

Committee Members in attendance

- Laurie Hunter, John Flaherty, Brian Schlegel, Kay Upham, Zander Kessler, Hanna Yelle, Brian Miller, John Boynton, Bob Grom, Ryan Kane, Kathleen Ogden Fasser, Mike Mastrullo, Susan Blevins, Mary McCabe

Citizen Observer Attendees

- Cynthia Rainey, Julie Ann Cancio, and ????

Approval of Prior Minutes

- John Boynton explained the process for approving the minutes.
- John Boynton asked if there were any changes/edits to the minutes
 - October 17, 2017 Minutes approved *as amended*
 - Laurie Hunter will edit typos
 - October 30, 2017 Working Group Minutes approved *as amended*
 - Amendment: Names of committee members in attendance added

A brief discussion followed re

Where can the public find a copy of the *approved* minutes

- Laurie Hunter set up a Campus Advisory Committee link on the District website
- Go to CCRSD Homepage, School Committee, Committee Reports, Campus Advisory

A brief discussion followed re where to send draft minutes.

- Mary McCabe will send draft to Mary Storrs to be linked to the following Agenda
- Leona Palmaccio will post the minutes on the website once amended/approved

Agenda item A

Kathy Campbell, CDW Consultants

At the October 30 *Working Group* meeting a decision was made to invite Kathy Campbell of CDW Consultants to the Campus Advisory Committee's November 7 meeting. Ms. Campbell knows the campus extremely well and it was hoped that she could share her knowledge of the campus especially pertaining to the now capped former landfill

Ms. Campbell's arrival was delayed.

John Boynton suggested the committee move to the next item on the Agenda.

Agenda items B and C

Data Inventory and Mapping/Site Plans

Brian Schlegel reported that he had sent “as built plans” to the committee. Kathleen Ogden Frasser (and others) inquired about obtaining a full size PDF version of the plans. John Boynton previously asked Gale Assoc. to send a CAD compatible version. Brian Schlegel and John Boynton will pursue CAD compatible versions.

Agenda item A

Kathy Campbell, CDW Consultants

- John Boynton explained to Ms. Campbell the committee’s task.
- John Boynton asked Ms. Campbell if she could share with the committee her understanding of what can/what cannot be done at the now capped former landfill
- Ms. Campbell presented an abbreviated version of the site history
- In the 1940’s/50’s the former privately owned landfill site was used as a burn pit by a local farmer; the pit had been an old quarry; ash + dirt from the burn pit was used to fill the quarry hole; trash consisted of, among many other things, building materials; burn pits are problematic: chemicals in burn pit ash typically includes lead, arsenic, etc.; before (?) the (old) school was built, the pit was raised (covered) with clean soil; the high school was built adjacent to the pit; when the burn pit was discovered efforts were made to delineate the contaminated area/determine remediation needs; a decision was made that it was too expensive to dig up the contaminated soil (the pit was ~ 15 feet deep); the most reasonable thing to do was to leave the contaminated soil and cap the landfill; the site is a GW1 site (concern is the risk of groundwater contamination); a ¼” clay liner was designed to be used as a cap above the site; the clay cap does not allow stormwater to seep through; undisturbed, the cap will prevent (forever) the contaminants from travelling further; the cap was installed with no sharp edges; all materials that might possibly damage the cap were removed from the site; a drainage layer was placed above the cap; the drainage design forces storm run-off/rain to flow away away from the cap; some sloping was built into the design, but generally the drainage follows the natural grade of what was already present; above the cap is a 2’ deep earthen cap; several earthen cap alternatives were explored: among others, “common borrow” versus “compacted gravel borrow”; the soil layer used is a “compacted gravel borrow” cap and allows for future “passive recreation”; the compacted gravel borrow offers a more stable base and better drainage than, for e.g., the common borrow option; John Flaherty noted that having the compacted gravel borrow installed now, eliminated the future cost of removing the fill at a later date; this insured one installation cost, rather than two; the compacted gravel borrow is suitable for multiple applications
- Ms. Campbell explained that the cap is designed for “passive recreation” use; cars and/or large trucks driving on the cap would disturb the cap, i.e., cars/trucks not passive use

- In response to a question from Kathleen Ogden Fasser, yes, it is possible to remove the soil layer and put down a concrete cap; concrete would meet a higher, i.e., “stricter” standard; this would be expensive; the clay cap should not be penetrated, hence the passive recreation designation;
- In response to a question from Kathleen Ogden Fasser, yes, you can *build up*, e.g., berms
- In response to a question, footings for light standards would not be permissible; this would require “overdigging” *and removal* of contaminated soil; it is possible, yes, but the cost of driving the piles, etc., would have to include the cost of overdigging, and contaminated soil would have to be removed from the site
- John Boynton asked about some of the uses that have been previously mentioned, for e.g., a track; a track would be permissible if the appropriate drainage system was put in place
- In response to a question about the track and the gravel earthen cap, Kathleen Ogden Fraser said approximately 6”-12” of fill would have to be removed to do the track work
- Kathleen Ogden Fraser: Any improvements to the site, for e.g., a walkway, most likely would require more fill; there is no additional fill available at the site
- Ms. Campbell: The skate park is w/in the landfill; the asphalt where the skate park sits was in very good condition and deemed an appropriate storm-water barrier
- Kay Upham asked about the drainage plan; Ms. Campbell said that all of the drainage from the cap goes to 2 previously existing catch basins
- John Boynton asked Ms. Campbell about the flow of storm-water. In other words, if it rains in the area of the now capped former landfill, water travels through the earthen gravel cap, hits the clay, and then goes ... where? Ms. Campbell explained, you can see a swale; there are pipes in the swale; these pipes are directly connected to the two catch basin
- Bob Grom asked whether Ms. Campbell was familiar with similar projects and what type of passive recreation (or otherwise) exists on those sites? Ms. Campbell mentioned golf driving ranges and solar farms
- Bob Grom asked if the school committee could guarantee the safety/health of athletes participating in passive recreation above the cap; Ms. Campbell said yes as long as the cap is maintained, i.e., no penetration
- Bob Grom asked if the site would be monitored? Ms. Campbell explained that the Mass. DEP required maintenance of the cap integrity
- Kathleen Ogden Fasser noted anything that requires a footing sounds like an issue, i.e., would involve penetration of the cap; Brian Miller agreed, but noted that it would still be possible, albeit expensive
- Kay Upham asked if there were any plans to install lights for the skateboard park (the skateboard park previously benefited possibly from the then existing parking lot lights); John Flaherty was not aware of any plans to install lights for the skate park
- Ms. Campbell explained that in February (?) a Notice of Activity and Use Limitation would be published; It is important to make sure that the language of the notice doesn’t unintentionally prevent future action at the site; CDW will use a standard form

