

Note: Draft minutes are subject to corrections, additions and deletions.

November 2, 2017

PRESENT: Jim Waddell, Chairman
Regina Barnes, Vice-Chairman
Rick Griffin, Selectman
Phil Bean, Selectman
Rusty Bridle, Selectman
Frederick Welch, Town Manager
Mark Gearreald, Town Attorney

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

I. Public Hearing – Open at 7:03

Robert Sullivan, City Attorney for Portsmouth; who introduced Dan MacRitchie, Engineer from Exeter; Peter Britz, Environmental Planner for Portsmouth; Michael Deyling, Hydrogeologist employed by Coakley Landfill Group.

1. Coakley Landfill Group and PFC's found in public drinking water supplies

Attorney Sullivan: I am here tonight because about 6-8 weeks ago the City became aware that the Town had concerns about the landfill; for cooperation between Portsmouth and Hampton; make presentation to the Town; here on behalf of the City of Portsmouth; the City constitute half of the voting in the Coakley Group; \$26,000,000 has been spent on the site over the years. The Coakley Landfill was a regular municipal landfill; which the City of Portsmouth, Town of North Hampton, the Town of Newcastle and the Air force Base all contributed their municipal refuse too; it was a quarry, once spent it was filled using municipal refuse; 10 years. In the early 1980s, contamination started to show up; it was the first superfund site; money raised by the parties who contributed to the situation; it placed heavy burden on Portsmouth. EPA and DES have pervasively regulated everything that has happened on the site; study was done in the 80's at great expense and under strict supervision of State and Federal agencies. A design was developed which was deemed by EPA and DES at that time to be protective of public health, which is a legal requirement of the superfund. A design was made and the project went on for several years; ultimately, the cap was built; site has been administered by an executive committee of the Coakley Landfill Group. The group consists of anybody identified back in the early 1980s as having contributed to the site, transported waste or operated the site; been divided into three groups; municipal group, transporter group (brought waste to site) and generator group consisting of companies that were identified at the time of having generated materials that went to the site. The cap was constructed (under authority of Coakley Landfill Group) roughly 25 years ago; group meets monthly (teleconference); other members are an environmental attorney from Boston Seth Jaffe, represents the generator group; Curtis Shipley, Attorney, represents the transport group; only have contact with these groups through these two men I've identified to you. A very extensive sampling and monitoring program that goes

Note: Draft minutes are subject to corrections, additions and deletions.

on in connection with the ground water, surface water, bedrock, water in the area around the site. The actual location of the site is on Breakfast Hill Road, in the Towns of North Hampton and Greenland.

Mr. MacRitchie: slide show; showed aerial photo of landfill; I am the person in charge of overseeing and coordinating the construction phase of the multi-layered cap and the activities that took place before and after; related to the cap and the ultimate closure of site. Starting in 1996, I was responsible to coordinate between the Coakley Landfill Group, general contractor, supervising contractor, quality assurance contractor, EPA and DES. The cap itself is approximately 4 feet thick, it is a multi-layer cap section consisting of landfill refuse, low permeability fill; flexible membrane layer; drainage sand layer; cover soil and topsoil; the site looks like a field and is mowed once a year.

Attorney Sullivan: Mr. MacRitchie would you describe how all this is supposed to work, so to keep the refuse from contaminating. Mr. MacRitchie: the whole idea of the cap is to keep the storm water flow from continuing to percolate down through what was an uncapped landfill and continue to have contact with the refuse underneath. Many factors involved to get it to drain properly; different layers of cap are designed to either shed water or relieve gas pressure in order to make sure the integrity of the middle layer, the flexible membrane liner remains intact.

Attorney Sullivan: give dimensions of all this. Mr. MacRitchie: the footprint of the landfill is approximately 25 acres; was originally 26-27 acres of footprint and after consolidation is somewhere around 24 acres left.

