

**Chittenden County All-Hazards Mitigation Plan Review/Update Committee Meeting**  
**DRAFT MINUTES**

Date: **Wednesday, February 10, 2016**  
Time: **2:30 p.m. – 4: 30 p.m.**  
Location: **Main Conference Room, CCRPC Offices, Winooski**

**Attendees:** Dan Albrecht (CCRPC), Regina Mahony (CCRPC), Lee Krohn (CCRPC), Emily Nosse-Leirer (CCRPC), Karen Purinton (Colchester), Melissa Manka (Westford), Ken Belliveau (Williston), Staci Pomeroy (ANR), Brian Bigelow (Underhill), Sharon Murray (Bolton), Todd Odit (Jericho), Ben Rose (Vermont Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security) and Lauren Oates (Vermont Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security).

1. **Call to Order, Introductions and Changes to the Agenda**
2. **Public comments on items not on the Agenda** – No one from the public was in attendance.
3. **Review and Action on Minutes of November 5, 2015** – Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Sharon Murray to approve the November 5, 2015 minutes. No discussion. MOTION PASSED.
4. **Overview of County All Hazards Mitigation Plan & Maps**

Dan Albrecht provided an overview of the Table of Contents of the Chittenden County plan to provide the Committee with an understanding of the organization and contents of the Plan including the hazards, vulnerabilities, mitigation strategies and plan maintenance. Staci Pomeroy has some comments on the Plan and will provide some feedback, including language regarding the fact that Buel's Gore and St. George are not in the flood insurance program.

Dan Albrecht described the FEMA-declared disasters over the last 2.5 decades. There were significant damages in the 1990's, less damage in the 2000's, and we are now half way through the 2010's and we've exceeded the amount of damage experienced in the 1990's. Dan described some of the other updated information regarding the structures in the flood plain and river corridor, and the amount of value of these structures. The amount of conserved land was also updated. Ken Belliveau asked what land is included in the conserved lands table. Regina explained that this does not include municipally conserved lands beyond what was in the original UVM database. Williston and Westford have these conserved lands in a database and can provide it. Dan and Pam will follow-up on this to see how consistent this information is across each municipality.

Dan Albrecht then provided an overview of the maps. Staci had a question about Map 3. The maps look deceiving because it makes you feel like there is no erosion in the river corridor areas without FEH data. Yellow happens to be where we have assessment information, not the only place where there is an erosion hazard. CCRPC will edit the titles to clarify this. Sharon had a question about whether CCRPC was still going to be doing more phase II FEH work because we don't have all of the streams done. Bolton has some that they would still like to be done. Dan suggested that we list those specific needs in each of the municipal annexes. Ultimately this information is needed to help work with the RPC and State to make the River Corridor map more accurate.

Lauren also has e-911 data for hazard mitigation projects. We may want to map that information as well to show what buy-outs and other projects have been completed. When reviewing Map 7 Ben explained that there is the Department of Health Vulnerable Populations online map based on Census track which might be helpful. It was sent out through the flood resiliency list serve. Some of the layers that they include may be useful for this purpose. Dan will follow-up on these additional data sources.

5. **Review County Key Hazards Risk Estimation Scoring Matrices**

Dan Albrecht reviewed the final hazard rankings now that they are sorted by rank. The Committee made some additional edits to the scores. There was a discussion about how water quality is ranked. It is an

ongoing issue with algal blooms, phosphorus, etc. so the Committee decided to move the occurrence rank from 4 to 5, making this the highest ranked of the technological hazards. There was some discussion regarding the occurrence of invasive species, and this was changed to a 5 since it is ongoing. The Economic Disruption score for invasive species was lowered from a 2 to a 1. There was some discussion regarding the two '2' scores in the Economic Disruption score. Staci suggested that we title these 2a and 2b to make the score clear for each incident (and carry that forward into each cell). The Committee decided to lower the occurrence ranking for sewer from 4 to 3, as we don't often experience a service loss on wastewater treatment. The Committee decided to change the occurrence score from 4 to 5 for crime since it is ongoing. Staci asked if mosquito borne diseases are included in the epidemic category. Dan explained that they are included under epidemic.

