

CDAC meeting 8.7.24

6-7:30 pm

Agenda and minutes (Minutes of this mtg start on page 2)

AGENDA

1. Welcome and introductions (5 min)
2. Approval of [July 3 meeting minutes here](#) (5 min)
3. Presentation of Site Assessment findings by Haley-Ward (40 min)
 - a. [Link to map 1](#)
 - b. [Link to Map 2 - aerial view](#)
 - c. [Link to Site Conditions report - Natural resources data, photos and forms](#)
 - d. [Link to Borings report/Bearing capacity results](#)
4. Q+A for Haley-Ward (20 min)
5. Next steps (15 min)
 - a. engaging other town officials (PB, DPW, Rec. dept., Selectboard)
 - b. Solar info (Prentice)
 - c. Grant opps and schedule (Lex?)
6. Meetings (5 min)
 - a. Next regular meeting - Wed Sept 4
 - b. Set date for Community Meeting, arrange Save-The-Date

Other info - list of Round 4 CRP/Community Action Grants

MINUTES

Attending:

CDAC members - Lissa Widoff, Steve B, Lex B, Walter Fuller, Sean Murphy

Haley-Ward representatives - Johanna Szillery, Jeff Weeks

SW Cole representative - — Nate Strout

[Link to meeting recording here](#)

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Steve moved, Sean seconded and all approved of [July 3 meeting minutes](#)
3. Presentation of Site Assessment findings by Haley-Ward - Discussion of Findings and Q&A
 - a. Johanna - Environmental Assessment and wetland delineations -
 - i. Vernal pools- She visited site on May 2 and May 21 for vernal pool research - time frame is determined by Maine IFW wildlife guidelines - look for ponded areas that support amphibian breeding. Doing an egg mass count - 7 locations - nothing met the guidelines for a vernal pool by the state - amphibian breeding areas were located for wood frog and spotted salamander - but none are in appropriate habitat and are instead located in disturbed areas (man-made, likely skidder ruts and ditches) that may actually hinder successful breeding as they dry out too soon. So thus no type of limitation or permitting around these “vernal pools” - it is recommended that we remove/re-grade those man made areas that act as a “decoy” and may distract amphibians from appropriate habitat. A permit from DEP (via permit by rule) is required to alter even man-made wetland.
 - i. Wetland delineations -: Maps show wetlands that are regulated as floodplain or WOSS (Wetlands of State Significance) in blue. Other non

WOSS - Would fall out of the flood plain but is a wetland more of a forested area. Those are white areas of Wetland on the map

- ii. Floodplain zone - Q about whether it is based on elevation - How does elevation play a role in how we build on the wetland - whereas there are regulations that state that you can build over x ft over the wetland. At this site there NO published baseline elevation of the floodplain area in Freedom - so then it becomes graphic plotting - horizontal positioning - can be very expensive to determine specifically, so the horizontal/graphic plotting is best practice.
- iii. White Area Wetlands - It goes right up to the top of the property line - That upward island - The approximate boundary line based on property pins was actually short and the survey showed that the property extended out past that.

c. Strout - SW Cole Borings results

- i. Geotech - Fills are not favorable, they are not controlled or compacted - no information when that occurred - 2 to 8 ft.
 - 1. Building on fill is not favorable because this soil is not stable and can settle.
- ii. Shallow bedrock exists so if you want to dig down at all - in the central portions- shallow rock.
- iii. Water table- found water pretty shallow - constructability concern as it's hard to 1ft - 2ft deep.
- iv. How do you determine water depth - Pulling out the auger and measure how far down the hole you get until you hit water or based on the actual soil sample, and observing saturation of soils pulled from auger
- v. Native soils are favorable - deposited by water flowing, alluvial soils

- vi. If there would any interest in building we would need to take into consideration that the soil across the site does vary quite a bit so it would be important to reassess when a site for building is selected to ensure the fill would not need to be removed and replaced or that special foundations aren't needed to support the structure given the soil capacity.
- vii. Could we put a building on the existing Slab given it's in the flood zone- it already exists so it may be grandfathered in to any regulations but we could check. {note from Lissa - not really grandfathered if no structure}. It may also be beneficial to recheck the bearing capacity of those old slabs to check to see if building is feasible.
- viii. The slab does not appear to be level with much variability - which does lend to the idea that is indeed unstable given that it is close to that fill area.
- ix. Wetlands are certainly regulated - it would be good to look at these state and federal restrictions -
- d. Jeff Weeks, HW survey results
 - i. Survey - CAD file did work and was used to plot - establish town lines - topo - build up to where storage facility.
- e. [Link to map 1](#)
- f. [Link to Map 2 - aerial view](#)
- g. [Link to Site Conditions report - Natural resources data, photos and forms](#)
- h. [Link to Borings report/Bearing capacity results](#)

7. Next steps

- a. Plan for meeting Wed Sept 4
 - i. engaging other town officials (PB, DPW, Rec. dept., Selectboard)
 - ii. Solar info (Prentice)

- iii. Lissa will check with Wilson/historical Soc on other grants relating to Village and DOT planning; and also ask about old bridge abutments found by Johanna
 - iv. Grant opps and schedule (Lex?)
 - v. Flag some of the boundaries this fall, esp where the blazes are short of actual boundary line from new survey.
- b. Set date for Community Meeting, arrange Save-The-Date- early Oct., TBD