very tired of hearing how we just need to study the problem a little more, that funding is not needed until later, that we can't enforce laws yet.

We need a lot of funding. We need it now, and we need it from reliable sustainable sources going forward. Also, it is important that the funds be unrestricted in how they are used.

My preference would be to enact a big tax on fertilizer (both residential and agricultural) or on one of the other major contributors to the problem. It seems to me that fertilizer tax would be relatively easy and inexpensive to implement. Or if it were up to me, I would tax the manure and sewage that is being spread on the fields.

If large enough, this could discourage the polluting activities, and would provide reliable targeted funds going forward.

I understand you are concerned about the costs of implementing a new tax, and I agree that could be an issue. If the new tax is not targeting polluters, or it is too small to change behavior, then it may not be worth the extra administrative costs.

But if you propose getting money from the capital fund, there is the danger that the funds will not be available in years when other priorities arise. We need reliable, sustainable, substantial funds going forward for the foreseeable future.

Given that agriculture is the largest contributor, I would be alarmed if the new tax taxed everyone except the farm sector. For example, I don't see how a per parcel tax, or a transfer tax discourages any pollution. It just adds another tax. On the other hand, if could be implemented efficiently, and it would guarantee substantial funds going forward, it may be an acceptable solution. My first priority is that we have a stable source of unrestricted funds. My second priority is that it targets polluting behavior.

Some say that people on the lake, or people who recreate on the lake, should pay the tax. In my opinion, any activities done by people on the lake that is injuring the lake should be reduced through regulation and enforcement. To tax everyone who recreates on the lake, or lives on the lake, would more often than not be taxing the victims instead of the causes.

The blue green algae is a public health emergency. Our drinking water is at stake, the environmental reputation of the state is at stake, and our recreation based economy is at stake. I am also concerned about breathing the algae as winds blow off of the lake. It is not clear what the long-term effects of this chronic exposure are.

We need action now, and that requires major funding immediately.

Thank you for listening.

Jeff van den Noort
North Hero, VT

From: Irene Wrenner
Sent: Sunday, November 5, 2017 3:55 PM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: Comments on Draft Report on Water Quality Funding

Instead of creating a path to long-term funding, this draft plan recommends a piecemeal approach that is heavily dependent on capital funding, which is money we can't count on from year to year, and needs to be paid back.

All Vermonters deserve clean, safe water – and this plan doesn't get us there.

Vermont needs stable, long-term dedicated funding to meet our important phosphorus reduction and clean-up goals for Lake Champlain and other threatened waterways for today – and for generations to come.

Further, we should explore the creation of a Clean Water Authority that is publicly accountable and can work to strategically deploy money into Vermont communities to clean up our waters.

Most of all, we need the report to recommend that the Legislature put in place a plan this year that will create a dedicated new funding source that does not rely significantly on capital funds when the current funding expires in July 2019.

Thank you...

Irene Wrenner
Essex, VT

From: Callie Willis
Sent: Saturday, October 28, 2017 7:02 PM
To: Percival, Penny <Penny.Percival@vermont.gov>
Subject: Comments: Act 73 Clean Water Funding Draft Report

Hi, just a quick public comment here to say that investing in the clean-up of and maintaining a clean Lake Champlain should be a very high priority for the Vt. legislature. This is a big and broad undertaking that will take time and long-term dedicated funding but it is well worth the investment.
