

Meeting Date/Time: September 2, 2020; 5:00 pm (Rescheduled from August 25, 2020)

Members present: Chad Pickens; Mary Stowe (joined the meeting at 5:14; emailed at 6:12 that she lost her connection); Pamela Schultz; Phil Post (joined the meeting at 5:21 and left the meeting at 7:00); Sally Hoyt; Shugong Wang; Stefan Klakovich; Stephan Hearn (joined the meeting at 6:35; he sent an email that he would be joining the meeting late); Steve Bevington (joined the meeting at 5:21 but won't be able to stay for the whole meeting).

Members absent: None

Staff: Sue Burke; Alisha Goldstein; Mary Beth Meumann; Allison Weakley; Amy Harvey

Guests: Julie McClintock

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Discussion points</b>	<b>Motions/Votes</b>	<b>Action</b>
Meeting called to order	Ms. Schultz called the virtual meeting to order and called the roll.	N/A	The virtual meeting began at 5:03 on Zoom; a quorum was present.
Introductions	N/A	N/A	N/A
Announcements	None	N/A	N/A
Petitions	None	N/A	N/A
Approval of meeting notes	Deferred to the September 22, 2020 meeting	N/A	N/A
<b>BOARD BUSINESS</b>			
RCD information requested by the Board – staff update	<p>Ms. Schultz gave an overview of where the Board was from the previous meeting - the Stormwater Advisory Board (Board) had provided recommendations for two development applications to the Town Council. There was an overall sense that the Board would benefit from having the opportunity of providing comments earlier in the project review process. That led to the creation of the subcommittee to talk about that process, where the Board might fit into it, and also understanding better how projects have been impacting the RCD.</p> <p>The subcommittee met twice in July, looking at development application impacts to the RCD; to begin to identify what types of projects, at the concept plan stage, the Board felt it could provide comments; and to determine criteria to identify those projects.</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion points	Motions/Votes	Action
<p>RCD information requested by the Board – staff update (cont.)</p>	<p>Stormwater staff presented a Powerpoint about encroachments in the RCD; at the June meeting the Board requested project information about RCD encroachments. This information is not tracked in the review database, so it has to be pulled project by project. Staff looked at administrative review projects (approved by staff) for the past year and large-scale development projects (approved by Town Council) for the past five years.</p> <p>Questions and comments:</p> <p>Slide 8 – What kind of projects would be approved for single family homes in the RCD? Are these permitted uses?</p> <p>Some single-family homes that existed before 2003 (LUMO adoption) can expand into the RCD. Others could be permitted uses. All of these still had to go through the approval process.</p> <p>Slide 9 – Does encroachment mean it was not a permitted use?</p> <p>No, it could include permitted uses as well as those encroachments requesting a modification to the regulations (i.e., exceeded the dimensional regulations).</p> <p>A Board member was surprised that 28 of the 33 projects did not have RCD onsite.</p> <p>Only 7 of the 33 projects had RCD on their sites. Only five proposed an encroachment. This analysis did not include projects in the Blue Hill District, which were exempt from the RCD regulations.</p> <p>Staff reviewed the five large-scale development projects, detailing the dimensional regulations and RCD encroachments for each.</p> <p>A Board member said that it appeared there was a pattern for applicants to automatically use the managed and upland zones for stormwater measures in order to have more buildable area.</p> <p>Staff replied it is a strategy some applicants may use but topography also figures in as they need to be able to discharge the stormwater at the lowest point.</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion points	Motions/Votes	Action
<p>RCD information requested by the Board – staff update (cont.)</p>	<p>A Board member noted that if it is a permitted use then developers will continue to build stormwater measures in the RCD. There seems to be two options – change the LUMO or request that the Council not approve changes that violate the RCD.</p> <p>Another Board member stated that a well-designed, functional stormwater control measure was a benefit to the community even if it was partially constructed in the RCD.</p> <p>Board members recognize that there is a trade-off in balancing the RCD encroachment with other public benefits. But because it is the Stormwater Advisory Board, it should advocate for protection of the RCD.</p> <p>Staff observed that an LID (low impact design) approach where smaller stormwater controls are distributed throughout the site was also a design option.</p> <p>The Board members said the presentation was very helpful and it recommended the continued tracking of RCD encroachment data.</p> <p>A Board member asked if the Board was aware of the dimensional requirements for some the projects it provided recommendations for, e.g., Chandler Woods, and noted the importance of having that data available.</p> <p>A Board member asked how the Board could help staff reduce RCD impacts.</p> <p>LUMO revisions – permitted uses, dimensional ratios</p> <p>Board recommendations – while not specific to the RCD, a staff member gave an example of a Board recommendation for Chandler Woods requiring weekly inspections by Town staff during construction. Staff made notes and sent them to the developer who was responsible for any needed corrective action. This helps reduce the amount of sediment leaving the site.</p> <p>A Board member noted that some may argue stormwater control measures (SCMs) are permitted in the RCD; does the Board that considered a problem.</p>		

