

## Bradford M. Field Memorial Library Ad Hoc Committee Meeting Minutes

November 17, 2022

Present: Richard Nathhorst, Ann Ferguson, Maureen Ippolito, Silas Ball, Kathryn Stoddard, Van Stoddard, Kari Ridge

Absent: Andrew Vlock, Don and Sara Robinson, Anne Schuyler

Visiting: Pat Duffy, Oran Kaufman

Meeting began at 7:35

Next meeting will be on December 8<sup>th</sup>. December 1<sup>st</sup> will be the Charcoal Kiln meeting put on by the Historical Commission which conflicts with our meeting. Many members of our committee want to attend. We are marking time to have the survey started, and that is moving forward. We should have a surveyor of the land on hand shortly and we will be getting the information.

Richard had another request to make a change to the agenda and move the discussion of the outreach to the Leverett community to first place. We have a guest, and I'm going to let Ann make the introductions

Ann Ferguson: I think that most of you know Oran Kaufman. He's invited because he has agreed, if the committee can agree to how we want to organize two town forums, he would be will to be the facilitator.

Oran: Hello, I know some of you, but I don't know all of you. Ann had asked me if I would be willing to consider doing it and I said I would. I don't know what it will entail. I'm happy to hear what you are thinking about and help with it. My day job is as a mediator, not a moderator. I have done some public facilitation which isn't the main part of what I do, but I have some thoughts about it. I want to know what are you thinking about for the public forums And what it would look like. I'm happy to give you some ideas about how to structure it in order to meet our goals.

Ann F.: Based on the October 13<sup>th</sup> discussion we had about the two forums, I have a proposal. If you remember, the first forum we thought would be a presentation of the facts that we have discovered as a committee about the land survey, septic and well survey and the possibilities for the existing site along with other facts that we have discovered that pertain to the future of the building. It seems that if we are thinking about the first forum, our committee presentation could should be to state the facts as we know them and a second part of the presentation would be to present the three options that we've come up with as a committee for the future of the building.

Option one, as I see it, would be the idea that the town retains ownership and moves the building to the library complex.

Option two is that the town retains ownership and commits to ongoing maintenance and keeps the building at the present site.

Option three would be that the town sells the building to a relevant non-profit.

Those three options involve the ownership and the site questions, and that we choose an advocate from this committee who wants to advocate for each one of these options. This person would relay the facts we've discovered to the meeting attendees. The idea would be that it wouldn't be a debate. We'd choose someone for each of the options who would relay that facts. After these three advocates for each option state their opinions, then there would be a discussion by town members who raise questions about the facts, who raise questions to each of the advocates of each option and also state their own opinions about the possible uses they would like to see for the building, including keeping it as a museum. Then we figure out some ground rules for we have for the discussion and agree on those. That would be Forum 1.

Forum 2 would be a follow-up where we would do some type of interactive exercise where every town member gets to express their opinions for the three options and also brainstorm possible uses for the future of the building. I'm just wondering if people agree with that idea as a way of getting town opinion and also getting the facts out about the relevant options?

Silas: Sounds good, you've thought it out very thoroughly and it sounds pretty good to me.

Ann: The point of having just one of us defend each option is that we don't get into a debate as a committee. We just have a person who really believes in their option state the facts about the site and what they think the option should be. Then, everyone in the town who comes to the meeting gets to express their views and that is where the facilitation happens with Oran. If people agree to this format we have to decide who will advocate for Option one, two, and three.

Kathy—I think that makes a lot of sense and thank you for structuring it like that.

Ann has her proposal written up and she sent it to Richard.

Oran: Can I just ask a question, what exactly is the charge of this committee?

Ann: Richard, maybe you can speak to that. I understood it to be to solicit opinions as to the future of the Field building, including possible uses, but also to gather facts about the site and various options.

Kari read the charge.

