

DRAFT

1 TOWN OF HINESBURG SELECTBOARD
2 MINUTES – JULY 23, 2015
3 DRAFT

4
5 Attending: Mike Bissonette, Chair; Phil Pouech, Vice-Chair; Andrea Morgante; Jon Trefry; Tom Ayer;
6 Trevor Lashua, Town Administrator; Rocky Martin, Director of Buildings and Facilities; Dorothy Pellett,
7 Burlington Free Press; Doug Olufsen; Glenn Enos; George Bedard; Joe Iadanza, Planning Commission;
8 Wilma Smith; James Donegan, Planning Commission; W. Dennison; Aaron Kimball, Planning
9 Commission; Jeff French, Planning Commission; Barbara Forauer; Gill Coates; Robert Hyams; and
10 Maggie Gordon.

11
12 The meeting began at 7:00 p.m.

13 Public Hearing – Petitioned vote to repeal the stormwater regulations adopted in May

14 Mike Bissonette opened the public hearing on the vote to repeal stormwater regulations adopted by the
15 Selectboard in the spring.
16

17
18 Trevor Lashua provided a brief summary. Joe Iadanza, chair of the Planning Commission, spoke about
19 the regulations in greater detail, and how the Planning Commission arrived at its recommendations.
20 Planning Commission members Maggie Gordon and Aaron Kimball also discussed the regulations, and
21 the need to implement them with the small area for disturbed/impervious surfaces when compared to the
22 State standard.
23

24 Andrea Morgante talked about the impending stormwater permit and planning needed for Town roads,
25 following water quality/Lake Champlain cleanup legislation passed during the most recent legislative
26 session.
27

28 George Bedard discussed the origin of the petition to repeal, citing factors such as potential cost, the
29 impact on small projects and the “small guy,” and that stormwater improvements should be something all
30 residents pay for rather than those engaged in development activities.
31

32 Jeff French, of the Planning Commission, spoke about the importance of the regulations as they relate to
33 the cumulative impacts of small developments and stormwater impacts on neighbors. He encouraged the
34 Town to think long-term, and that 10,000 square feet of disturbed or impervious surfaces is not a small
35 project, as discussed, but at least medium-sized.
36

37 Joe I. also talked about 10,000 square feet as a mid- to larger-sized project, as opposed to a small. The
38 Town Hall parking lot was used as an example for a 10,000 square foot impervious area.
39

40 Gill Coates talked about issues with stormwater runoff from rural roads, and how it effects his and
41 neighboring properties. He asked if there were any examples of runoff creating adverse impacts in other
42 areas. Many folks cited Dynamite Hill, a private road, and the impact of its runoff on Lake Iroquois.
43

44 Mike B. asked George B. about his concerns regarding levels of impact, and George B. discussed his
45 preference for a system of choices as opposed to mandates, with violators made to retrofit or improve.
46

47 Phil Pouech asked why the 100-year flood event was selected as a benchmark. Joe I. talked about how the
48 100-year flood is a common benchmark from a flood resiliency perspective, however, the effects of
49 climate change probably mean that the 100-year flood standard is likely already dated.
50

DRAFT

51 Doug Olufsen cited his concern about applicants asked to pay multiple times for the same engineering
52 services to satisfy concerns of the Development Review Board. Phil P. said that the engineering
53 requirements were intended to stave off the double-engineering or excessive engineering cost concerns by
54 creating unanimity sooner in the process, though there was merit to allowing alternate pathways to
55 addressing stormwater concerns.

56
57 George B. stated that he thought the regulations are based more on emotion than fact.

58
59 Robert Hyams commended the Town for taking action, and discussed how Partridge Hill Road is
60 problematic after heavy rains because of the impact from runoff. Robert H. asked if the regulations are
61 part of a stormwater master plan and if the regulations could be subject to a trial period.

62
63 Tom Ayer responded that the regulations can either be modified or overturned, but currently are not
64 constructed to serve for a trial period. Andrea talked about the ability to amend the regulations to make
65 necessary changes based on experience. Mike B. confirmed that the Board is planning to discuss potential
66 changes following the vote, regardless of the vote's outcome. Jon Trefy talked about the Town's focus on
67 stormwater planning in the village area, but not yet having extended that to include the Town as a whole.

68
69 Andrea M. talked about prior studies and the data already collected, which can be incorporated into a
70 master planning process.

71
72 Maggie G. discussed that cleanup and response to stormwater runoff is already costing the Town, and hits
73 all taxpayers through the budget process. The regulations are intended to make the necessary
74 improvements during development to head off that later impact. She stated that once the Town finds out
75 what kind of a steward a developer is, it's usually too late.

76
77 Barbara Forauer commended the Town for being proactive, and added that water will be the big issue for
78 the next generation. She added that, since the State's timeline for action is unclear, the Town should be
79 doing what it can to improve water quality.

80
81 Glenn Enose urged the Town to take care of the problems already known.

82
83 Phil recapped a number of the questions that arose during the discussion – what the cost/benefits
84 associated are (is the gain appropriate for the money spent), how the Town is planning to address its
85 stormwater impacts, and whether or not a universal fee charged to all property owners is appropriate. The
86 goals, he said, are to ensure water quality and protection of properties.

87
88 Jon T. discussed how he is supportive of the underlying purpose of the regulations, but concerned about
89 the costs associated with compliance. He added that using some sort of risk assessment tool would be
90 useful in determining future impacts and remedies.

91
92 Tom A. said that he too was worried about the cost of compliance and the lack of a risk assessment
93 framework, along with the need to modify the regulations to include "common sense" remedies.

94
95 Andrea M. encouraged folks to focus on making necessary adjustments to the regulations as adopted, as
96 opposed to simply repealing the entire set.

97
98 Mike B. added that it is important to ensure the DRB gets what it needs with regards to technical support
99 and education for review.

100

DRAFT

101 Mike stated that voting will occur by Australian ballot either by absentee ballot or on Tuesday, July 28
102 from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. in the Main Hall of Town Hall. He concluded the public hearing by reading the
103 question before voters: “Article I. Shall the changes to the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations, as
104 approved on May 18, 2015, by the Hinesburg Selectboard be repealed?
105

106 The public hearing was closed at 8:00 p.m.
107

108 FY16 Water/Wastewater Rates

109 Rocky Martin, Director of Buildings and Facilities, presented the proposed water and wastewater rates for
110 FY16. The Board and staff discussed the impact of the November bond approval to construct and connect
111 two new wells, the unknown impact of the changing wastewater regulatory framework at the State level,
112 and how the Town’s rates compare with selected benchmark communities.
113

114 Jon T. moved, and Tom A. seconded, a motion to approve the rates as presented and effective July 1,
115 2015. The motion passed 5-0.
116

117 Tom A. asked why VTrans was using a smaller mower for its roadside mowing efforts. Trevor L. will
118 inquire.
119

120 Phil P. moved, and Tom A. seconded, a motion to adjourn at 8:30 p.m. The motion passed 5-0.
121
122
123
124
125
126