#### **6. Review County Mitigation Strategies**

Dan Albrecht provided a quick overview of the strategies, and described the edits that have been made to the Chittenden County level strategies: added the vulnerabilities, and added an economic recession strategy. Staci appreciated seeing the specific years and municipalities that we'll be working with each year.

#### **7. Overview of Municipal-Level All Hazards Mitigation Plan & Maps**

Dan Albrecht provided a quick overview of the Westford Plan. Dan asked Staci to review the flood hazard/river corridor section as this will be the boilerplate language that we will use in each of the municipal annexes. Dan asked if there are still scour rankings on bridge assessments. We had this in the last plan but Dan hasn't been able to find updated information. Lauren suggested that FEMA will ask for information about whether the Plan is good as is or needs to be improved. Dan asked Lauren to send him this language. Dan explained that we may want to add in some language about the municipal roads general permit for all non-MS4 towns; perhaps not an actual strategy but some discreet language somewhere.

Dan Albrecht provided a quick overview of the Westford Maps. The Committee provided a variety of recommendations for edits to the maps. Staci suggested that we label Route 15. There was discussion regarding the fact that the small streams don't show up in the River Corridor layer; and there was a question about whether we can add more of the culvert and bridge assessments that are not just from the Phase II FEH assessments. Without this data the maps make it look like there aren't very many undersized culverts. There are other bridge and culvert inventories not associated with the Phase II FEH Assessments that are accurate and helpful to add. Dan asked Staci to provide this information to Dan and Pam. It would be helpful to add a note on the maps that the debris removal projects show up at the Town Halls, but that is not an accurate indication of where the debris was removed. Sharon asked if we can add Town Garages to the critical facilities layer. There was a discussion regarding what category of critical facilities we are using and whether the municipalities can add places that they think is critical. Regina suggested that we should be able to add a note that accurately describes the data set for the base critical facilities, and then add a note if individual municipalities want to add facilities that they consider critical. There was also a discussion regarding the congregate housing data layer on the maps. It appears that the mobile home layer may include all mobile homes. There was discussion that individual mobile homes should not be considered 'congregate housing'. Only mobile home parks should be included on these maps, and the colors should be fixed as the yellow roads make it difficult to see the mobile home parks.

Regarding timing, we will maintain eligibility for ERAF as soon as we submit the plans to FEMA. Lauren indicated that FEMA is taking 3 months for review for individual plans. FEMA would like the municipal annexes to be adopted at the same time. Sharon asked if we can establish an effective date rather than an adopted date so that everyone will be on the same timeframe? Ben Rose indicated that we could try that.

Ken Belliveau asked if there is language that they should include in their Town Plan regarding the All Hazard Mitigation Plan in case the AHMP takes longer than expected. They'll adopt their Town Plan sooner than the AHMP update, so they want to make sure that CCRPC isn't going to make them include something if the AHMP isn't moving forward as planned. Dan explained that they would like the Town Plans to reference the AHMP and if feasible, when discussing action items in their Town Plan to include, for example, references to discrete strategies in the AHMP.

Ben suggested that we don't lose all of the preparedness language since it is agreeable and that is what folks are doing. Just make it clear that it isn't a mitigation strategy from FEMA's perspective.

8. **Next Steps**

- a. Dan, Lee and Emily described what work they've been doing on the local Annexes. Lauren Oates and Ben Rose described the next steps from their perspective. Lauren will provide us with some feedback and then we will incorporate those edits. Dan suggested that we hold a formal public input meeting before we submit this draft to FEMA. The Committee agreed.
- b. Regina Mahony explained that the ECOS Plan amendments incorporated reference to the County All Hazard Mitigation Plan. The first public hearing for these amendments will take place on 3/16/16. The Plan already includes much of the language needed to meet the flood resiliency requirements.

**Adjourn** – the meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:30pm.