The charge of the Field Building Ad Hoc Committee is to address the following questions:

1. What are the preferred future uses of the building as recommended through the deliberation and study by the committee members that includes input from interviews and committee meetings with at-large community members?
2. Considering the answer to question 1, should the town retain ownership of the building.
3. If the answer to question 2 is yes, what will be the financial impact to the town, to the taxpayer?
4. If the answer to question 2 is no, what conditions, if any, should be placed on the sale of the building?

Richard shared the proposal that Ann had emailed to him.

11-17 Field Meeting Ann F's Suggestions re Outreach (Forums):

That we agree to have the Committee Presentation in **Forum 1** have **two parts**:

- **Facts statement Presentation** of Land Survey and Septic and Well results and possibilities (Richard presents?)
  - **Options Presentation Format:** That one proponent of each of the three options that have been discussed by the committee be selected to advocate for that option, given the facts of building and site, *viz*,
  - Option 1 Advocate Would defend the idea of Town retaining ownership and moving building to library complex;
  - Option 2 Advocate Would defend the idea of Town retaining ownership and committing to ongoing maintenance costs at the present site
  - Option 3 Advocate Would defend the idea that the Town sell the building and site to the relevant non-profit.  
Each advocate could discuss possible uses they see for the building if their option is chosen by the Town.
  - **Discussion** would consist of questions from Town members about the facts and to the advocates of Option 1, 2 and 3, including stating their own opinions on the options.
  - **Ground rules** would include that committee members not weigh in with their personal options on Options 1, 2 or 3 except for the advocate that has been chosen to present that option. They would also include agreements only to express personal preferences and not to put down others for different personal preferences as to future ownership or possible uses.
- Forum 2** would have the form of some kind of interactive group exercise where every town member present would get to express their preference for Option 1, 2 or 3 as well as to brainstorm about various uses and adaptive reuses for the building.

Ann: If we agree, I will put this in the form of a motion.

Richard: That would be the logical thing to do, to make it a motion, get it seconded and vote on it.

Kathy: I just want to bring up that the charge of the committee as it's written here didn't include an evaluation of what is legally possible on the property which is what we've been discussing.

Richard: It's part of the relevant information about the site and that is clearly a part of the charge.

Kathy: Is that under the first section?

Richard: I would say that it's under the first section, "gather facts". I can't imagine that it doesn't include the legalities of the current site. I don't think we have a problem there.

Kathy: Ok, great.

Judy: I think it's a great plan, I would wondering if we want to have the museum open before the forums so that the towns people can see it?

There was agreement by the committee for this. Richard feels it doesn't need to be part of the motion and Judy agreed. Susan Mareneck was the one who brought the idea up to Judy.

Ann: I move what you see before you as a proposal.

Silas: Does it have to be one person representing each of the three options or can it be several people on each point?

Ann: That's up to the committee to decide.

Silas: There are several people that have the same opinion and they just might want to be part of the team.

Ann: Here's the reason to have only one advocate. We know we disagree as a committee and we have gotten into somewhat contentious discussions in the past. What we really want in this forum is to give the opportunity for towns people to express their own views so if we choose one advocate and then we maintain that rule that we as committee members won't weigh in, unless it's on factual question that we are asked, then that gives the town members much more of a sense that they are involved in considering these three options and possible uses of the building. It gives them more time to be soliciting their opinions rather than just stating our own. Otherwise, I could see us going on and on defending one of our favorite options.

Richard: I agree with Ann. This is not supposed to be a debate, it is supposed to be a presentation of options. If we are going to be presenting information to the town, which is what we are proposing to do here, we should have one presenter for each option and then have a discussion with the towns people about it. We aren't asking them necessarily to vote, we are just informing them and where they will get to cast their vote will be at town meeting.

Ann: In the understanding that I have for the second forum is to have the towns people state their views in some way where we are gathering their opinions.

Richard: I agree. In no way are the forums to end in a vote. That will take place after the SB makes their decisions, they get to weigh in on it and if it comes to town meeting that is where it gets voted on.

