

Butler Farms/Oak Creek Village Stormwater Study Group
Meeting Thursday, April 19, 2007
7:00 PM, City Hall Conference Room

AGENDA and NOTES

Present: Stormwater Study Group members, Breck Bowden, Juli Beth Hinds, Tom DiPietro, Jack Myers, Helena Vladich.

1. Welcome – Breck Bowden, UVM-Rubenstein School
2. Project status update – Juli Beth Hinds & Tom DiPietro, City of South Burlington
 - Legislation pending regarding title amnesty
 - Juli Beth: House bill HR 154 will extend permit to Jan 1, 2010 (though house has pushed it back to 2009). This effectively defers the need to obtain a permit until then.
 - Stormwater utility standards and takeovers
 - Tom: Several different neighborhoods and condo communities are in the process of turning over the SW permit management to the City
 - Charge to staff/engineer/UVM regarding alternative engineering option
 - See last item
 - Other matters
 - City interaction with Golf Course. Not this summer but it has to be done for them to get a permit. GC is asking for a lot and SB is saying they must do a lot.
3. Engineering plan options – Jack Myers, PE, Stantech
 - Review of initial options and opinions of probable costs
 - Option 1: Bigger pond Hinesburg, pocket pond, uses existing ponds
 - Option 1A: partial neighborhood coverage, pocket pond, uses existing ponds
 - Option 2: Super Pond, covers entire neighborhood, pocket pond
 - Problem: requires lots of excavation, expensive
 - Introduction of new “third option” – new design alternative – and probable costs
 - Option 3: Makes use of existing ponds.
 - Also has pocket pond
 - Re connects old pipes
 - Utilizes smaller ponds along Hinesburg Rd.
 - Low-impact designs (LID’s) within neighborhood to reduce runoff and flooding
 - No Superpond and thus no excavation
 - Allows for phasing of treatments

4. Hydrology context – Helena Vladich, UVM-SNR

- How the engineering options relate to the micro-drainage and sub-watersheds attached to and within Butler Farms/Oak Creek Village
 - Options 1 A/B
 - Gets the permit
 - somewhat less expensive
 - but treats less of the neighborhood
 - less opportunity to intervene with local flooding
 - Option 2:
 - Gets the permit
 - treats all the neighborhood
 - much more expensive
 - some opportunity to intervene with local flooding
 - Option 3:
 - Gets the permit
 - no more expensive
 - treats the entire neighborhood
 - greater opportunity to intervene with local flooding
 - Other benefits of Option 3
 - Stormwater Park area: recreation and social amenities
 - Natural pond design (no Superpond)
 - Evidence that property values increase
 - Include stream/ditch restoration
 - With right plants, greater evapotranspiration, less runoff, smaller design pond?, lower cost?
- Helena reviewed the details of the LIDAR-based Municipal Stormwater Drainage Density index she has developed.
- Point from audience: Need design details for stream restoration. Is this really needed to manage stormwater?
- Point from audience: There is regular flooding in SE corner of the neighborhood that needs to be treated.

5. Comparison and considerations among engineering options. NOTE: The following discussion was primarily about the permitting and financing process.

- Area 16 (by Golf Course) is a tough case. What can we do there? [Note: City, UVM, and Stantec are discussing possibility of an experiment porous pavement/sub-base detention system demonstration at this site.]
- BF/OCV will need to deal with permitting on their own. But City and UVM can help. If the homeowners approve a “plan” and financing, the Utility will take over. This will provide the basis for a permit and will clear the title. But...

- There is wrinkle in that the state has to develop the watershed-wide permits first (based on a “total maximum daily load” or TMDL plan, also developed by the state) before individual neighborhood permits can be issued. The good news is that BF/OCV are in Potash Brook which is the *only* watershed in Vermont that currently has a stormwater TMDL. Thus, we are likely to be first in line for a permit.
 - Option: Allow city to work with all adjacent land owners in the area (e.g. Golf Course, DuBois, Rye, Marceau) to get treatment on their properties so it does not get into BF/OCV.
 - SW Working Group participants like this idea. But they don’t want to depend on the “outside” landowners to participate when their (homeowners) permit and title are at risk.
 - Another option: Homeowners need to approach the City Council for support in pushing this forward.
 - Options for cost-shared treatment with “outside” landowners: One good option would be existing NE pond and the Rye Farm property. Oversize it now and then “share” cost with developers in the future to treat stormwater in this pond. Concept: “Site balancing”
5. Cost matrix: Juli Beth went through a spreadsheet she and Jack devised that compares costs of the three options. The spreadsheet will be posted on the RAN/SWWG web page.
6. Wrap-up
- Consensus to use the upcoming survey to get a “sense of the neighborhood” about the three options.
 - Question from audience: How do we formally make a decision on *any* option
Juli Beth: Have to go to City Council. Endorse EFA. Would be a public take over. Financing would depend on the option chosen. Superpond = “special assessment district”. If smaller LID = different approach likely, but could be spread out over time; i.e. lower impact on everyone.
 - Once the residents make a decision, the Utility will take over negotiations with the other ‘offsite’ owners.
 - General consensus by the SWWG members present that option 3 is best.
 - The Legislative extension does not seem to make any difference to any particular plan.
 - Upcoming matters
 - Newsletter: Cost/benefit of options, financing, decision process outline
 - Survey: follows up on 2003 survey, new questions, will query re: options
 - To be posted soon on website:
 - i. Jack’s presentation
 - ii. Helena’s presentation
 - iii. Cost estimates