

CCV Stormwater Management Committee Meeting  
Joint Council-Committee Meeting  
March 23, 2021 7:00-8:30 PM

**In Attendance:** Julie Sparacino, David Goldwyn, Elise Pas, Kevin Cannard, Nancy Somerville, Bruce Hebbard, Todd Eskelsen, Tom McCarty, Peter Marks (SWMC liaison-Town Council member), Catherine Schempp (resident), Mike Bellaman (resident), Ron Sherrow (resident-Town Council member), Paula Fudge (resident-Town Council member), Brian Manion (resident).

Absent: Tony Salah, Paul Kempton

- I. Initiation of the meeting - quorum (6 members) was noted and the meeting was initiated.
- II. Approval of minutes for 3.16.21 meeting
- III. Updates on Town Council meeting (David)
  - A. Money has been earmarked for budget for reserve purposes. Some could go to fund the SWMC report recommendation, if approved, but specific allocations were not revealed- that will be addressed at the budget meeting.
  - B. Questions by SWMC members at the Town Council meeting were raised about accuracy of Clark/Azar report assessment of the conditions of stormwater inlets.
  - C. Council expressed trepidation about regulations that would involve public property and this has driven some thinking about the way we present the information within the report and the presentation- it is with this lens that we will review and finalize the report today
- IV. Update on Town Survey (Tom)
  - A. There were challenges in how to synthesize and summarize the data- Tom presented some ideas about collapsing and streamlining data.
  - B. Reviewing the table that Jana sent with breakdowns by time frame, the September 10, 2020 and "last 60 days" was basically the same time frame (September-November) and we know that there was no other comparable storm to September 10, so we can use just the 60 days data; there was a lot of missing data for 5 year timelines- so suggested the 1 year timelines. The tables possibly deflate the prevalence of water issues
    1. 311 residences in the town- 99 responses- discussed how the % of respondents reporting damage is of interest, with clarity that the response rate was about  $\frac{1}{3}$  of households.
    2. Concerns that not all residents received the survey- Julie clarified that the survey was sent through "constant contact"- which has pretty extensive coverage within the town.

3. The data point of 76 people reported being impacted by storms was not evident on the table provided- a request to add this data point.
  - C. Tom found a "flood factors" resource/website (non-profit that compiles flooding data) - uses a mathematical model that indicates where there is flooding and this site indicates some overlap with what we know about higher risk areas.
  - D. Tom McCarty is willing to assist the town in analyzing these data and to conduct any data mapping work to provide a clearer depiction of the findings for the Town and MCDOT.
  - E. The SWMC assessed that using the data as presented in the tables provided to it in the SWMC would be misleading or inaccurate and the SWMC elected not to use it. But it was agreed the data needed to be more effectively analyzed and presented, including for the purposes of sharing it with MCDOT (which had originally requested the survey).
- V. Review of draft report - this was reviewed in detail, page by page, and edits were made throughout the meeting.
- A. Refined and finalized the findings and recommendations
  - B. Added back the recommendations into the report
  - C. Finalized how to present the age of stormwater infrastructure
  - D. Town declined to pass on requests by the SWMC concerning GIS data and age of the CCV stormwater infrastructure to MCDOT, which had said requests need to come from the town.
  - E. Discussed the conclusions at length and made some tweaks to the language
- VI. Motions made by D. Goldwyn
- A. To adopt the report- Agreement to adopt as it was finalized during the meeting- E. Pas to send around the clean version and committee members have 72 hours to dissent. So moved by T. Eskelsen, seconded by E. Pas, and unanimously voted for in favor.
  - B. To make a request to the Town Council to make a live (including virtual) presentation to the Town Council which is open to the public. Committee agreement that we can present in the earliest possible time. No objections raised by the committee.
- VII. Resident questions
- A. Will the report be shared publicly (e.g., to MCDOT)? The report will become a public record when shared with the Town Council and will discuss how else to share the report.
- VIII. Next meeting on April 6, 2021 at 7:00-8:30 PM: to discuss the presentation to the Town and communicate the report to others
- IX. Adjournment