

A. Call to Order

- Mary Storrs called the meeting to order at 5:00pm and noted the meeting was being recorded
- The Concord Town Clerk swore in the Campus Advisory Committee members after distributing Concord's Committee Handbook (revised September 2017) and the Effective Governance Workshop materials (September 23, 2017)
 - Members present and sworn in: Barry Haley, Zander Kessler, Kay Upham, Brian Miller, Robert Grom, Laurie Hunter, Mike Mastrullo, Brian Schlegel, John Flaherty, Mary McCabe
 - Members who will arrange to take oath at the Concord town clerk's office: John Boynton (arrived after swearing in)
 - Members not present, to be sworn in by appropriate Town Clerk
 - Carlisle: Susan Ludi Blevins, Hannah Yelle, Mary Storrs
 - Concord: Kathleen Ogden Fasser, Ryan Kane, Ravin Nanda

B. Public Comments

- Mary Storrs asked if there were any public comments
 - *Cynthia Rainey*, parent of a former indoor/outdoor track athlete, referenced a November 16, 2017 letter that she had earlier submitted to the committee
 - Letter is logged to Campus Advisory Committee Google Drive
 - *Julie Ann Cancio* reviewed the agenda in advance, but was unable to locate the attachments; she asked the committee if it was possible to include the documents as attachments to the agenda
 - Mary Storrs agreed to make this change
 - *Beverly Bryant* (see comment below)

C. Reading of Minutes

- Campus Advisory Committee Meeting (November 7, 2017)
 - The November 7 minutes mistakenly were not sent to the committee for review; Mary Storrs will send both the November 7 and the November 21 minutes with the December 19 Agenda

D. Communication and Correspondence

- Mary Storrs updated the committee re correspondence
 - Committee members should forward all community correspondence to Mary Storrs and she will file with other materials
- At this point there have been three pieces of correspondence received and filed on the Google Drive:
 - Ms. Cynthia Rainey (track facility) (discussed above)
 - Mr. Charlie Parker (solar panels) (no discussion)
 - Ms. Andi Rice (ice rink) (discussed on November 7)
 - Mr. David Luby (METCO proposal. Goal is to celebrate/recognize the 50th anniversary. Several options were presented in the letter, e.g., a brick inlay at ground level; A question was asked as to the scope of the committee's work; it was agreed that Mike Mastrullo would submit the proposal to the Regional School Committee directly

E. Updates from Committee Members [Departure from Agenda]

- Brian Schlegel. CCHS is over the 15% impervious material requirement. As a government entity, the regional school district can present a proposal for an exception to the Concord Zoning Board of Appeals for their consideration
- John Boynton. John has requested as built plans in CAD format from Gale Associates. Several of the previously known contacts familiar with the campus have left Gale. John will continue to pursue the plans.
- Brian Miller. Brian is trying to track down the landscape architecture plans in an effort to update as built plans. Unfortunately the documents he has located are not in a format that the committee can utilize. Brian will continue to pursue a different format.

F. Reports and Issues for Discussion

- *Discussion of Documents Reviewed*. At the November 7 committee meeting, members agreed to review documents in an effort to better understand the committee’s charge, challenges, opportunities, etc. The committee as a whole reviewed their reaction to each document.
 - Weston & Sampson PowerPoint Presentation
 - Scope of work included the potential for use of the landfill site for practice fields or a 6 or 8 lane track
 - Anything placed above the cap will have a cost; anything that breaks the cap would be exponentially more expensive
 - At the time that the decision was made to use compact borrow instead of common or ordinary borrow the town agreed that having the flexibility to do something in the future was important
 - CCHS Impervious Information
 - Mike Mastrullo asked whether a six lane track would add impervious surface
 - Barry Haley explained that a track surface can be either impervious or pervious (porous)
 - Barry Haley explained the difference between a six lane track and an eight lane track
 - Barry Haley noted that it was a town decision to exclude the throws from Emerson, i.e., that decision could be changed
 - John Flaherty noted that the committee’s recommendation might be to have the throwing events moved to Emerson
 - Brian Miller estimated that a six lane track would be equal to approximately 30,000 square feet, i.e., .7% increase in impervious material (if impervious)
 - John Flaherty noted that one of the complications associated with an eight lane track would be the possibility of displacing a low cost parking option (80 spots in the area between the skate park and the high school; this area is not part of the “hot” zone and is furthest from the houses)
 - *Beverly Bryant* (citizen observer) asked why we are concerned about an impervious track if the cap was impervious?
 - Recreation Strategic Plan
 - Mike Mastrullo remarked that 41% of the townspeople polled wanted an indoor track; aging community likely related to this polling outcome
 - Mary Storrs noted that the Carlisle School gym is open for folks to walk in the morning
 - Discussion about an indoor facility followed; John Boynton asked about a bubble (above a track and /or above the current turf fields)
 - Mary Storrs asked whether the committee’s public outreach should mimic the strategic plan outreach, albeit this document is now several years outdated and some of the issues have been addressed