to draft the AUL; draft language would allow for passive recreation usage and any other use that doesn't penetrate the cap; language might also include exceptions if the school committee knew in advance that it wanted to install, for e.g., lights, etc.; CDW does not want to preclude the School Committee doing something they might want in the future

- Bob Grom thought the AUL would be filed/published on February 6
- Mike Mastrullo asked if there was an efficient way to learn how people have used these sites in the past; Ms. Campbell thought she might be able to do some sort of search on the Mass DEP database, but Kathy Ogden Fasser noted that even if we had a list of brownfield sites, we wouldn't be able to piece together the various stages, for e.g., were light standards installed before or after the clay cap, etc.,
- Discussion involving a potential ice hockey rink ensued. John Flaherty noted that the heavy equipment necessary to install the rink would disturb the cap, i.e., heavy equipment violates the passive recreation activity and use restriction
- Kathleen Ogden Fasser asked for clarification - the current cap is clay, compact gravel borrow, and topsoil. Ms. Campbell agreed. Kathleen asked if you could remove the topsoil and put down pavement. Yes, but John Flaherty noted that the campus is above the threshold for pavement
- Ms. Campbell explained that you could change the cap, i.e., pave the 4.5 acres, but the cost would be quite high; the current cap was designed/built at significantly less cost
- Ms. Campbell explained that if you modify the cap (and, yes that can be done) you need to amend the AUL
- Susan Blevins asked if you can pave part of the area, but not all of the area; Ms. Campbell answered yes, but you would have to create another barrier between the two areas
- John Boynton noted that it appeared anything was possible, but at a cost, sometimes quite significant
- Kay Upham raised an issue about the impermeable surface usage at the high school and a concern whether the campus had already exceeded its threshold; she asked for clarification re what does the groundwater district allow? More specifically Ms. Upham inquired whether it was possible to add ANY impermeable surface to the high school site; a discussion followed: If the campus is already over the threshold (one person thought the high school was at 18%, another person said 20%; and most thought the threshold is 15%), can you obtain an exception from the zoning board of appeals
 - Laurie Hunter and John Flaherty asked Brian Schlegel to research this issue; Brian Schlegel will call the town and report back to the committee

Citizen observers were asked if they had any questions for Ms. Campbell. Cynthia Rainey noted that the compacted gravel borrow was "future thinking," with specific passive recreation activities considered, i.e., a track

Agenda item D

User Data on Existing Facilities

Mike Mastrullo and Brian Miller collected this data and shared it with the committee. Data does not include daytime activities on the campus. This two page document identifies non-facility usage gathered in anticipation of defining stakeholders.

Kay Upham commented that there might be a need for more parking at the high school if the school was utilized by multiple parties, i.e., more than just Concord and Carlisle

Agenda item E

List of Stakeholders

Susan Blevins created a draft/cursory list of stakeholders. She will share this list with the committee. Committee members can make edits/additions. John Boynton emphasized authentic participation; it is necessary/important to be proactive re stakeholders

Agenda items F and G

Student/Teacher Outreach and Community Input

It was agreed that these actions should be postponed until a CAD compatible version of the as built plan was available and Brian Schlegel completed his research re the impermeable threshold.

Agenda item H

Upcoming Meeting Dates

Laurie Hunter outlined upcoming meeting dates. At the next meeting (November 21) the committee will continue with its preliminary work. This preliminary work is necessary to make informed decisions. It is important for everyone on the committee to have looked at all of the different agreements relative to the campus. Laurie Hunter noted that there was a good deal of "legalise." Nevertheless, it was noted that the committee really needs to understand these documents and the implications for the campus. Bob Grom asked that Mary Storrs prioritize the documents/organize in folders.

Future meetings and timeline

Laurie Hunter presented a proposed timeline.

- November 21 → assign tasks, create subgroups
- December 19 → update from committee members re tasks
- January 16 → review of all available space on the broader campus; likely limited, yes, but don't overlook options
- February (date to be decided) → usage, documents, available space; first report due to the school committee; here the committee can present landfill options (understand the costs, what is legally allowed)
- March 20 → working groups share research from February; committee will need public input; Bob Grom strongly encouraged the committee to seek public input as early as possible; John Boynton liked style and approach of the document that Andy Rice submitted re ice hockey; a discussion ensued re perhaps other interests could submit similar documents; Bob Grom noted that the public needs lead time; John Boynton asked how the committee might publish this request; Kathleen Ogden Fasser agreed to present a "living" public engagement plan at the next meeting
- April (date to be decided) pull everything together
- May → presentation to the school committee

Meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.