Mr. Deyling: hydrogeologist; environmental monitoring; water quality monitoring; interpretations of what we see happening around the site; we have data that extends back to the time when it was capped; annual data that has been collected since then; terrific database; slide show. Monitoring history; since 1998, the site has been sampled annually for contaminants of concern (COC); information goes into database and submitted annually in reports to EPA and DES; can go on-line and directly assess the information. Starting in 2017, the agencies requested that additional monitoring be done at the site; being done semi-annual basis; collecting samples; groundwater, surface water, sediment samples from a variety of locations. In April-May 2017 11 samples were collected from OU1 (Operable Unit 1); that is the area immediately around the landfill; 27 wells sampled in the OU2 (Operable Unit 2), that is the area beyond OU1; 8 surface water sample locations were taken April-May; 1 leach 8 location; 7 sediment sample locations and 23 private residences. Second semiannual sampling, was completed in October and are awaiting results. What he will be talking about will be the April-May data. Groundwater management zone (GMZ) part of requirement through NH DES; which establishes a zone where we are required to know that contaminants do not exceed regulatory standards. Three compounds were selected, as they are known contaminants of concern. First is 1,4 Dioxane; long term monitoring looks pretty stable, do not see a lot of changes that indicate there are drastic differences going on over time. We start in the 2009-2010 time frame; 1,4 Dioxane is much like PFCs are today; at the time EPA said we have data on this chemical that has elevated it to a concern; in 2009, it is a new emerging contaminant. Arsenic is a common naturally occurring contaminant in New England; some concentrations can go up, becomes more soluble; concern at the site; does not show significant increases in arsenic. We did the same for Benzene, volatile organic compound; concentrations have decreased to the point where they are all below the clean-up standard; the cap is doing its job;

Note: Draft minutes are subject to corrections, additions and deletions.

functioning as it should be; not seeing major changes in terms of deterioration of groundwater quality. The presence of PFAS OR PFCs meant as a general class of chemicals; presence of PFCs or PFAS compounds are related to the operation of the landfill in the 70s & 80s; no waste disposal at site from 1985 forward. The data that we see for the compounds that have long-term history show stability and do not suggest that anything has changed in the hydro geologic system that would cause concern that the remedy was not working properly. The presence of PFCs were related to historic operation; merely like 1,4 Dioxane in that the EPA has said this is an emerging contaminate and would like you to sample. NHDES website shows information on various concentrations of PFCs that were found throughout the state; their database is interactive; specific information. PFCs are common to things like food wrappers, non-stick surfaces, Teflon, furniture products, Scotch guard, Vortex, Firefighting foams, car wash waxes; shed water; provided water resistance. Studies have shown that over 95% of people tested have PFAS in their blood stream; not uncommon contaminant. PFAS found in Aquarion wells; Rye Breakfast Hill Landfill has been sampled and monitoring wells at the site have been in excess of the 70ppt standard; same as Grove Road Landfill; nurseries have some concentrations that are below the 70ppt, but in the 40ppt range. The golf course well is located outside the watershed that Coakley is in; draws its water from a highly permeable sand and gravel aquifer in that area and have detected 34ppt. At this point the standard is not being exceeded outside the groundwater management zone at Coakley; concern has been raised to the south; three wells to the west are non-detect, as of May 2017. The majority of the wells in the Stone Meadow Way subdivision have been sampled several times for PFCs, and through May these have been non-detect as of May 2017. Falls Way subdivision were non-detect; DES has sampled more wells in this subdivision; less than 10ppt. EPA recently came out with an addendum to their five-year review; made determination on a short-term basis the site is protective of human health; in 2016 left an uncertainty in southern portion away from the site. Aquarion wells; concentration of PFAS detected as of August; shared data; 3-4 miles away from Coakley; some wells are bedrock; some over-burdened wells; based on information we have there really is no reasonable connection from the Coakley site to impacts seen in these wells. The DES is continuing to look at the data; Aquarion is continuing to sample and we continue to sample at the site. Surface water sampling is a combination of sampling done by multiple or different groups: Conservation Law Foundation, CLK (DES), and Coakley Landfill Group. When PFCs showed up in surface water the DEA developed surface water and sentiment screening criteria, Berry's Brook & Coakley; different exposure scenarios; 45-120 days of the year exposure; 760 Nano grams per liter; if exceed level would like to see additional investigation. None of the sentiment samples exceeded the screening criteria; none exceeded the adult screening level; two samples collected in May did exceed the 120-day exposure for a child. There has been some talk about deeper bedrock, do not know enough; tested the Chinburg well (300' deep); to investigate the deep bedrock pathway; pretty good evidence there is not a likely connection.

