

from the Steinberg Lalli Charitable Foundation, for increasing affordable housing in Concord. In addition, Town Meeting approved \$75,000 in funds from the Community Preservation Act towards development costs. The plan is to build 8 two- and three-bedroom condominiums to be sold at Concord affordable rates (up to 150% of median income) through a lottery system. Funds were expended for site engineering, design, planning, environmental studies and a new septic system for the existing structure. Plans have been presented to the Board of Selectmen, the Planning Board, the Community Preservation Committee, the Natural Resources Commission and the Zoning Board of Appeals.

In addition to the project at 1245 Elm St., the CHDC has also been pursuing another land acquisition in Concord with the help of the Walden Woods Foundation. It has cooperated with the Town in maintaining affordable housing at Emerson Annex, and with the other housing groups in Concord. In the fall, it assumed the tasks of the Concord Housing Trust as the Trust completed its final project at 335 Walden St.

## 2229 MAIN STREET OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Pam Rockwell, Chair  
Paul Boehm  
Ray Bruttpmesso  
Kerry Diskin  
Deborah Farnsworth  
Len Rappoli  
Fred Seward

The 2229 Main Street Oversight Committee was formed to monitor the cleanup at Starmet, formerly Nuclear Metals, Inc. (NMI), a former defense contractor that is now a superfund site. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is the agency in charge of the cleanup. Currently EPA is overseeing a Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS). The investigation will determine the extent of the contamination at the site and the pathways by which the public may be exposed. The feasibility study will develop possible cleanup strategies. The EPA has hired the consulting firm de maximis inc. to conduct the RI/FS.

During 2009, de maximis inc. began using the soil and water sampling data collected over the past few years

to define areas of risk at the site. During the spring, the Committee commented on adequacy of the data collection, and suggested that certain areas be tested for PCBs. In December, the EPA released a preliminary version of the baseline human health risk assessment – the next step in determining what areas of the site are contaminated enough to require remediation. This site is contaminated with depleted uranium, beryllium, and other laboratory chemicals. There are also PCBs located in most of the areas where there is uranium contamination in surface soil, which means that these areas will definitely trigger a remediation action. (These areas are all close to buildings and enclosed by fences.) A major plume of uranium in the ground above the bedrock has also been identified heading from the former holding basin, under the buildings, and towards the Assabet River. The Committee is currently developing comments about the risk assessment.

The Committee continued to advocate with the EPA to remove the buildings at the Starmet site. There is radioactive contamination in all parts of the buildings, including offices, due mostly to a leaky roof and standing water. In some areas, water is above the level of the electrical outlets. This is a particular danger to emergency workers who might have to respond to the site. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts filed a complaint in Suffolk Superior Court against Starmet alleging that Starmet violated a 2007 Administrative Consent to permanently vacate the site. The complaint sought a permanent injunction ordering Starmet to vacate the site by June 31, 2009. At the end of 2009, Starmet had still not complied. The State is slated to file a Summary Judgment motion in early 2010 with the Court to have Starmet comply. In February 2009, the United States District Court determined that Starmet was responsible for the remediation costs. The EPA is negotiating with the principal responsible parties (mostly the US Army) to pay the costs of the removal of the buildings.

More information about the Starmet cleanup can be found at the following websites, (the committee does not have control over the content of these sites):

- [www.nmisite.org](http://www.nmisite.org) is the website created by the contractor de maximis. It includes a list of the current activities at the site, including data and maps from the sampling that has been completed.

- The EPA also has a website with historical information. Go to [www.epa.gov/region1/superfund/findsite/find-index.htm](http://www.epa.gov/region1/superfund/findsite/find-index.htm) and search for “Nuclear Metals”.
- [www.crewconcord.org](http://www.crewconcord.org) is the website for the environmental advocacy group CREW.

## **HANSCOM FIELD ADVISORY COMMISSION (HFAC)**

Elise Woodward, Selectmen Representative

### *Role of HFAC*

To act as an advisory commission with regard to Hanscom Field for review of issues land use, noise and transportation and to provide a forum for communications among the surrounding towns, the users of the airfield, and Massport in matters pertaining to Hanscom Field.

## **HANSCOM AREA TOWNS COMMITTEE (HATS)**

Elise Woodward, Selectmen Representative  
Doris Cole, Planning Board Representative

### *Role of HATS*

HATS brings together representatives of the towns of Bedford, Concord, Lexington and Lincoln to consider matters of common concern. These include, but are not limited to, issues arising out of the operation of Hanscom Airfield and the Hanscom Air Force Base.

The HATS Environmental Sub-Committee assists HATS with the review of environmental impacts associated with airport activities.

## **HIGHLIGHTS OF 2009 ACTIVITIES**

### *Aviation Activities*

Flight operations through November were approximately 11% below the same period during the prior year. Associated with fewer flights is less noise, a boon to the adjacent communities. However, November saw only a 0.5% decrease in operations relative to 2008, suggesting that the decline in aviation activity may be bottoming out. Without scheduled commercial operations, enplanements are likely to stay low. Despite the decrease in operations and enplanements at the Air Field, Massport continued to push for expanded aviation options at Hanscom Field. Individually and collectively, the HATS communities responded to development proposals for

the east ramp, which would double the existing hangar space, lead to the demolition of Hanger 24 to make way for a new fixed base operator and use Stimulus funds to enhance Hanscom for corporate jet aviation.

Lexington Town Meeting affirmed the 1997 resolution about curtailing development and use changes at Hanscom until a multi-modal regional transportation study is conducted, and called for a moratorium on the use of Stimulus funds for promoting corporate aviation. The public hearings of the Bedford Conservation Commission (BCC) with Massport over vegetative management in the Bedford Town Forest were monitored. The BCC is preparing an order of conditions for the removal of significant tree cover in the Forest.

### *Air Force Development*

Col. David Orr, 66th Air Base Wing Commander, Hanscom Air Force Base, provided an update on privatization initiatives at the base. Provisions of the lease may necessitate base housing be opened to non-military personnel, accompanied by changes in security check points.

Sara Mattes, Lincoln Selectman, was appointed as liaison and Elise Woodward, Concord Selectman, as alternate to the Electronic Systems Command Advisory Board, newly created to promote public/private partnerships that will enhance the economic impact of the Command’s mission.

### *Regional Developments*

Topics of regional interest were explored, which highlighted the similarities and the differences in the ways each of the towns approaches policy. Topics included:

- Budget processes and broad fiscal policies
- Conservation stewardship and regulations
- Outreach to persons with disabilities
- Opportunities for regional cooperation
- Support for local agriculture
- Services for our youths

HATS followed proposed legislation affecting zoning regulations, the Land Use Partnership Act, which among other features, proposed changes in the use of site plan review, broadened options for collecting impact fees and threatened to undo much of the appeals case history.