



Minutes of Meeting

DATE: November 30, 2017
MMI #: 4430-02
PROJECT: Moon Brook Impoundment
Modification Project

ATTENDEES:
See full attendees list.

SUBJECT: Public Meeting #4 Notes

LOCATION: Rutland High School Lecture Hall

See presentation slides for specific information presented in each portion of the meeting.

7:00 Piedmont Pond Presentation by Roy Schiff, Milone & MacBroom:

- Reviewed previous information and goals of the meeting.
- We can still meet with people to review simulations or designs.
- We have been keeping the communities values in mind throughout the design.
- The temperature modeling looks at Moon Brook as a system.
- Simulations examined included work at Combination and the corridor and the following at Piedmont Pond:
 - #1 – dredging and vegetation with 5 meter wide canopy, keep water surface the same
 - #3 – dredging and vegetation with 15 meter wide canopy, lower water surface 2 feet
- The shade canopy needs to be around 80% of the perimeter of the pond, but can include “view windows”.
- Follow-up on how deep the water would be after dredging and if there will be a stone bottom. This will be done during data collection.
- Someone in the audience thought that the pond surface used to be 2 feet higher.
- Discussed leaves from the trees falling in the ponds. The leaves are good for macroinvertebrate habitat.
- The design will explore if there could be some removable boards on the dam to help with periodic flushing of the pond.
- The state has recommended option #3, which lowers the pond elevation 2 feet and has a wider canopy width to get better water quality benefits. With this option the habitat value also goes up. The new vegetation would also encroach on the lawns less, because it can extend out into what is currently pond.
- Invasive plants would be removed as part of the design.
- During the design phase a plan will be created that shows specific tree species in specific locations along with their mature size. There will be public comment on this at that future time.

Comments:

- View #2 should have trees adjusted toward dam to keep more of the mountain view from the property.

- The two residents at Piedmont Pond both prefer alternative #1. Their main goal is to keep the pond and keep the pond deep. They are ok with compromising on the buffer width.
- Feedback from other nearby residents will be sought following the meeting.
- There was concern that a shallower pond might fill in quicker.
- They would like to make sure trees chosen will resist blow-over. A silver maple along the pond edge had already fallen.
- Aquatic organism passage / fish passage should be improved.
- Ethan Swift responded that aquatic organism passage improvements would be very good to include in the design.
- The cracks in the dam are getting worse.

8:00 Combination Pond Presentation by Roy Schiff, Milone & MacBroom:

- Reviewed alternatives. At Combination Pond both alternatives #1 and #3 are the same, with the only differences at Piedmont Pond.
- The alternative includes dredging, planting vegetation with 15 meter wide canopy, and lowering the pond water surface 2 feet.
- Vegetation on or near the dam embankment will be important for the design.
- The dam should likely be significant hazard due to downstream development.
- A new dam spillway will be needed and the culvert under the road will need to be replaced or repaired.

Comments:

- Funding should consider ownership. Combination pond is public and people can fish there, which Piedmont Pond is private.
- 10 years ago we would fish upstream and it was shaded. Now the beavers have dammed it up and tore down the trees. It is heating up the water.
- The state does have a beaver protocol, but it is difficult. You have to trap all the beavers before you can remove the dam.
- Rutland has marketed themselves as a solar city and this resident has made a passive solar house. The 3 acre pond produces 1 million kilowatt hours and passively heats their home. The trees will diminish energy capture. How can we manage energy loss? The sun in July is at the left of view #1, this time of year is in the center of the pond, and in late winter is closer to the dam.
- On view #1, move the right tree a little farther to the right.
- Concentrate trees on the southeast corner of the pond and on the dam. There are no views blocked from those locations. Maybe put fill or the dredging spoils there?
- Generally ok with lowering pond. This will need a permit because it is Class 2 wetland.
- Would prefer pond edge to not move out in front of homes, but concentrate the edge moving at the north of the pond.
- Jeff – solar gain modeling was done by the state and the analysis is available.
- An island could be used to put trees out at the existing trash rack.

- View #2 – put more trees in the public viewing area.
- View #2 – keep windows, maybe smaller ones to still get some sun and locations to cast a rod.
- View #2 – the houses to the west of the pond near hear would like to keep some view. They have been adding riparian vegetation already and want to keep a view.
- Discussed dredging. Might be done with a clamshell from the edge or might need a small barge. After done, the pond would look the same, just be deeper.
- The plant list got general positive feedback. Do not like alder. Fruit and berries are good to feed wildlife and birds. Specifically mentioned apple as positive.
- Aquatic organism passage should be included.
- This needs to be a regional approach including the entire watershed and especially the upstream communities.
- Ethan Swift agreed that all efforts would also help the Lake Champlain P TMDL and described many stormwater treatment projects throughout the City and watershed.
- Jeff - The City will need to address their mowing ordinance and determine how to create the no-mow zone along the water edges. This will likely be a combination of education and incentives.
- Ethan Swift described the TMDL. The TMDL shows that the City can meet the target load, but it doesn't regulate the implementation plan. That is why we are here to meet the requirement and the needs of the community.
- Michel – There is no case here because there are no dead trout. He looks forward to working with the City on improvements. He plans to file a case in federal court.
- Ethan Swift – Reiterated that the TMDL was required because assessments show the absence of the species. He reviewed the standard.

Adjourned Meeting 9:20 pm