Burlington Conservation Board
645 Pine Street
Burlington, VT 05401
http://www.burlingtonvt.gov/DPI/CB
Telephone: (802) 865-7189

Miles Waite, Chair
Zoe Richards
Don Meals
Matt Moore
Ryan Crehan
Hannah Brislin
Rebecca Roman
Vacant
Vacant

Conservation Board Meeting Minutes

Monday, July 6, 2020 – 5:30 pm
Remote Meeting

Attendance

- **Board Members:** Zoe Richards (ZR), Ryan Crehan (RC), Miles Waite (MW), Rebecca Roman (RR), Matt Moore (MM), Don Meals (DM), Hannah Brislin (HB)
- **Absent:**
- **Public:** Bruce Baker, Jacques Larose (273 Pearl Street)
- **Staff:** Scott Gustin (Permitting & Inspections)

MW, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

Annual Organizational Meeting
MW explained that no action is needed until July 2021. The organizational meeting is deferred until then.

Minutes
Meeting minutes of June 1, 2020

A MOTION was made by DM and SECONDED by RR:

Accept the June 1 minutes as written.

Vote: 7-0-0, motion carried.

Board Comment
ZR asked if we have a new member. SG said no, but thought that Heather Fitzgerald applied. SG suggested that ZR ask Heather to follow up with Lori Olberg.

Public Comment
None.

Open Space Subcommittee
Open Space Addendum:

RR showed the updated addendum slides. ZR said that the addendum is targeted at climate action work related to natural areas. Nature is good for climate.

RR addressed the slides and updates for the Board. The centerpiece is nature-based climate solutions.
ZR said she's connected with the US sustainability directors' network through Jen Green at BED.
MM asked if Legacy Funds were used for open space planning previously. SG responded, yes.
MW, will this presentation be used in public outreach? ZR, this is aimed at the Planning Commission. SG agreed and noted it will be used in discussion with the P&R Commission. It could be part of the public outreach as well.

HB asked about the UN figures. ZR said she'd follow up to confirm the studies. HB asked about expansion of the Legacy Fund for this item. ZR said the fund does grow on its own. There's a longer term discussion to be had about increasing monies into the Fund. That would have to be voter-approved. ZR said that we're looking to encourage and expand upon what institutions are doing with their natural areas.

HB said she went to the Wildways on Saturday and spent the day there.

MW asked about the significance of the outline. SG explained that it's the basis for the addendum. The slides are the basis for discussion of the addendum with the Planning Commission and the P&R Commission. ZR said that maybe the addendum could be used as the basis for regulatory changes like steep slopes or planting native species along the lakeshore.

MW, is nature-based solutions a new concept for the plan? ZR, there's nothing about climate change in the original Open Space Protection Plan. This effort is something of a warm-up for a comprehensive update of the Open Space Protection Plan.

MW pointed out the reference to the original Abbenaki stewardship of the lands. ZR elaborated.

MW asked about process. SG said a vote to move it along would be warranted tonight.

A Motion was made by: HB Second: DM

The Conservation Board supports moving ahead with the open space addendum and onto the Planning Commission.

Vote: 7-0-0, motion carries.

Legacy Fund Logo:

ZR feels we should get a logo for the BCLF. We've spent monies and we should advertise it to make folks aware of what has benefited.

SG said that guidance is needed as to what should be in the logo. ZR, some recognizable image with reference to the Burlington Conservation Legacy Fund. MM, why not just use the city logo? He agrees with ZR about elevating the profile of these conserved spaces. Do other city entities have their own logos? ZR, P&R does. HB feels that a logo specific to the fund makes sense. Some sort of conservation acknowledgement in the name could help explain the fund. RC said that there is an urban wilds logo that refers to the Conservation Legacy Fund. MW said that perhaps we can use that one. ZR said she'd check in with Dan Cahill and follow up with the Board next month.

Project Review

1. 20-0717CA/MA; 273 Pearl St (RH, Ward 8E) Triple Tree Group, LLC
Planned Unit Development involving 273 Pearl St, 11 Hungerford Tr, 15 Hungerford Tr, and 21 Hungerford Tr. Construct 12-unit residential building with related parking and supporting infrastructure.

Bruce Baker and Jacques Larose appeared on behalf of this application.

SG noted the project is "major impact" and therefore requires BCB review. Stormwater and EPSC plans have been assembled and submitted.

Bruce Baker overviewed the project to the Board. He noted a gentle slope to the west before then dropping off into what was formerly a ravine. He's proposing 12 units of multi-family housing. Underground storage and filtration is proposed for stormwater.

Jaqcues Larose addressed stormwater. The project includes roughly a 10,000 sf increase in lot coverage. Runoff of all of the existing and new impervious surface will be captured. Due to the soils, an underground infiltration chamber is proposed. Overflow will move out via a control structure.

MW, have you done soil borings and analysis. Mr. Larose, yes. Mr. Baker said that contamination analysis has been done. Geotechnical work will be done before building.

MM, sounds like a phase 1 assessment has been done. If there was some sort of contamination that would prohibit this type of stormwater management, are there other options? Mr. Larose said there are other options such as a sand filter. He said that infiltration is the first choice.

RC, what storm event can the infiltration chambers handle? Mr. Larose, it can handle at least to the 10-year storm event and likely beyond that. For the entire 10-year event, a portion would be infiltrated, and excess would be released at a controlled rate. Water will not leave the site faster than under current conditions.

MW, it's important to know that the soil can structurally handle the construction.

MM, where is the discharge? Mr. Larose, on the western side of the site and into the swale. MM, what's at the bottom of the ravine? Mr. Larose, there will be a pipe through the retaining wall. The ravine drains into the combined sewer system. MM, is that where everything is going now? The existing drainage path is being maintained.

ZR, is there any improvement over conditions? Mr. Larose, yes, there is up to the 10-year storm event.

Mr. Baker said that parking is needed but limited with a 50% waiver request.
MM, what does plan B look like for stormwater management? Mr. Larose, we can make the storm tech system work either way. The question would be whether it infiltrates or filters before discharge. MW, infiltration would be an ideal way to reduce flows.

RC, a bigger concern is about the 10-year storm event. Once the capacity is full, will more stormwater leave the site than pre-development? Mr. Larose, no. Volume will be reduced associated with the 10-year storm event.

RC, did you talk with the Handy's about the project? Mr. Baker, yes, but they were not receptive to working together.

MW, have you calculated the volume of fill you will need? Mr. Larose, we don't have a number yet. Mr. Baker said that some preliminary analysis was done. Sandy soils will be used.

MW, will Act 250 be required? Mr. Baker, no.

A Motion was made by: ZR Second: DM

Recommend approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. Need geo technical borings for infiltration and soil quality testing of the native soils to determine suitability for infiltration.
2. Consider installing a couple of monitoring wells for pre- and post-infiltration to measure ground water.

Discussion:
MM, to whom would they send tests results? MM, if the soils are unsuitable and stormwater redesign is needed, would additional zoning review be needed? SG, only if the site changes. Otherwise, just city stormwater staff review.

RR left at 6:55 PM.

MM questioned whether the conditions are redundant with the city stormwater review. MW thinks it merits inclusion in the motion. MM, as to ground-water monitoring wells, is this BCB's purview? Who will do and to whom will it be reported? MW said it's advisory. ZR concurred. DM said our action is advisory to the DRB. They may place or alter the condition or not.

Vote: 6-0-0, motion carries.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 7:04 PM.