Attorney Sullivan: for the reasons you just saw, the City of Portsmouth, NHDES and US EPA all believe that the Coakley remedy is protective of the public health; main reason is that no one is drinking water contaminated above health advisory levels by that landfill; nobody ever will; DES would not allow it, EPA would not allow it. The sole purpose of the superfund is that no one drinks contaminated water above the health advisory level; have a giant mechanism in place to be protective; operated by Local, State and Federal Government agencies whose purpose is to protect the public health. No one's work is done; always be problems; as

Note: Draft minutes are subject to corrections, additions and deletions.

problems come up, we will deal with them. City of Portsmouth has spent more than \$13,000,000; expenditure money is not over; a lot more money will be spent before the situation is resolved. The collection and sampling of water; actions taken to deal with any perceived threat to the public health; they will not end; process continues; whatever science dictates needs to be done to protect the people who drink water, those things are going to be done.

Chairman Waddell called for public comments.

Mike Edgar, Representative from Hampton: the proposed systems that were originally put forth to take care of Coakley, were there several ones and why was the one that was picked chosen. Attorney Sullivan: the superfund process called for the identification of the problems at the landfill contaminates of concern; the definition of the problem; once problem was defined then a number of solutions were required to be put forward by engineers. One of the solutions proposed was a pump and treat system, but was not selected.

Representative Edgar: were there any other alternatives. Attorney Sullivan: yes, in the 5-6 range.

Representative Edgar: did any of them include putting a liner underneath. Attorney Sullivan: I do not recall.

Representative Edgar: Dan might remember. Mr. MacRitchie: I do not remember, I do not think so, but cannot say I am 100% sure.

Representative Edgar: illustrations showed how high Coakley is; were there a lot of testing done on Little River that comes towards Hampton. Mr. Deyling: yes, there were samples taken near the landfill; samples at North Road from Little River.

Representative Edgar: are there any more taken further down Little River closer to Hampton. Mr. Deyling: not as part of what the CLG has done; cannot speak whether the DES has taken some samples further down; not aware that they have.

Representative Edgar: aware of limits that exist, they might go down and more stringent requirement in the future; maybe things suggested now will not be sufficient to meet the lower standards if they do exist.

Selectman Barnes: Representative Edgar hinted that you are in compliance now with the EPA limit of 70ppt; if it was lowered that would be something Coakley might have to look at. Attorney Sullivan: right, Coakley would be required to respond to that.

Selectman Barnes: on the map that shows CLG; limits of groundwater management in a restriction zone/lateral PFOA and PFAS in bedrock; outside of that, I see 70ppt north of Coakley, but right below that zone has there been testing in North Hampton that shows what the limits are. Mr. Deyling: the three wells were all non-detect; there are some wells that have been added at the request of the agency; additional sampling taken and just to the east of the landfill as well; results pending; were below the 70ppt standard; agency requested to go farther.

Selectman Barnes: you are awaiting those results. Mr. Deyling: yes.

Selectman Griffin: when was the quarry last open. Attorney Sullivan: was opened in the late 70s.

Selectman Griffin: they were taking sand and rock. Attorney Sullivan: yes.

Note: Draft minutes are subject to corrections, additions and deletions.

Selectman Griffin: it left the ownership of the Coakley family and then became owned by Portsmouth. Attorney Sullivan: no, to my knowledge, the Coakley family owns it today; the Coakley family made an agreement with the municipality under which the municipality used that Coakley property as the municipal land.