Agenda Item	Discussion points	Motions/Votes	Action
RCD information requested by the Board – staff update (cont.)	<p>A staff member responded that the closer a SCM discharges to a stream, there is less opportunity for the runoff to disperse and infiltrate.</p> <p>We see a lot of linear ponds running parallel to the RCD boundaries, resulting in more disturbance and removal of vegetation. The vegetation is critical to keeping the slopes stable and non-eroding.</p> <p>A Board member said that there are a lot of ponds proposed because they meet all the stormwater requirements. Has the Town considered revising its 2-year volume requirement? That may reduce the dependence on ponds. While the intent of the 2-year volume requirement – increase infiltration, reduce the volume of runoff – is good, it is difficult to achieve because of the volume amount and the clay soils. There is ongoing discussion as to whether increased detention times are causing more stream channel erosion.</p> <p>A Board member suggested using models to simulate the impacts to the RCD, looking at the flooding issue or stream flow for different storm events.</p> <p>Another Board member thought the Board should encourage low impact stormwater management controls.</p>		
Subcommittee Update	<p>The subcommittee discussed the projects going forward, how the Board would be involved in providing comments, and when that would occur. A Board member had suggested the Stormwater Board request the materials that go to the CDC at the same time or after the CDC reviewed the project. The Board would be aware of projects in advance and be able to send comments to the Council.</p> <p>A Board member asked whether the applicant would know if they would be requesting a modification to the regulations at the concept plan stage.</p> <p>Staff provided a list of projects with the amounts of land disturbance and impervious surface to Ms. Schultz. This information looks beyond RCD impacts. Ms. Schultz also had information about the number and types of projects from the Town website. Ms. Schultz broke the data out by permit type and year.</p>	<p>Mr. Klakovich made a motion “to send the subcommittee the task of creating language to create the necessary review triggers.” The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoyt. In a roll call vote, the motion was approved unanimously (6-0). [Pickens, Schultz, Hoyt, Wang, Klakovich, Hearn]</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion points	Motions/Votes	Action
Subcommittee Update (cont.)	<p>A Board member asked Ms. Schultz to email the bar charts to them.</p> <p>A Board member suggested using RCD on the property as an initial screening factor. Another Board member suggested developing a questionnaire for projects requesting a modification to the regulations. This would help focus attention on the issue the Board wants to address.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do you need a modification – Yes or No</li> <li>• How much do think it will be and reasons for it</li> <li>• What LID measures have you already taken</li> </ul> <p>The Board decided to have the subcommittee draft language for the Board to consider at its next meeting.</p>		
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	The next Board meeting is September 22, 2020.	A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Klakovich and seconded by Mr. Pickens. It passed unanimously, 6-0, in a roll call vote. [Pickens, Schultz, Hoyt, Wang, Klakovich, Hearn]	Meeting adjourned at 7:21 pm.