Oran: Is the main goal of this committee to sort of get input from the town as to what uses the town people want for this building?

Richard: That is one of the purposes. It's also to determine what is actually, factually possible.

Oran: I know that you guys have done a lot more work on it, I'm just kind of jumping in here. So, by presenting three options are you sort of constricting what ideas people have—who's on first, who's on second. Does it make sense to kind of get ideas and determine which of those are feasible and which are not?

Richard: I think we are sort of past that. One of the problems with options for the buildings that have been collected in the past is that people have "wish dreams" of what they'd like to see for the building and they are not tethered to any form of reality. This is a very, very small building, on a very small piece of land, and there are a lot of things that are pretty much simply impossible there. If we don't put some kind of constraints on what we think are the realistic options, I think that the forum could spin off into some pretty fanciful directions.

Oran: I understand that, and that makes sense. So, the other question is, without putting constraints on these three options, does it make sense to have the initial forum be telling the townsfolk what the constraints are: "does the Town own it, or not own it". These are the constraints in which we are working and then generate ideas from town people based on those constraints before having them sort of thinking about whether the town should continue to own it. Just my initial thinking.

Richard: I think that is too open ended myself.

Van: I think that the timing of the forum is going to be very important. I think that part of what we are supposed to do is gather facts and legal options. This is going to have to be part of our initial presentation at the first forum, this is what we know we can do. I don't want to state any premature opinion, but it may be that these three items or three subjects change between now and then.

Richard: Right, it is possible that when the legal survey of the property comes back from the surveyors, it would put constraints on what is possible that will limit what we can do.

Van: I don't really think we should waste the towns people's efforts in something that we've been told by authorities that can't happen. The timing is very important.

Richard: I agree, I don't think this can happen until we have that survey in hand and have taken it to public health and conservation.

Ann: This is of course assuming, Van, that we have all that information. We wouldn't have this forum until we had all that and the BOH says this can't be a public site for meetings because there is not possible septic or well, etc. We have to have the information to present to the people. On the other hand, you present that there is no possibility of that, and someone might say in their idea of uses "let's just have a warming spot for people who are going to be on the town pond in

the winter". There are lots of ways to spin what the uses could be, not what some of the rest of us think is worth the town money to keep maintaining the building, but that presumably would come out in the discussion. My point is that we wouldn't present any of these options or have any of this discussion of uses, we wouldn't have the forum until we have all the facts.

Van: Richard was concentrating on the subject of the survey, but it's a lot more than the survey. Because we have to get, for one thing, ConComm, we have to get a health agent.

Richard: We have to get ConComm and we need to get our public health board to weigh in first. We may not even need to hire an agent, we may not get that far.

Pat: Can you take the shared screen down? Kari had her hand up for a while.

Kari: Most of what I was going to say was just covered. I was looking back at the proposal that Ann and I had put together about from a month ago that we had all talked about, and really the first forum is supposed to be an introduction of the facts so we do need to have all the facts together to present to people so it won't be confusing. It will be confusing to the public if we know some things but not others, so I think that the time, as Van said, is really essential to have everything ready to go for that first forum. If that means that the first forum isn't for two month or three months (maybe two months with our deadline for town meeting), so be it. Another aspect of each forum should be a notetaker to record on everything that was shared. I'm just mentioning that so that Oran knows we've thought a little bit about the structure.

Van: We could record it.

Richard: Yes, it's definitely going to be online.

Kari: That's a good point, we weren't thinking that a few weeks ago, but it will be.

Van: Is it all online or in person too, hybrid?

Ann: We thought a hybrid.

Richard; That is one of the reasons that we want to have Oran there, I am the technical link and the chair and I can't run the meeting effectively and run the computer. So the idea would be that I would make the introduction, as chair, and then turn it over to you as the facilitator.