- Brian Miller noted a demand for community space, i.e., for gatherings
- Kay Upham thought the Concord Rec Dept has already addressed/is implementing changes based on this document
- Barry Haley noted that DPW is working to upgrade Emerson; John Boynton encouraged the committee to pay attention to this type of overlap, i.e., no need for the committee to address areas of upgrade if others already involved
- Barry Haley noted that the high school demands on Emerson have changed in light of the work completed by CC at Play
- Mary McCabe encouraged the committee to look at the Gale Associates report. She noted, in particular, the section that discussed/measured CCHS “outsourced” uses, at Emerson
- Both John Boynton and Barry Haley agreed that the high school demands have changed
- Mary McCabe commented that we have moved *some* of the outsourced use back to the high school, but not *all* and if that is a priority we should move more
- John Boynton commented that CC at Play primarily addressed the demand for “rectangular grass sports” and he and Barry Haley feel that we have satisfied that demand, i.e., additional rectangular grass sport fields are not needed
- Laurie Hunter cautioned that although the rectangular grass sports issue might have been addressed, the Recreation Department has needs that are still a work in progress
- A discussion ensued about the possibility of a field house and the potential for additional revenue sources (evenings); and/or fields generally as a revenue source
 - Barry Haley noted that he had 3 requests just this week for summer use, i.e., outside revenue source, e.g., tennis courts
 - John Flaherty cautioned -- “use means more maintenance”; Brian Schlegel agreed
- A brief conversation re the scope of the committee’s charge and Verizon’s recent request of the CCRSD School Committee to install towers on the school roof; the committee agreed this was beyond the scope of its charge
- Community Use Agreement
 - Doug White Fields, i.e., the turf soccer fields, are managed by the town; the land is leased by the district to the town
 - High School sports have priority
 - Mary Storrs commented that there is a community use agreement for the town of Carlisle and she will find that document with the others
 - Mary McCabe asked for clarification about these agreements. These agreements are required when CPA provides funding for projects.
- CC at Play Lease
 - John Boynton doesn’t think this document will impact the committee’s work; i.e., no long term impact
 - As soon as the last phase of work is completed, i.e., stairs and the maintenance shed, the agreement will be terminated
 - John Boynton noted that CC at Play was formed with the goal that as long as there were long term recreation projects ongoing in town and a need for help with fundraising CC at Play would be open to the possibility of helping
- TOC and CCRSD Intergovernmental Agreement
 - Laurie Hunter and John Flaherty included this document with the other readings because they thought it reinforced the idea that the district is its own governmental authority

- John Flaherty reminded the committee that there is a common misconception, e.g., with contractors, that they need to check with the town about any questions when in fact they need to check with the CCRSD
- Mary McCabe commented on the common theme across all of the documents, i.e., the property is first and foremost to serve the educational needs of the students
- Kay Upham noted that the needs of a facility can change; perspective of what is required can change; e.g., the Beede Center is having difficulty covering expenses, only at the ½ point of its lease; underlying assumptions have changed
- Laurie Hunter reminded the committee that the use of the land is a complicated story and it is important to look over *all* of the documents