Selectman Griffin: how long was that done; from the 80s on. Attorney Sullivan: it was over by the early 80s.

Selectman Griffin: Portsmouth used to bring all their stuff there. Attorney Sullivan: yes.

Selectman Bean: I am a consumer of water in Hampton; comments as Selectman and State Representative and member of the Seacoast Cancer Cluster Commission. Dr. Chan, DES testified last week that the Seacoast does in fact have by definition, a cancer cluster; 4 cancers, 4 deaths to include children within several miles of the Coakley Landfill out of 350 in the USA. I say again 350 very deadly cancers, 4 deaths in close proximity to the Coakley Landfill out of 350 in the USA. There was a governor's appointee to the commission that launched into a dissertation at the last meeting to minimize the concept that there even was a cancer cluster; he was removed from the Commission during the hearing. There are different versions of reality that you have and I have. NJ has just affected rates that are fractional of what DES recommends or enforces 13ppt, so the data here would be in violation both in NJ and in VT. Legislation put forth by Representative Messmer to reduce the legal limits that will make your presentation here tonight problematic; we have different versions of reality on this subject. (Read portion of letter from Attorney Sullivan) Your letter was in response to this board unanimously voting that we thought there was a conflict of interest; we see that our version is different from yours. You stated you have to balance your interests with the taxpayers of Portsmouth; in Hampton, we do not balance the life safety, any cancer threats with any taxpayer, anywhere, anytime, anyplace. In Camp Lejeune compounds were dumped into the water and it took death and disease and cancers; 12 diseases; because young people were dying of cancer; people knew about it; two billion dollar fund set up. I will not share the confidence in CLG, EPA or DES; will not balance any interest with any taxpayer ever when there are carcinogens and people dying. On July 31, 2017 I was appointed to the Seacoast Cancer Cluster investigation; the general court recognizes the Department of Health and Human Services found on 2/2/16 the first cancer cluster ever identified in the State of NH. Powers and duties – develop a common understand of key definitions and concept of cancer cluster and environmental investigation; review progress made by State, Federal agencies and their partners, I would call you a partner in that effort. The commission shall solicit any information (NH Statute) from any person or entity on the commission that it deems relevant to its study. There was a discharge of funds (MBTE); your Town is going to be the recipient of two; one is the Bellamy River to benefit your water system; another one near the CLG to benefit your Town's culpability. We have closed a well in this Town; have limits that exceed NJ and VT; more cooperation between CLG and this Town. We have many shared interests with Portsmouth; read from article from Seacoast Online dated July 24, 1998 and mentions Attorney Sullivan. CLG chose the cheapest method. In 1981, the State of NH granted the Town of North Hampton permission to dispose pesticide waste containers at the Coakley Landfill site. No one can speak to where the contains were, what kind of pesticide was in there, if they are going to leak in the future; from Governor Hassan's task force on the Seacoast Cancer Cluster. The City of Portsmouth began operating a refuse to energy plant on Pease Air Force Base in 1982; from 1982-1985 municipalities began transporting their refuse to this plant. You are

Note: Draft minutes are subject to corrections, additions and deletions.