Pat: It think it's pretty straight forward. Get the facts for the presentation. Oran will be the unbiased party to present it so that the controversy won't sort of direct the meeting. Hopefully, the first meeting will encourage people to attend the second one where they can have more input into what they think and then in the end, this is my take on it that you will collate all of this and these were the ideas that came up and this many people thought this, and this many people thought that and so on. It seems really straight forward once we get the facts down about what is possible.

Maureen: I'm not sure I like the idea of three different people presenting the option that they want. I know some of us have really passionate opinions and I don't know how that would play

out. You've said you don't want multiple people presenting each option. I'm worried that if the person favoring that option is presenting it will be biased. I feel it would be better for one person to present all the options.

Silas: I agree. It should be unbiased that way. My question got completely misunderstood. I realize that we don't want any in-fighting amongst ourselves, that wasn't the point. The point was that several people might have many ideas to present, and I kind of agree with what Maureen said too. We should compile all the options and let Oran them present them.

Ann: Now wait, now we are saying that he (Oran) should present all the options?

Richard: I think that's asking a lot of Oran or of one person to know all the ins and outs of each option.

Maureen: Well, we will all be there.

Richard: But we won't all be speaking.

Maureen: The person presenting the option is stating all the facts, or the person presenting all three options. For example, if I don't want to move the building and I'm presenting the information for not moving the building and then someone wants to present for moving the building, I just feel like there is a potential to get into a little bit of an argumentative discussion.

Richard: Well, we are not going to have a discussion.

Maureen: I don't want any tension and I think that people will see there is tension.

Richard: Kari, I think you were next and then Van.

Kari: I was just going to say that I think the facts might guide, we may not need to present each option so blatantly. I think that when we present the facts they will guide the way that the forum will go. I get what Maureen and Silas are saying. I also really like having structure at a meeting. I'm wondering if at the second one is where we get into more of what Ann proposed? Maybe at the first one, we just present the facts.

Van: I think it's important for the committee as a whole to present a united front, as it were. It should be made obvious to the townspeople that these are not necessarily the opinions of the person presenting it. I think that could be done in a way that will not stimulate debate. We could even put down a concept of no debate. We need to present the information that we as a viable committee, who have done our homework, and we have chosen three people to present three different opinions. They are not necessarily their opinions. It would be important for the people presenting the opinion to not show their own opinion.

Richard: I don't think that possible, frankly.

Van: No, I do think it's possible because if you start out by simply trying to explain only facts that are not necessarily subjective in each of the three cases, I hope it would not stimulate discussion amongst the committee.

Richard: It's clear that we won't have any discussion from the committee.

Pat: I think Van is right. When I was first listening to this discussion, and I thought it would be interesting if people drew a lot and I'm going to be the presenter for this idea and just commit to being unbiased in your presentation because really the bottom line is this is supposed to be what does the town want? We all have our own ideas, but it's not about us. It's about the town. If people did the unbiased presentation I think it would convey that. This isn't controversial with us, "just the facts, this is what it is". Then, open it up later in the next forum for more discussion. We faced this with the police forum that didn't actually happen for a couple of reasons. We have to keep this really tight, because it isn't about whether people don't want police, it's about the Leverett/Wendell agreement. Understanding what we were opening. Keeping it tight, if that makes sense.

Ann: I'm interested in what Oran thinks.

Oran: I'm just wondering, if it doesn't take too long, I'm wondering about the nuances involved here. What do you envision a presentation sounding like? What would those three options be like? What do you envision a person saying to the townsfolk who are there?

Kathy: We could structure each of the three options to have a similar structure and maybe practice it or script it in advance so that we would not be going off in a direction that we as a committee would not necessarily be agreeing to. I've done a lot of these kinds of presentations in my work. Scripting it might sound a little artificial, but it's respectful to the people who are listening.

Oran: That's a good idea.

Ann: Yeah, can you give an example of how would you script the idea that the town keep the building but keep it as is, which I know is not necessarily your option.

