



**Minutes of
Danvers Conservation Commission
Thursday, May 14, 2015
Danvers Town Hall**

The Danvers Conservation Commission held a public meeting on Thursday, May 14, 2015, at the Danvers Town Hall, Daniel J. Toomey Hearing Room, located at One Sylvan Street, Danvers, MA 01923.

Members present: Jeffrey Cary, Chairman
Michael Splaine, Vice Chairman
Bill Glynn, Member
Matthew Lallier, Member
Neal Waldman, Member

Members absent: None

Staff present: Kristan Farr, Planner
Christine Marshall, Secretary

Mr. Cary opened the Conservation Commission meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a reading of the “Commission Statement.”

Request for Certificate of Compliance

- 25 Bradley Road; DEP File No. 14-728 – not present – no action taken

Public Hearing - NOI

- 17 Florence Street; DEP File No. 14-1258 – Applicant requested to continue until May 28, 2015

Public Hearing - NOI

- 60 Cabot Road; DEP File No. 14-1257

Mr. Cary, due to a conflict of interest, will not participate in the discussion or vote on this hearing.

Kerri Brennan, the Town Program Engineer; Michael Moonan, Project Manager for Weston and Sampson; Roger Alcott, Team Leader for Weston and Sampson were present.

Mr. Moonan presented a revised plan and asked if there were questions from the last site walk from the Commission. There were questions regarding the emergency road and what type of surface will be used. Mr. Moonan discussed the comment letter received from DEP on May 5th, and distributed their response letter. Mr. Moonan described the new software, BETA version 3, which was introduced on March 17. Documents for this project were submitted on March 12. According to new software Frost Fish Brook is now categorized as a perennial stream; therefore, the application and storm water report has been revised.



**Minutes of
Danvers Conservation Commission
Thursday, May 14, 2015
Danvers Town Hall**

The letter addressed the following areas:

- Riverfront explanation
- List of general performance standards
- Update of storm water report
- Revise Form 3 NOI and indicate the altered area within the 200 feet riverfront area

Mr. Glynn asked for an explanation of the alternative evaluations and the difference between 1B and 2A. One of the alternatives the track stayed in the same location and the other the press box was closer to the school. The proposed plan offers additional playing fields between the school and the track. All alternative designs were working within the existing disturbed area. The project still is working within previously disturbed areas. The following alternatives were discussed:

- Option 1B - kept the stadium where it was – did not allow for as much programming, field orientation would have been east/west (north/south is preferred), the track would have been narrow and this plan would not have allowed for full size freshman baseball field.
- Option 2A – the bleachers were on the west side – the Commission felt this might be a better alternative as far as the resource area; however, this option would not have allowed for the Youth Soccer fields.
- Questions regarding the maintenance/emergency road. The road is needed for construction and could be discontinued after the project is complete. Ms. Brennan explained the benefit to the town to have an emergency road during events to allow access for fire and ambulance. The proposed plan also allows for the emergency road to be used to stock the concession stand. The road will be gated. There was discussion regarding the 100 foot buffer area being close to the bleachers in one area.
- Discussion on the roadway surface. The Commission would like to see the gravel instead of pavement. Mr. Alcott discussed that the pavement was chosen for maintenance purposes. Pavers/with grass is an option. The road will not be plowed or cleared in the winter. Mr. Glynn's preference is gravel or pavers or porous asphalt. The Commission would like to keep it as a gravel road.

Mr. Splaine opened the discussion for public comment:

- Mark Zuberek, 9 Glendale Drive, has been dealing with this issue for two months. He stated that it is an expensive field \$6.2 million; however, residents have not been considered. He would like the Town to consider both the environment and the residents' quality of life. Mr. Zuberek also discussed the stream, storm water runoff, the residents affected by the plan, maintenance road, and press box. He felt that there was good discussion at the public meeting last night. He feels that there is a need for buffers/shrub growth to absorb water in the back. He expressed his concern of the access road being in the residents' backyards and the need to take care of the conservation land.
- John Zavaglia, 34 Roosevelt Avenue, talked about the wetlands issues regarding several studies in hazardous water runoff from turf fields. Mr. Zavaglia read each research study in detail.



**Minutes of
Danvers Conservation Commission
Thursday, May 14, 2015
Danvers Town Hall**

The Commission asked why we chose synthetic turf instead of grass. Mr. Moonan explained that the synthetic turf field meets the needs of the Town, offering the most playability, lower level of maintenance, and it was presented as a synthetic turf field at town meeting when it was approved. Mr. Moonan explained that there are some issues with crumb rubber fields that were not installed correctly using improper/untested materials. Our project will use materials which pass all stringent requirements and DEP standards. DEP uses Needham fields as an example, where the water quality runoff and the crumb rubber is tested every year. All the test conclusions have been that the fields are safe. Mr. Moonan distributed the water quality test results for Needham for the past two years, which is required by DEP. Mr. Moonan discussed 75 other studies done over the past ten years throughout the United States, with conclusions that the levels of metals or materials are minimal, and are as clean or cleaner than native soils. Mr. Moonan also distributed other test reports on crumb rubber and a letter from the State of Connecticut from their DEP that risk assessment did not find elevated cancer risks. Also, the tests that are performed are to the standards of children's ingestible play toys.

