

Hazard Mitigation Committee
29 June 2016 Special Meeting
Public Forum “Bridging the Brook”

Minutes

Attending: Bram Towbin, Dan Gadd, George Springston, Michael Billingsley, Robert Bridges, David Hill, Bob Fancher, Kathy Fancher, Edward Hutchinson, Caresse Monteith, Alice Merrill, Dawn Fancher, Susan Grimaldi, John Adams, Michael Birnbaum, Greg (videotape)

Meeting called to order by Chair Dan Gadd at 7:10

Panel participants George Springston, Bram Towbin and Michael Billingsley were introduced by Dan Gadd. Dan announced that the recommendation of the Committee had emerged from a voted Hazard Mitigation Committee resolution. Note – text of that resolution, adopted during our 16 April meeting, is as follows: “Committee recommendation to coincide with M&M recommended option #4: replacement of Bridges 1 & 2 at 1.0 bank full structures, with stream bed modifications. “ -Moved by Bram Towbin, 2nd George Springston – passed by voice vote with no abstentions.

1. Bram Towbin gave an introduction to flooding history, the formation of the Flood Advisory Committee and the Selectboard decision to hire Milone & MacBroom for an engineering analysis of Great Brook.

Copies were handed out of a summary of the Milone & MacBroom report and an illustration of “option #4” (prepared by G. Springston) and full copies of the report (prepared by B. Towbin).

2. Michael Billingsley gave a summary of general observations from the report about Great Brook scouring and erosive actions during floods, as well as the adding of woody debris following landslides. The principle cause of flood damage is undersized bridges at Brook Road and Mill Street.

3. George Springston gave an illustrated presentation about the damage at and near the Brook Road bridge, as well as Milone & MacBroom’s models of the kind of bridges and stream bed work which would alleviate most further damage at both Brook Road and Mill Street.

4. Bram Towbin talked about the likely cost of the proposed solution (2 new bridges plus stream bed alteration in the vicinity of such bridges), how similar projects are funded, what the likely time frame for solutions might be, and what (in general) lies ahead.

If the Selectboard accepts the recommendation of the Committee and support of the public, and the article is passed by the Town, the next step would be to commission a bridge construction study including seeing what sorts (and costs) accompany recommended bridge design(s).

5. The participating public asked quite a few questions and presented concerns, particularly about cost and whether such a project could be successfully completed ahead of more damaging flood events.

The broad consensus seemed to be that the Committee’s choice to support the conclusions of the Milone and MacBroom report was a good action.

The meeting was closed at about 8:45 p.m. although several people stayed behind to talk further with committee members.