Kathy: My idea would be to have a structure for each option which would be the legal findings, the social benefits, and the environmental benefits. It's off the top of my head right at this moment, but something like that. It's a structure that would carry through each of the three options.

Oran: The flip side is that you can do both. You can say the pros and cons to each of these proposals and the person presenting gives the pros and cons.

Ann: I think that is a really good idea. If we are trying to include possible uses, the pros of the town keeping it at the site is that is a historical site and therefore has more authenticity. The con is it can't have a septic. The pro is that it can be a museum occasionally and then other uses could include a warming place for town pond uses. You'd have the pros and cons. It would cost the town money to maintain it. A con is that there aren't too many parking places so not too many people could use it at one time, etc. You'd have to go down the list of what we've discussed in the committee of what are pros and cons.

Oran: It seems that you guys have done a ton of work and have a lot of knowledge that people in the Town don't necessarily have. What you are trying to do is convey a lot of the information



that you've been sifting through to present it to them so they can start thinking about what the options are. I like the idea of having it structured with legal, social, environmental, having various categories for each one so that you can have them be parallel.

Ann: It seems like it's a new idea, this structure. Maybe we should have as homework that if people agree with the general idea, what categories would we have? Do we like the pro/con format? One person presents the pros/cons the committee has. Maybe we have a run through before the actual forum and we agree on what is a reasonably fair presentation of the pros and cons in the category and let's go with that. Does that sound like a reasonable thing for us to be considering as a committee for homework for next time?

Richard: I think that is probably a good idea.

Van: I think it's important for us to present ourselves, as much as possible, as unbiased. Our charge is really to do research, it's not to come up with a solution. The more we can keep it in that vein the better, and I think that scripting is a good idea. I think separation is a good idea, in other words the person presenting one option is not going to be presenting option two or three. It's important to give cohesive information.

Kathy: Oran, since you are used to doing things like this, can you weigh in here?

Oran: Yeah, I do a lot of divorce mediation and I can tell you that parents who are getting divorced often fight about how they will tell the kids that they are getting a divorce. I often advise that they should come up with a script and you should both present it to your kids together. So that they hear the same thing together so it's not "who am I siding with, who will I choose?" I think that is a really good idea. It sounds, Van, like you are saying that you not only have an opinion, but that is how you are charged. Your charge is to convince the town of the facts and get their input into what people in town want knowing what the restrictions are, what this building has. It sounds like it's going in the right direction in presenting it. I would have ground rules, we can talk about that another time in terms of how to keep it tight so that it doesn't become a debate, it's an information session. We need to help people understand what is going on.

Ann: Do we feel that included in the facts, do we expect everyone to know the past use of the building as a library? There's archival items and all that stuff. It has been co-managed, in some sense, by a non-profit and the town in the past. I think a lot of people don't know very much about this building. I don't know how much of the past history is relevant, I am just raising a question as to whether that is our charge to talk about the past history at all?

Van: That might be something we could put in the newsletter.

Ann: Yeah, that's a good idea.

Pat: When you start a meeting, you will have an introduction. Someone could write up a paragraph and introduction the topic and include those items. Not to dwell on them, but to go "So, where do we go from here? Here's what we came up with".

Oran: It seems to me that some history is relevant and would be interesting to people. It's important for people to know "what is this building". That isn't necessarily going to dictate what happens in the future, but the history is important in his opinion and people might not know much about it.

Van: Getting back to the newsletter because it's a great communication tool. At some point we are going to want to introduce to people to the idea that we are having a forum. We could certainly include some history of the building in that to raise interest in how important it's been in Leverett and get the idea that this isn't a frivolous undertaking that we are doing, it's a very serious attempt to preserve one of our historic facilities. I think it could be included in the presentation.

Ann: I just want to point out that we have had some discussion of the history of the building in the past and it's been used somewhat contentiously to imply that we have to do in the future what has been done in the past, like share responsibility with a non-profit, etc. I think we will have to have committee consensus on what the use was in the past and what goes into that as this newsletter PR for the forum and to lead into people being interested in the forum.