getting money from the state on the first dumping; performing hazardous operations on Federal facilities; dumping your stuff in another Town; we are sitting here uncertain about the safety. EPA proposed remedial action of preferred alternative, including placing a cap on the cover of the landfill to minimize the migration of contaminants from the landfill; record the collection and treatment of groundwater to remove and prevent further migration of contaminants. This containment and clean-up plan bearing an estimate of an estimated of \$20,200,000 represents a compromise between less expensive (which is the one you chose), less environmentally protected programs (you choose), more costly protected ones; you low-balled it; we have a serious problem 30 years later. You are in the lead for this for the implementation, US EPA and NHDES have input into the process, but CLG leads. In 2016, the State of NH were informed of a small number of cases of a rare pediatric cancer; to suggest we are going to balance efforts to protect those and the unknown against taxpayers is falling to be polite. In 2016, the CLG, USEPA, NHDES agree with the environmental governor's task force that groundwater may flow from Coakley Landfill to the northeast/southeast; we are southeast. Potential for migration towards municipal water systems in the Towns of Rye, North Hampton, Portsmouth and Hampton; Eversource is involved, Aquarion has closed a well. Since the current selected remedy of MNA is ineffective for controlling migration of PFCs under the surface water, remediate Coakley Landfill site and mitigate PFC contaminated discharge to surface waters within the next two years. Continue to provide a permanent water supply for the 300 homes along Breakfast Hill Road. We are concerned about your conflict of interest, Mr. Sullivan; CLG gives you powers to act as chief executive; gives voting privileges; you are the driving force; interested in the right-to-know provisions of the document. We would like full transparency on how much money you have in the CLG; provisions account for funds; you are getting hooked up, but we are not and we are concerned about it. There is a waiver of conflict of interest; confidentiality of shared information, that information is our information; undersigned party enters into consent agreement in the matter of USA v City of Portsmouth relating to the Coakley Landfill Superfund site; agent authorized to accept service on behalf of the undersigned party is you Mr. Sullivan; you are balancing taxpayer interest. We share the wealth in protecting Portsmouth and surrounding communities.

Attorney Gearreald: you presented areas of interest on a map; highest concentrations that have been detected of PFOA and PFOS both in groundwater and surface water appear to be in the area of the Coakley Landfill, is that right? Mr. Deyling: yes.

Attorney Gearreald: these are in the areas of 400ppt way above the 70ppt, which is the state limit; PFOAs and PFCs are soluble and transportable in water, correct? Mr. Deyling: yes.

Attorney Gearreald: when the Coakley Landfill were designed, Mr. MacRitchie there is no liner underneath, correct? Mr. MacRitchie: there is no lining underneath.

Attorney Gearreald: when this was designed and built, the cap is above the surface and goes down to groundwater, does it now? Mr. MacRitchie: it does not necessarily go down to groundwater it just goes down below existing grade, all around the perimeter.

Attorney Gearreald: the landfill cap was designed in response to the migration of landfill gas, is that correct? Mr. MacRitchie: among other things, yes.

Attorney Gearreald: landfill gas does not permeate groundwater does it; it acts as a barrier. Mr. MacRitchie: I believe that is accurate.

Note: Draft minutes are subject to corrections, additions and deletions.

Attorney Gearreald: landfill gas moves along a path of least resistance; whatever that is go up down, sideways. Mr. MacRitchie: that is my understanding.

Attorney Gearreald: the cap was designed in the large part to avoid migration of landfill gas, isn't that right? Mr. MacRitchie: I may have misspoken on an earlier question about the landfill gas; not sure I understood you correctly, it is not to control the migration, it is to allow it not to build up underneath the impervious liner. There is a layer of sand right underneath the liner that acts as a conveyance layer that allows the gas to move freely through that layer, then there are vents throughout the footprint of the landfill to let the gas out.

Attorney Gearreald: correct, the design as was implemented by yourself and others was to deal with landfill gas more than anything. Mr. MacRitchie: no, the design mechanism is to deal with rainwater and to shed that off the footprint of it and to do that in a way it does not allow gas to build up or any negative impacts that would impede on the ability of the liner to do that primary job.

Attorney Gearreald: the cap does not have any control over PFCs that are in the landfill permeating into the groundwater below it, does it. Mr. MacRitchie: the caps sole purpose is to minimize the amount of water coming down from storm water into the landfill; that is what the design is intended to do.

Attorney Gearreald: but it does not prevent PFCs from migrating from under the landfill that are already there, does it. Mr. MacRitchie: by its nature is it simply a dome over the top of the landfill, so the answer is no.

Attorney Gearreald: PFCs, which can move in groundwater and surface water can go underneath the landfill, the cap does not stop that. Mr. MacRitchie: it does not, no.

