

## **Longmeadow Ad Hoc Committee Meeting – 2/22/17**

Members Present: Bob Andrews, Craig Baldwin, John Bergendahl, John Dilorio, Lisa Semancik, Greg Short, Sharon Verrilli

Guests: Kim Bergendahl

Location: Pomfret Town Hall, Conference Room

Time: 6:30 PM

Summary: Craig Baldwin handed out a road assessment document as prepared by Paul Montenegro on 2/22/17. The assessment appraises the road as structurally sound with minor local deflections. Also noted were minor abrasions on high points due to snow plowing as well as some popped stone aggregate. Partial de-laminations of rubber crack sealant was also noted. There are 6 courses of action listed:

- 1) Full depth reclamation
- 2) Mill and fill
- 3) Tack and overlay
- 4) SAM with 2" overlay
- 5) Sam alone
- 6) Do nothing for 2 years

CB started the conversation by stating that he feels the goal is to encapsulate the coal tar.

JB asked what the definition of "stable" as it applies to the road is.

CB said as long as the wear surface of the road does not break down, the road will remain stable.

JB asked about having an independent assessment done, perhaps with one of the engineers from the list that he had provided to CB previously. JB questioned whether it is encapsulation or remediation that is need and said that we don't need more assessments from contractors, but rather an assessment from a pavement engineer who can sort out the risk of each approach. CB stated that he had left a message with an engineer at Lenard Engineering that morning and was awaiting a return call.

JD reiterated that both encapsulation and remediation hold some level of risk. He went on to question CB's documented discussion with Steve Krukoff as it did not match what Mr. Krukoff has stated to JD in previous conversations. CB stated that he had vetted his message with Mr. Krukoff prior to sending it to the Ad Hoc Committee. JD went on to say that he thought we could move forward with a trustworthy contractor if we could agree on a solution. JD stated that the coal tar should not be there and it has to be fixed right.

LS asked why Mr. Krukoff was not at this meeting. LS went on to say that she is struggling with what is right, and asked why we are not talking about getting rid of it.

JD stated that Mr. Krukoff had mentioned a process in which the top 1" is removed and then the road can be top coated and the coal tar is gone.

SV mentioned that Tom Ennis, City Engineer of Austin Texas mentioned to her that we should consider shot blasting with HEPA filtration. He recommended we remain patient and fix it the right way. A core sample would be needed to determine the depth of the penetration of the rejuvenator.

JB stated that contractors don't do risk control, we don't do risk control, engineers do risk control. JB questioned the claim of 3/8" penetration of the rejuvenator when the divots of the road surface are at least 3/8" deep. How do you assess how deep to shot blast? JB mentioned an estimate of approximately \$160k to shot blast the material off the roadway.

CB agreed that mitigation of risk is good and agreed to follow up with the engineer at Lenard Engineering. He will ask what they can do for the Town and will inquire about bringing him in for a visit.

SV mentioned that Tom Ennis had offered to assist by travelling to Ct. and working with a licensed Ct. PE to come to a conclusion. This visit would be at no cost except for reimbursement of living expenses. JD commented that Tom Ennis has a passionate bias but is a brilliant engineer.

GS commented that he feels that Paul Montenegro is biased and has been pushing his solution. CB stated that Mr. Montenegro has admitted that PDC is not good.

JD stated that he is concerned that an independent engineer will be extremely conservative due to the risk involved and questioned the potential cost involved with a conservative solution.

LS expressed her frustration in that we have been talking for months and yet nothing is happening. She said that we must meet more often than every 6 weeks as each meeting ends with a promise to get more information and then nothing substantial happens. CB suggested we email information to speed up the process.

JB asked how the committee feels about hiring an independent engineer and BA stated that more data is needed and that a non-biased opinion is necessary.

CB stated that if we bring in an independent engineer, we own whatever the proposed solution is and asked why if the committee feels that shot blasting is acceptable, why don't we move in that direction.

JB stated that the way he sees it, there are 3 options, and each carries some level of risk:

- 1) Overlay (encapsulation)
- 2) Shotblast (remediation)
- 3) Reclamation (recycle)

JD stated that maybe the best approach would be to have the engineer assess the three options and evaluate the risk associated with each. He went on to caution that if we hire an engineer, we probably won't see construction until fall.

CB said he will follow up with the engineer at Lenard Engineering and will email the group with a summary of the conversation.

JB said the evaluation should include both risk as well as long-term performance.

LS pointed out that chances are that no engineer has experience with PDC and will need to be educated by doing their own research.

CB stated that he understands the concerns about PDC and said that Government resources as well as Tom Ennis are a good source for information.

Prior to conclusion of the meeting, there was some discussion on removal of the island at the Rt. 44 entrance. SV reported that some resistance has been encountered. Some approaches to get a democratic decision were discussed.

Going forward:

- CB to contact Lenard Engineering and update the Committee following the discussion.
- Further research required to determine the course of action with the island.

Submitted by: R. Andrews

DRAFT