Kari: I think we'll all agree, before we put anything in the newsletter or before it's scripted that it makes sense that we all come together before we put anything out there.

Van: That is what I was going to say.

Richard: We do have a couple of other things we want to do and we have more information to present. Do we want to table this discussion at this point? I think there is some homework to do on it. What is the consensus?

Kari: I'm fine with tabling, and Ann you had a really good idea of what our homework might be. Can you repeat that?

Ann: I'll support the motion to table this with the idea that we table it so the committee can do homework on a scripted presentation by the committee that would include some person presenting the pros and cons of each of the three options we put forward. In terms of various categories that we've raised that include such things as legal findings, social uses, and environmental impacts. Our homework is to figure out the categories that would be part of a scripted presentation.

Oran: Ann, when we first started talking about it, you were talking about defending the positions and maybe even reframing that to presenting rather than defending because that assumes that there contention somewhere.

Ann: Let's change it to "presenting the options".

Kathy: So, I think you brought up that maybe the person that was presenting each of the three options would also be presenting the pros and cons.

Ann: Yes, they'd be presenting what the advocate of a pro position would take, and then presenting what the person opposed to that would take. The person would be presenting the

positions, but not defending the position. They are presenting the positions on both sides along with the legal, environmental, and social implications.

Van: So, we have some work to do in terms of the way this is all going to work in the three categories we are discussing. And, of course, we also don't have the information to know exactly what we are going to base it on.

Richard: Yeah, we need to have some additional facts that we don't have yet.

Van: I think that one thing that is going to be really important to the townspeople that we don't come off as a committee that is arguing amongst ourselves. Because, I think that is not going to be something is going to give people a sense of security with us. The more they can trust us to be objective, I think the better off we will be as a committee. Especially if we are going to do a second forum, because we don't want the review of the first one to "well these guys were so completely up in the air about certain things and I have no idea what they are talking about".

Ann: Or they were obviously biased in favor of something and don't want to listen to anyone else's views,

Van: We've all been in enough town meetings to know that can really get out of hand.

Richard: Shall we move on?

Ann: Well we have a motion to table, so why don't we have it seconded and vote on it?

Richard: Ok, I make a motion to table.

Van: Second.

Richard: We have a motion to table, any further discussion?

Ann: Move the question.

Richard: All those in favor of tabling this for tonight, until our next meeting and we've done our homework.

There was unanimous agreement to table the motion until the next meeting.

Silas: Thanks Oran, we'll probably be needing you again.

We all thanked Oran and he left the meeting.

Richard: I wanted to give you some further information about the survey. I think I mentioned earlier that we have approval to go out and solicit and Margie is working on this. It should go very quickly and it will help a great deal.

Ann: Can I just ask about the process? So, Margie putting it out to bid to do the land survey?

Richard: Yes, we discussed at our last meeting that we want to approach the Select Board about heating oil for the building for this winter and to see if we can control the humidity a little bit in the building. Right now, Edie Field is funding the heating of a town building and I think that is pretty crazy. I have presented this in a note to the three SB members and it will be brought up at a later SB meeting. I don't know if Pat has a comment on that.

Pat: I don't have the agenda.

Richard: It's not on the agenda yet.

Ann: When is the next SB meeting?

Richard and Pat weren't sure.

Ann: Never mind.

Richard: I wanted Silas to know that I did carry that forward and to see if we can move on it. The other things, Pat you had an issue that you raised with me about the newspaper "The Montague Recorder" misquoting me. Do you want to speak to that?

Pat: Yeah, the newspaper reporter made it sound like you presented one idea that the only solution is going to be moving the building. It's not what Richard said and it's not what the minutes report. I wanted everyone to know that because reporters misquote probably at least half the time at these things.