Attorney Gearreald: Attorney Sullivan you have listened to me at times where I have provided you some results that Aquarion Water Company have provided to us, of its recent sampling. You expressed an understanding of how our folks here might be very concerned about what they are drinking even though it does not rise to the current levels established; will you confirm that. Attorney Sullivan: I will confirm that, it is why I am here.

Attorney Gearreald: exactly; you have recently been considering with EPA and DES what further sampling of migration of contaminates from Coakley Landfill will be implemented, is that right. Attorney Sullivan: that is correct.

Attorney Gearreald: you probably know that this board authorized a major effort on my part and others whom I have communicated to try to have the proceedings of the EPA, DES and Coakley Landfill Group in a recent technical session be opened to the public; I am sure you can confirm that the meeting was not the recent meeting, correct. Attorney Sullivan: I can confirm that.

Attorney Gearreald: the latest one was October 24. Attorney Sullivan: it was recent.

Attorney Gearreald: as a result of that meeting was EPA and DES insistent upon there being some further monitoring of the flow of groundwater or bedrock from Coakley Landfill Group in the direction that we are talking about here, to the southeast. Attorney Sullivan: no decisions or determinations were made that day, it was a discussion.

Note: Draft minutes are subject to corrections, additions and deletions.

Attorney Gearreald: although there were no determinations, have the EPA and DES made any efforts to try to persuade the Coakley Landfill Group to do such monitoring. Attorney Sullivan: no decisions have been made yet; no instructions have been issued yet.

Attorney Gearreald: EPA and DES is planning a public presentation about the Coakley Landfill on November 15 at the North Hampton Town Hall; they had promised us they would be conducting such a public presentation after this latest technical session. Do you have any understanding what they are going to be presenting in terms of what further monitoring is going to result. Attorney Sullivan: the only thing I know about the presentation, which will occur in North Hampton, is Mr. Deyling will be making a presentation, along the lines of what you have just seen.

Attorney Gearreald: I am sure you understand our concerns about the quality of our drinking water even though it may not exceed the maximum contamination levels currently used by EPA and DES as being acceptable. Regardless of what DES and EPA insist upon do you have any thoughts about what sampling you might be willing to do to determine whether or not what we are seeing in the Aquarion wells is coming from the Coakley Landfill. Attorney Sullivan: that really is a technical question, and would require people with technical knowledge, beyond my own, to determine what might be appropriate; I rely upon experts and scientists to make decisions involving that.

Attorney Gearreald: have you anything to offer to the public tonight that would reassure us that it is going to be looked into, from your end. Attorney Sullivan: it is entirely appropriate for you and for anybody to be concerned about the quality of drinking water; the members of the CLG and members of the Government of the City of Portsmouth are very concerned. Selectman Bean indicated some of the actions we have taken along those lines, including cooperating with the Town of Greenland it may turn out to be extending the City of Portsmouth municipal water system significantly into the Town of Greenland at a cost estimated up to \$17,000,000. Not only is it important that drinking water be safe, but also important that everybody believe that it is safe. As much investigation as is necessary to resolve that public concern needs to be done; that is my view and the way I will vote as a member of the CLG on behalf of the City of Portsmouth.

Attorney Gearreald: I do not know if you had the opportunity to watch the presentation that was made to this body on October 23 by Aquarion Water Company. Attorney Sullivan: I was able to watch that.

Attorney Gearreald: do you foresee any efforts on the part of the CLG to cooperate with Aquarion in its investigation as to what the source of the PFCs are in its well. Attorney Sullivan: for my part, we would cooperate with Aquarion immediately; this PFC issue is widespread; you saw the maps Mr. Deyling produced; a great deal of water in public water supplies including the public water supply of the City of Portsmouth shows detects of PFCs, below health advisory; matter of record. One of the ironies that arose in connection with the Coakley Landfill was some people who had private wells show no detect, prefer to be served by public water, which had detect. The best pathway to resolution to everything is North Hampton Selectman Larry Miller who has pointed out in writing, we are all in this problem together, and the only way we are going to get out of it is by cooperating on a resolution together; I total endorse that idea.

