

Conservation Commission Town Hearing- Public Comment for 1/8/2015

First, I would like to thank the commission for their careful consideration of this project and for providing abutters like myself, an opportunity to address important concerns and questions.

Based upon the current state of the project, I would ask that the commission considers the following questions and comments. These may or may not be appropriate topics for the 1/8 meeting, but felt it important to add these to the public commentary at this point.

1. Would the commission be able to ascertain why the industrial generator was not mentioned in Varsity's conservation commission application? Please request that Varsity disclose any hazardous materials that a generator or battery back-up would have and also any remediation strategies that they have employed at their other Massachusetts towers (not Sears or K-Mart locations) to ensure environmental safety and wetland protection. Varsity also does not mention any type of battery back-up in their Boxford application, but confirms the existence of one in their Plymouth, MA application. Also, please clarify if every carrier would have their own generator and battery back-up, as there could be up to 4. Would the commission also determine if Varsity has or will be filing a MSDS (material safety data sheet) with our local fire department?
2. Would the commission please inquire with Varsity and independently confirm any requirements that may exist with respect to clean air and pollution based upon multiple generators?
3. Would the commission please ask Varsity to produce aerial views or pictures of other sites they have constructed in Massachusetts, so we can better determine the placement of the generators and how this part of the facility may impact wetlands. They are also placing some equipment outside of the compound per map A2. Is this equipment included with respect to the commercial setback measurement?
4. Would the Commission please weigh in on the questions relating to the entire corner of the facility breaching the 100 foot commercial setback? This would appear to require special approval from the Conservation Commission, which Varsity has not specifically requested. Please also consider that they state that the facility is 1 foot within the commercial setback requirement, neglecting to include the entire corner in their measurements. Would the commission ever approve a commercial structure to be constructed within the commercial setback and if so, under what circumstances?
5. Would the commission please consider the definition of and what is included in the facility itself? Our bylaws indicate that parking spaces should be included in when considering the commercial setback. Commentary shared at the last meeting referred to Varsity's parking space as a turnaround area, however their plans refer to it as a parking space.
6. Please also consider and clarify with Varsity the number of visitors accessing the facility. Commentary at the last meeting suggested that maintenance personnel might be on site every 6 months. The plans indicate that visitors will be on site less than what one might expect at a single family home. If 4 carriers collocate at this facility, we could expect even more traffic. Were these estimates based on 1 carrier or 4?
7. Would the commission also give due consideration to the significance of this project, with respect to abutter adverse effects? In the unlikely event that our ZBA approves this application, a challenge will occur in the form of an appeal. We would request that the commission not complete any soil tests until after the 4/1 best practice benchmark has passed, as to ensure that all steps were conducted in the most rigorous manner possible, generating the most accurate measurements. As stated in previous public commentary, the final measurements will be critical in determining the placement of the facility, and resulting decisions by both the Conservation Commission and ZBA.

Mike Cassidy

25 Berry Patch Lane