

From: [Medash, Kyle](#)
To: mcypes@hinesburg.org
Cc: [Pfeiffer, Rebecca](#); "[Alex Weinhagen](#)"
Subject: RE: Hinesburg Center Phase II
Date: Thursday, March 17, 2022 2:45:58 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[RE Hinesburg Center II -- Hydraulic analysis demonstrating de minimis rise \(56.4 KB\).msg](#)

Hi Mitch,

Thank you for the update. Hope the meeting went well on Tuesday, I was unable to make this one but will make sure to be available for the final plat review. For awareness, I've attached the Rivers Program response to the Developer's consultant in regards to the latest hydraulic modeling results. To be clear, we have not given approval to the proposal under Act 250 Criterion 1D. In order for the proposal to receive favorable comments under Criterion 1D, we've requested a redesign of the project where the hydraulic modeling must not show any increase in the lateral extent of floodwaters or diversion of floodwaters onto neighboring land as well as no or de minimis rise in floodwater elevations or velocities. Please keep me in the loop on any updated applications to provide review/comment in accordance with 24 VSA §4424.

I understand the Town's interest in developing this area as a community center and the desire for the connector road to proposed Haystack development. There are some great ideas to be pursued to further develop the Town's village center; however, with designated development center within the SFHA and RC involving multiple drainages, complex hydrology, and increasing development pressures it stresses the importance of hydraulic modeling for future development planning in this area. There are a few factors at play when considering larger developments in this area and I think the Town would realize long term benefits and improved flood resiliency by viewing these different proposals comprehensively and holistically. One being future management of the canal – will this be managed to accept varying flows in the future and provide flood relief? Will it be abandoned and not accept any flow – increasing flows to Patrick Brook? Is it worth looking at upsizing the Route 116 culvert to reduce backup and floodwaters from running down 116? What areas are available for conservation/restoration to possibly increase floodwater storage and conveyance? From a Town planning perspective, we want to view this area as a whole over the long term rather than project by project during this development phase. The latter approach has potential to increase flood risk by creating new development at the expense of increasing flood risk to existing properties, leaving little options to mitigate this after the fact. Please let me know if you have any questions, happy to discuss further or participate in future meetings if helpful.

Respectfully,



Kyle Medash | Western Floodplain Manager
Vermont Agency of Natural Resources | Department of Environmental Conservation
Watershed Management Division, Rivers Program
450 Asa Bloomer State Office Building, 88 Merchants Row | Rutland, VT 05701-5903
802-490-6154 cell
kyle.medash@vermont.gov

From: mcypes@hinesburg.org <mcypes@hinesburg.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2022 3:01 PM
To: Medash, Kyle <Kyle.Medash@vermont.gov>
Cc: Pfeiffer, Rebecca <Rebecca.Pfeiffer@vermont.gov>; 'Alex Weinhagen' <aweinhagen@HINESBURG.ORG>
Subject: RE: Hinesburg Center Phase II

EXTERNAL SENDER: Do not open attachments or click on links unless you recognize and trust the sender.

Hi Kyle,

Hope you and yours are well. We are doing well. Thank you for your offer. Tonight's meeting is more procedural. The Applicant previously received approval for a sketch plan and preliminary plat for 23 of the 73 proposed units. During the review, the master plan, which showed the entire development of 75 units, was reviewed in detail. The Applicant proposed only 23 units in a first phase due to lack of water availability. Sufficient water and sewer allocation recently became available. The Applicant is returning to the DRB for sketch plan approval for the rest of the development and a waiver of final plat review. With this approval, they can apply for a final plat approval for the entire development.

That said, I spoke to Nick Smith, who spoke of his work with the State. He plans to speak of your progress at tonight's meeting. It may be valuable at the final plat hearing for you to attend, but may not be worth attending this one. Should you wish to attend, I have attached the agenda for the meeting with the Zoom links and meeting information.

One aspect that the Town is very interested in seeing go forward is the connector to the proposed Haystack development. The prior reports recommending an aquatic organism passage, which would be a replacement for the undersized existing culvert under VT Route 116, had a size that was not site specific. The HC2 proposal was to mimic that size in the report, being how close the two structures would be. The non-site specific structure in the State report would not have been full when areas of the 116 roadway would have been flooded. During the Town review, I recommended that the Applicant propose a hydrological equivalent that was lower in height and wider in length, which would span the current stream area and would be fully utilized before adjacent areas would flood. I understand that the connector is a work in progress, which we hope can be worked out.

Again, thank you for the offer and be well.

Mitch

Mitchel Cypes, P.E.
Hinesburg Development Review Coordinator
mcypes@hinesburg.org
802-482-4211
10632 Route 116, Hinesburg, VT 05461

From: Medash, Kyle <Kyle.Medash@vermont.gov>

Sent: Monday, March 14, 2022 5:54 PM

To: Alex Weinhausen <aweinhagen@HINESBURG.ORG>; Mitchel Cypes <mcypes@hinesburg.org>

Cc: jjarvis@hinesburg.org; Pfeiffer, Rebecca <Rebecca.Pfeiffer@vermont.gov>

Subject: Hinesburg Center Phase II

Hi Alex & Mitch,

Hope all is well! It has been brought to my attention that at tomorrow evening's DRB meeting one of the topics involves application review for a proposal for Hinesburg Center Phase II development. Since I've been hearing about it recently on a few fronts I figured I'd check in and see if you needed any assistance with the project review as it relates to floodplain impacts and bylaw requirements outlined in Section 6.13. I have not yet reviewed any site plans for the current proposal but based on earlier designs and the location within the SFHA – the current review should pay particular attention to how the proposal meets the development standards outlined in Section 6.12 (5), specifically demonstrating that the proposal meets all elements of the “no undue adverse impact” language.

The Rivers Program is currently working with the Developer's consultant on modeling floodplain impacts for the current proposal to meet the requirements of Act 250 Criterion 1D. Currently, no ANR decision has been made based on the modeling results and no approvals for the project have been given to the applicant from the Rivers Program. To my knowledge they have not yet submitted for an Act 250 permit; that will likely happen once the floodplain impact issue is sorted out. Any municipal permit would be contingent upon receiving any necessary State or Federal Permits (in this case Act 250) before work can begin in accordance with Section 6.5.2. Please let me know if you have any questions, happy to keep you in the loop and discuss further as this project evolves.

Respectfully,



Kyle Medash | Western Floodplain Manager

Vermont Agency of Natural Resources | Department of Environmental Conservation
Watershed Management Division, Rivers Program

450 Asa Bloomer State Office Building, 88 Merchants Row | Rutland, VT 05701-5903

802-490-6154 cell

kyle.medash@vermont.gov