Peter Clement, 9 Jersey Lane, commented on the statement that the crumb rubber is cleaner than the ground, and Mr. Clement discussed the fact that many playing fields were built on old landfills. His question was that since the Danvers fields were not old landfills, if adding the crumb rubber material will contaminate this site. Mr. Splaine has also seen articles that the crumb rubber material can break down, and Mr. Splaine questioned the life of the field. The life of a synthetic turf field is 10-15 years.

Mark Zuberek, 9 Glendale Drive, discussed that crumb rubber is ground up tires and that there are contaminants in the rubber. He stated that the issues are twofold:

1. Water storage system – Mr. Zuberek believes that the crumb rubber will get into the water and then will be used to water the other fields.
2. Mr. Zuberek informed the Commission on an NECN broadcast two nights ago on crumb rubber and cancer in children.

John Zavaglia, 34 Roosevelt Avenue, read the NECN story and how the study fell short and the Federal government stated that the testing may not have been expansive enough.

Mr. Moonan discussed that the oldest fields from 1999, and several tests conducted since 2008. There's not one study linking cancer to the fields. There are reports of people having concerns of the fields being carcinogenic. Zinc levels after leaching through the field are the same as the levels as drinking water. Well maintained fields should last 11-12 years. There was discussion of grooming the turf. Mr. Splaine asked why we wouldn't consider a grass field and wait for more testing before installing a synthetic turf field. Ms. Brennan explained that the grass field would not meet the programming needs. There is longer use on a turf field than a grass field. There was discussion regarding the crumb rubber breaking down, leaching, maintenance, and annual testing.

There was discussion regarding the access road and statistics of how often emergency use is needed. Other accesses were pointed out on the plan, and there are three main access points.

Mr. Moonan informed the Commission that in addition to the existing buffer the Town has agreed to plant 6-8 foot evergreens along the edge behind stands. The vegetation is dense along that edge.



**Minutes of
Danvers Conservation Commission
Thursday, May 14, 2015
Danvers Town Hall**

Mark Zuberek, 9 Glendale Drive, asked if the stadium could be moved closer to the school and feels that the problem is that the stands and press box are close to the abutters. Mr. Moonan stated that moving the stadium would not make a difference. The press box is not much higher than the trees. If the stadium was moved 10-20 feet it would eliminate the youth soccer field/practice fields. The plan meets all state and by-law regulations within the existing disturbed areas.

There was discussion of the athletic storage, for use for sporting equipment. There will be no trucks or maintenance equipment in this storage building.

MOTION: Mr. Waldman made a motion to close the public hearing; 60 Cabot Road, DEP File No. 14-1257; and issue an Order of Conditions with the following conditions:

1. Gravel or porous surface on the emergency access road that is maintained as porous or pervious;
2. Emergency road is used for emergency vehicles only and is not plowed;
3. Annual sampling of EPA priority pollutant metals;
4. Planting of evergreen trees at least 8 feet tall to provide screening.

Mr. Glynn seconded; motion failed by a vote of 2-2, Mr. Waldman abstained.

MOTION: Mr. Glynn made a motion to reconsider the vote on 60 Cabot Road, DEP File No. 14-1257; Mr. Lallier seconded; motion passed by a vote of 3-1.

MOTION: Mr. Glynn made a motion for reconsideration to close the public hearing; 60 Cabot Road, DEP File No. 14-1257; and issue an Order of Conditions with the following conditions:

1. Gravel or porous surface on the emergency access road that is maintained as porous or pervious;
2. Emergency road is used for emergency vehicles only and is not plowed;
3. Annual sampling of EPA priority pollutant metals;
4. Planting of evergreen trees at least 8 feet tall to provide screening.

Mr. Lallier seconded; motion passed by a vote of 3-1.

Minutes – April 23, 2015

MOTION: Mr. Glynn made a motion to approve the minutes of April 23, 2015; Mr. Waldman seconded; and the motion passed unanimously.

An update was provided on the site visit/informal discussion with the applicant for 13 Endicott Street. Gradings and patios were completed without approval. Applicant will put up temporary canvas garages without approval needed.

Mr. Waldman asked about a property on Centre Street. This project was heard by the Commission and approved in February for a spa and patio area.



**Minutes of
Danvers Conservation Commission
Thursday, May 14, 2015
Danvers Town Hall**

There was discussion about a house on river. Ms. Farr will be going out with Chris Sanborn next week to look at it. Ms. Farr will determine if there is a violation, and will report back to the Commission.

Adjournment

MOTION: Mr. Lallier made a motion to adjourn at 8:30 PM; Mr. Waldman seconded; motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Marshall
Conservation Commission Secretary