Note: Draft minutes are subject to corrections, additions and deletions.

Attorney Gearreald: acting cooperatively with us, the Aquarion Water Company is planning to implement a water treatment system, which would address PFCs; the technology is there now to do that; will address PFCs. Has there been any consideration to date by the CLG of a similar type of treatment. Attorney Sullivan: the legal responsibility is to implement the two consent decrees that exist in connection with the Coakley Landfill site; it does not have the authority to go beyond the consent decrees. In the 1990's no part of implementing the consent decree involved a pump and treat system and that continues today.

Attorney Gearreald: undertaking any initiative regarding the kind of treatment system Aquarion was talking about, the impetus for that as far as CLG is concerned has to come from EPA or DES. Attorney Sullivan: yes, the Federal Government would be obligated to contribute significant money towards it under the consent decrees, so the Federal Government would be involved as well.

Attorney Gearreald: because of the contributions made by the Air Force and the Department of the Navy. Attorney Sullivan: yes, and a slight degree the Coast Guard in New Castle.

Attorney Gearreald: in terms of what this community and those that share in the Aquarion Water Supply, which is not only Hampton, but also North Hampton and Rye are concerned, if there were to be a treatment of PFCs, not just to detect their migration, but also to do something about it, as far as the CLG is the pressure must come from DES and EPA. Attorney Sullivan: really needs to be initiated by a scientific basis that calls for it; if it is determined then it is the duty of the regulatory agencies under the superfund to bring this issue up and work towards a remedy.

Town Manager Welch: all of us are aware of the diagnosis of the cancer cluster and the concern of the people who live in and around this general area, have had several children die because of the diagnosis. Earlier in the evening, it was brought up as to whether or not there was a liner under the landfill; having closed four landfills, that I closed; one was a superfund site; done by the Town without EPA and DES intervention, we worked with them. The only way we closed the landfill was to completely dig it up and put a liner underneath and treat the material that comes out of it; landfill is going to be there for 1000+ years. Water moves very slowly underground, but it does move; need to start thinking about a permanent solution, not testing, not waiting for this to disappear; only way to do that is dig it up and cap it all the way around or put in a landfill like a turnkey that is capped all the way around. We need to think about a permanent ending solution to this very quickly, or this is going to get much worse over a longer period of time.

Chairman Waddell: thank you for coming tonight, thank you for your presentation.

Attorney Sullivan: I would invite the board or Mark to contact me anytime.

Chairman Waddell: we have to do the warrant for the tax rate. Please find attached the 2017 second half Property Tax Warrant in the amount of \$27,631,761.00 for your review and signature this evening; the municipal tax rate is going to be \$6.32. The total tax rate is \$16.37, as of right now.

Selectman Barnes MOTIONED to ACCEPT the second half Property Tax Warrant in the amount of \$27,631,761.00 with the municipal tax rate of \$6.32 SECONDED by Selectman Bridle.

VOTE: 5-0-0

Note: Draft minutes are subject to corrections, additions and deletions.

II. Closing Comments

At approximately 9:02PM, on MOTION made by Selectman Bridle, SECONDED by Selectman Barnes, the Board (voted unanimously by roll call) to go into a non-public session under RSA 91-A:3, II (c) and (e).

VOTE: 5-0-0

[Minutes were sealed under RSA 91-A:3, III]

III. Adjournment

At 9:20 PM, the non-public session adjourned on MOTION made by Selectman Bridle, SECONDED by Selectman Barnes.

VOTE: 5-0-0

On a MOTION was made by Selectman Bridle, SECONDED by Selectman Barnes, the Board voted unanimously by roll call vote to seal the Minutes of the non-public session under RSA 91-A:3, III on the grounds that they could affect adversely the reputation of any person other than a member of this Board, or jeopardize the effectiveness of the action to be taken.

At 9:22 PM, the public session adjourned on MOTION made by Selectman Bridle, SECONDED by Selectman Barnes.

VOTE: 5-0-0

Chairman