

CDAC Minutes 9.4.24

Agenda:

1. Review/Approve 8-7-24 mtg minutes: Approved
2. Quick debrief on Haley Ward results (if you took a copy of the HW report, please bring it so others can review. if you can't make the meeting, please drop it at my house before the meeting)
 - a. Lissa's consolidated summary of findings
 - b. Notes:
 - i. More wetland than we thought
 - ii. The boundary to the north on the right side of the lot the boundary line is incorrect.
 - iii. There is wetland life that has made habitats in a habitat not deemed as viable. We can move the amphibians out of that area to make those site less attractive; a permit would be required. The creatures could be moved and the those sites fixed to keep these creatures in their natural habitat. There are no vernal pools
 - iv. Our maps showcase, Wetland of state significance (heavily regulated - no go zones), wetlands that are not of state significance (permissible) but are still deemed wetlands, and flood plains.
 - v. Boring map shows high water tables, places where foundations lie sit on unstable fill. IF you were to build something in those areas, you may need to excavate the area to move the fill, so the building can be on a solid foundation. Areas of bedrock where there is ledge.
 - vi. Water table levels vary across the site. Ground water would be too high for a new septic system.
 - vii. Open space and not using the space and protecting the space, which is beneficial for the environment and meets the needs of the grant.
 - viii. All these things are limiting factors to what is possible from a development perspective.
 - ix. The state installed 2 culverts off of the 137 draining into this lot - Perhaps issue? Or Benefit? Water will run off into this lost down hill anyway and we are now just directing it.
3. Update from Prentice on preliminary research into Solar options on Cannery Lot. Preliminary proposals here (Prentice - if you have the Revision Energy proposal, please upload to that folder or send to me or Lex). These are exploratory proposals to help us define costs, scope and benefits.
 - a. Notes:
 - i. We budgeted \$6k or \$7k for solar. If the end goal for solar does not match what we proposed we would have to give any remaining money left back to the state.

1. How much money do we have leftover? Maybe \$10k
 - a. HW Budget: \$38,800
 - ii. Sundog, Revision, solar logix - average proposal cost - \$70K
 - iii. All the proposals were for a 25,000 kilowatt systems.
 - iv. $\frac{1}{3}$ of the power bill in the town are the street lights, which are LED lights, that do not have a meter.
 - v. With solar you can offset your own accounts for all meters, you would not be able to offset the street lights as they are not metered. YUCK.
 - vi. Ask client contact about streetlights and if other towns have dealt with this and if it could be resolved at the state level from a policy perspective.
 - vii. Sundog: Ground mount for cheaper but can do roof mount - roof is angled the wrong direction - 80% return on a roof with the pitch of the PW - they also looked. The suggested half on fire house and half on PW.
 - viii. Revision: Said never to put it on the PW building. Promoting ground mount at PWs. They said nothing makes sense for the size of our town and our system. They did suggest that if we wanted invest in renewable energy we could invest in a community solar project and buy solar panels there as a community farm share.
 - ix. Solar Logix: ground mount would be too expensive so they said roof mount.
- b. Based on this information it seems as though given the towns size and electricity usage that we should focus on site planning and put a solar project to the side.
- c. Lissa Moved to move away from solar for the site for now. Steve 2nd. All in favor.
4. Other:
 - a. We can think of anything to do with this site but let's put it in a larger context for the town
 - i. Walkability as a driver for how we make decisions on what to do with the lot that connects back to the greater need for the town holistically.
 - ii. Again circling around solar, parking, park, walk ways
 - iii. Get help from DOT who is building the new bridge AND potentially a foot bridge. Do we need to push DOT a bit more and pay attention here.
 - iv. Talk to wilson about applying for the village improvement grant via the
5. Plans for a community meeting in Oct per grant requirements
 - a. integrate broader vision?
 - b. status of MDOT Village Improvement grant (Wilson - did Freedom HS apply?)
 - i. General overview of grant and our proposal
 1. Goals - Climate Action, open space, ect.
 - ii. Talk about HW Findings
 - iii. Review town Survey Results
 - iv. How this all ties into a larger theme of Walkability.
 - v. Does it make sense to propose some ideas within that theme?
 - vi. Possible Date: November - Planning in October

6. Decision on priorities for next grant application deadline for Community Action grants.
(Lex - can you check on deadlines)
 - a. if significant change on solar project we may have to return funds and re-apply.

Next Steps:

1. Lissa to contact the state:
 - a. Ask about giving the funding back and/or extension?
 - b. Ask about program contact about streetlights and if other towns have dealt with this and if it could be resolved at the state level from a policy perspective.
 - c. Tips on when the next grant application would be due.
2. Lissa to find out more about the wetland park in bowdoinham.
3. Lissa to reach out to KVCOG on Development Planning Companies
4. Steve reached out to DOT about the footbridge being fixed when the bridge in town fixed.
5. Lissa to talk to wilson about the historical society applying for the village improvement grant.
6. Next Meeting: October 2nd, 2024