Richard: The other thing that I would add, this is speaking for myself about being misquoted. I would like to say that I keep hearing about this stuff in a roundabout manner. If somebody thinks that I've done something wrong in the committee, if people think that I have said something that has gotten into the newspapers and they disagree with it, I would prefer that they contact me directly. I am not going to be offended by being questioned, but it's a problem when it comes back to me that someone has said this about what appeared in the newspaper and that is passed to me through two or three other parties. If you have a problem, just email me, call me and I will tell you what I said and what I did. I would appreciate it if that were the case. I am the person that has to present these things to the SB and move these things through the town. I'm trying to do it in as neutral and reasonable way as possible. I'm trying to be approachable, so please approach.

There was a discussion about rumors and encouraging communicating when we have questions.

Richard: What else do we need to cover?

Ann: I have a question, we have to wait on the survey before we do anything on the septic or well, right?

Richard: Absolutely. It is absolutely pointless to do anything further until we have the land survey done and that gets sent up to the registry of deeds and registered. All of the legalities around wells and septic systems and that is based on the plot plan. We've got enough information

requested. We will have a topographic map on it so we will know elevations. We'll have the Mass DEP wetlands designation plotted on it. All of that information will be there when we present it to the town boards. So, with any luck at all, the town boards are going to be able to give us an answer that will be somewhat definitive anyway and we may be able to settle the issue based on that or know that we need to move forward with further work.

Van: When does the flood plain issue come into play?

Richard: You are talking about the 2020 Mass State flood plan bylaw? That has been passed and is in place now.. The reason that I haven't raised it with the town further than the fact that I've introduced it is that the folks from FEMA haven't issued the new FEMA maps of the flood plain yet for Franklin County. They are out for every other county in the state. Covid basically threw a monkey wrench into those maps getting issued and I am in touch FRCOG trying to find out what they know about it and if I do get an answer from FRCOG I am going to go directly to the state agency that is doing that to find out when those maps are coming out. Right now the maps are almost 30 years out of date, they are kind of meaningless. It is entirely possible that once those maps come out that will settle the issue once and for all for the current site of the building. Until FEMA issues them, it is sort of a moot point.

Kathy: Can you clarify that the committee, you as chair, were authorized by the town to expend some of the funds from the article.

Richard: That's correct. This committee voted that we ask the SB to authorize that and we also asked the CPA committee to do it. There was a consensus between CPA and the SB that that was a reasonable use of part of the \$30,000 that was appropriated to specifically deal with the issues of the Field Building and the SB voted to do that. All they voted for was that we move ahead with the survey and I made the presentation of what we wanted to do in the survey and they agreed and voted unanimously to go forward. The CPA agrees, so that has happened and we are putting that into motion as fast as we can.

Kathy: I just want to note that this is really encouraging on the purpose and the mandate of this committee.

Richard: It is definitely a step in the right direction and if we decide we need more consultants, if we decide we need a sanitarian or if we decide we need a specialist in wetlands designations we can get that. We can go back to the SB and the CPA and say that we did the survey and the survey raised these issues and we can get the rest of the information. I do think it's absolutely critical to do it in order and incrementally. It would make no sense to hire all these potential consultants in mass and have six different experts working around the site. The first thing we need is an accurate land parcel plan, plot plan, of the site and the topography and know where the buildings are. We are asking them to locate the distance to building on adjacent properties and adjacent wells, and the position of the building on the road, the driveway, and road. All of that plays into the Title 5 regulations and the Town of Leverett septic system regulations are based on the State Title 5. When we are done, people may or may not like what we find out, but what we find out will be true. At that point, we will have a lot more information about what to do from there.

Ann: I just want to raise one point. We are going to put off approving the minutes from the last meeting to the next time?

Richard: I guess so. Judy had not received the recording from the last meeting so that the minutes could be typed up. There were computer issues. I will also get tonight's meeting minutes to her as well.

Ann: I move that the meeting be adjourned.

Kari: Second.

Richard: All those in favor?

All agreed to adjourn the meeting.

Next meeting will be December 8<sup>th</sup>.

---