G. Additional Agenda Items

Mary Storrs included the items below on today’s agenda; these items are carry over items from the previous meeting (she wasn’t in attendance). See November 7 Minutes for additional details

1. **Data Inventory**
2. **Mapping/Site Plans**
 - John Boynton, Brian Miller, and Kathleen Ogden Fasser are working on obtaining CAD versions of as built docs
3. **User Data on Existing Facilities**
 - Discussed on November 7
 - Brian Miller and Mike Mastrullo submitted summary document to the committee; Document is [here](#)
4. **List of Stakeholders -**
 - Susan Blevins (absent) is working on this; committee is waiting for shared document to update/delineate
 - Discussion ensued re how the committee will correspond w/ stakeholders; what will correspondence address; will the committee seek proposals; will the committee entertain presentations
 - John Boynton recommended that the committee start talking about how to gather info from the stakeholders, once identified
 - Mary McCabe asked about a letter in the correspondence file from Andi Rice inquiring about the possibility of giving a presentation to the committee; John Boynton had previously responded to Ms. Rice saying at some point the committee will address this request if the committee goes this route; no decision has been made about presentations
 - A discussion ensued re what questions do we want answered in a proposal (or RFP) for potential uses of the landfill site; what content would be required
 - Bob Grom noted that the CPC has a form for funding applicants to fill out
 - John Boynton reminded the committee that the discussion re proposals is separate from asking the public/stakeholders what they want/need
 - A suggestion was made that perhaps the committee could email a template to stakeholders once identified
 - A discussion ensued about what information the stakeholders would need to know about the site
 - Mary Storrs agreed to work with Kathleen Ogden Fasser to address the appropriate language regarding the capped landfill and what can/cannot happen at that site
 - John Flaherty reminded the committee that eventually the committee would be making a recommendation to the school committee and that the committee needed to be mindful of future/ongoing maintenance costs and that perhaps the estimated cost of future/ongoing maintenance needs to be identified/explained in the submitted proposal, similar to an

RFP; John Flaherty noted that putting this type of information in the RFP helps the committee better understand the proposed project

- Brian Miller said he would work on drafting a RFP; Mary Storrs agreed that she would assist Brian; Mary Storrs will also work with Kathleen Ogden Fasser (see above) regarding the specific language that will be used to seek proposals
- A conversation followed regarding the timeline; in other words, what happens first? For example, gather the list of stakeholders, ask stakeholders for input re uses, solicit proposals? John Boynton suggested that some of this work might run in parallel
- John Boynton suggested that we seek input for ideas (brainstorming with community input from the stakeholders); then create a survey in an effort to assess how much demand exists for these ideas; and, simultaneously solicit proposals/RFP;
- Mary McCabe raised a concern about the risk of going beyond the scope of the committee's charge; she noted that the language "the primary purpose of the CCHS facility is to serve the educational needs of our students;"
 - Brian Miller commented that the site might fill an academic need/demand, e.g., a mobile classroom
 - Mike Mastrullo noted that the use should be consistent with the school's core values
- The conversation returned to what the RFP should contain; Mary Storrs cautioned against multiple surveys, i.e., risk of survey fatigue
- Laurie Hunter noted two outstanding high priority tasks before we can pursue further input from the community: (1) review of current usage and (2) review of available space (need the CAD);
- Mary McCabe asked about the recent school committee meeting and an Agenda item re Verizon cell towers; the committee agreed this was likely beyond the Campus Advisory committee's charge, especially because at this stage the towers under discussion would go on the roof
- John Boynton shared a text communication he received from a citizen who heard the school was "headed toward an ice hockey rink"; he responded to this person that no decisions have been made

5. Student/Teacher Outreach -

- Hold off until Stakeholder list is finalized

H. Upcoming Meeting Dates (all at 5:00pm at CCHS Learning Commons)

- December 19
- January 9
- February 13
- March 20
- April 10
- May 8

I. Adjourned at 6:26 p.m. (Motion by ??? Seconded by ???)