From: Moore, Julie
To: "Christopher Bray"
Cc: Tim Ashe; Peter Sterling; Tebbetts, Anson
Subject: RE: Clean Water -- staffing levels
Date: Friday, October 6, 2017 5:52:00 PM

Good evening, Sen. Bray.

These changes in staffing pre-date my current tenure at the Agency. As such, I wanted to confirm my understanding of the status of the positions included in Act 64 with the DEC Business Office. I have confirmed that DEC hired and retained the 13 positions that were funded by new fees in Act 64. I also learned that of the 13 new positions, five were filled by reallocating staff from the Onsite Septic & Drinking Water Program, which was cut during the late summer and early fall of SFY16 (August 2015 – October 2015) as a result of general fund rescissions. The position descriptions and allocations across a number of program areas are as follows:

Program Area	Positions	Position Description
State Highway Stormwater Regulation	1	This position will develop and administer a new State Highway (TS4) General Stormwater Permit for stormwater discharges from the state highway system.
Developed Land Stormwater Regulation	3	These positions support development and implementation of new permitting programs (3-acre permit & MS4 permits) to address stormwater runoff from existing unregulated developed land.
Wastewater	2	These positions write permits for and assist municipalities in upgrading wastewater treatment plants for the TMDLs.
Rivers	1	This position supports increased regulatory and technical assistance for floodplain protection and identify restoration projects to enhance phosphorus reduction.
Administrative	3	These administrative positions support new permit requirements and implementation of expanded stormwater, rivers, and wetlands programs.
Monitoring, Assessment & Planning Program and ERP/Clean Water Implementation Program (CWIP)	3	The Phase I Plan requires a watershed modeler to identify prioritized phosphorus reduction projects and an additional basin planner to perform assessments and tactical basin planning while assisting with prioritization of water quality remediation efforts through ERP/CWIP. Also required under the Phase 1 Plan to ensure accountability, DEC needs an environmental analyst to track pollution reductions from implementation projects and to link to tracking done by AAFM and VTrans.

From: Christopher Bray [mailto:CBray@leg.state.vt.us]
Sent: Friday, September 29, 2017 4:19 PM
To: Moore, Julie <Julie.Moore@vermont.gov>; Tebbetts, Anson <Anson.Tebbetts@vermont.gov>
Cc: Tim Ashe <TAshe@leg.state.vt.us>; Peter Sterling <PSterling@leg.state.vt.us>; Christopher Bray <CBray@leg.state.vt.us>
Subject: Clean Water -- staffing levels

Anson and Julie,

As you know, our discussions on water clean up include addressing staffing levels — inside and out of government. I'd like to check in with you on your two agencies.

The Act 64 Summary, page 4, includes the following:

> The act establishes 13 ANR water quality positions and funds them through increased fees on water-related ANR permits. Similarly, eight new AAFM water quality positions are established and funded, in part, from new or increased agricultural water quality fees.

As part of clarifying the current situation, could you please tell me if ANR and AAFM have subsequently hired and retained these 21 new positions?

====

In addition, in the case of AAFM, the Act 73 working group's approved minutes for the 8/11/17 meeting include the following:

> While farmers could fill in some of the funding gap for water quality implementation, it is unlikely that Vermont farmers could afford to fully fund Act 64 compliance costs. And even if the Legislature were to find additional monies for clean water implementation in the agricultural sector, AAFM would need additional staffing to get money out on the ground. AAFM needs roughly 1 FTE for every $600,000 that will be granted to farmers. Even at current funding levels, AAFM needs 5 FTEs (1 FTE to track spending for accountability framework; 4 FTEs to provide technical assistance to farmers, which is a precursor to putting money on the ground).

Anson — does AAFM plan to request five such new positions for FY19?

It's my understanding that in FY18, AAFM had to "return" capital dollars for allocation outside of AAFM because AAFM lacked the staff to spend/award those potential grant dollars. If AAFM does not make these 5 additional hires, will this mean that AAFM will once again have to return potential capital grant monies back to other agencies in FY19?

Thank you in advance for your help in clarifying staffing levels for Act 64, the TMDLs and all other related water quality work.

—Chris