

## CONSERVATION COMMISSION

STEPHEN WASHBURN, CHAIRMAN  
CATHERINE WALSH, VICE CHAIR  
CAROLYN ROCKLEN, TREASURER  
JOHN GEAR  
PETER BAMBER  
KELSEY QUINLAN  
OLIVIA HAGLUND



## ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNER/ CONSERVATION AGENT

HOLLY JONES, MSCI

OFFICE MANAGER/SR. ADMIN. ASST.  
LYNN MARCHAND

---

### Norwood Conservation Commission Meeting Minutes January 18, 2023

7:30 P.M.

**Present:** Stephen Washburn (remote), Carolyn Rocklen, John Gear, Peter Bamber, Kelsey Quinlan, Olivia Haglund (remote)

**Also Present:** Holly Jones, Environmental Planner/Conservation Agent

The January 18, 2023 meeting was held remotely using GoToMeeting software and in person in the Drummy Room of Norwood Town Hall. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Stephen Washburn at 7:30 p.m. followed by a roll call.

---

#### Public Hearings:

- 1. Off of Brook St-** Willett Pond Dam low level outlet repair *Notice of Intent* DEP File No 251-05XX Norwood No. N2022-17  
Applicant: Neponset River Landholding Association Representative: Andrea Judge of Fuss & O'Neil  
Project Description: Using a temporary access road from Brook St through bordering vegetated wetlands, slipline the existing low-level outlet pipes, replace low level outlet valves, install trash racks at inlets. To access the low level outlets for sliplining, the parshall flume will be breached and replaced after sliplining.

The Chair read the project description into the record. Representing the applicant remotely was Ms. Andrea Judge of Fuss & O'Neil. She provided the Commissioners with the DEP file number: DEP #SE251-0540. Ms. Jones said that DEP commented that the project did not require 401 or 404 permits from the State.

Ms. Judge introduced the project proponents, Mr. James Cane and Mr. Brian Blaine, who were present at the meeting. She discussed the proposed activities that would be involved in the dam repair/maintenance. She said there were two conduits that conveyed flow from the upstream side of the dam to the downstream side of the dam which were controlled by 2 valves that hold the water back. The valves are not currently functioning. She stated they would also be replacing the trash rack in the pond with something more functional which would allow water to flow into the conduits when the valves were open but keep trash out. Ms. Judge detailed the repairs and said that the work would be accomplished with the pond at its normal pool height/no draw down. She said the point of access on the downstream side would be from the parshall flume/concrete channel that measures the flow in the downstream pond. Ms. Judge described the access challenges (steep slope/not passable by normal equipment), the need to create a temporary access drive, and how they would limit impacts to bordering wetlands by delineating between temporary fill and existing grades. She told Commissioners that the site would be restored to its existing condition after the repairs were completed.

Commissioners asked questions and had discussions with Ms. Judge regarding the sliplining process, pipe condition analysis/mineral buildup, pipe stiffness, contingency plans, the restoration

of the site to existing conditions after repairs are complete, the need for the drawdown (during droughts), and also what the contingencies were if safety conditions developed.

Mr. Gear asked about pipe inspection to assess the pipe condition. Ms. Judge said divers performed an inspection of the pipes but noted that the mineral buildup prevented specific analysis of them. She noted that due to the age of the infrastructure that it was past its useful life. She said the pipes would be cleaned and inspected prior to the sliplining. The mineral buildup would be collected in a silt bag and treated. Discussion was had regarding the prep work and final sliplining process.

No members of the public had any comments.

Ms. Jones summarized her concerns regarding the access road, keeping the access road separate from the wetlands underneath it, and taking it out. She said she was confident with the proposed process. She recommended a condition that a wire backed silt fence be used along the access road and an orange construction fence at the limit of work to ensure that everything stays where it is put.

The applicants asked for a waiver of the \$9,700 application fee. They said it would be 15% of their entire budget, remarked that the project would be beneficial to the town, and said the money saved could be used for other projects. He explained that due to the high intensity of resource area impacted, it was maxing out the fee.

Commissioners stated several reasons for not waiving the fee; no history of waiving fees, sets a bad precedence, limited public access to the pond, privately held enterprise, applicant is required to maintain the flow of the stream regardless of the cost, and the applicant could do a one-time abutter assessment to fund the repairs. Discussion was had regarding revisiting the fee schedule in the future outside of this hearing.

**Motion: Mr. Bamber made a motion to close the public hearing and issue the Order of Conditions as described by Ms. Jones.**

**Mr. Gear seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 6-0 by roll call vote.**

2. **Moderna Way- Moderna Biobank Notice of Intent** -Norwood Only Norwood No. N2023-01  
Applicant: Louis Cicchese of Moderna Therapeutics Representative: Joseph Weed of Pare Corp.  
Project Description: Construction of a building addition with associated site work and utilities in the 200 foot riverfront area of an intermittent stream. This is an after the fact filing.

Representing the project from Pare Corporation were Mr. Joseph Weed and Mr. Steve Anderson, environmental scientist. Mr. Weed gave an overview of the project and a PowerPoint presentation beginning with a rendering of the proposed building. He showed a site view of the campus, the existing MTC-East Building, and the proposed location of the approximately 13,500 square foot addition for the Biobank. He explained that the proposed location was chosen for its proximity to the Biomarker Lab and how the two would interact. Mr. Weed said the building was intended to house 2 Hamilton storage units and a third one in the future which would be the central storage units used for the Bio-Maker Lab. He reviewed the demolition and erosion control plan, the 1.14 acres of limited disturbance, the relocation of the underground utility work, demolition and upgrade of the existing driveway access, sediment erosion controls around the perimeter, and the recently installed fencing. He added that the work was not intended to go beyond the fencing. He said the widening of the access was to create a larger radius for trucks and noted the loading dock in the back for single unit box trucks. He reviewed the underground infiltration system, the drainage utility map, the proposed underground treatment system to treat roof runoff from the 13,500 square foot building, the bioretention area to treat surface runoff from the roadway, and said they were leaving the existing hydrodynamic separator/Vortex system which he said would provide water quality for upstream areas. He said it's conveyed through there before discharging up towards the wetlands through an existing pipe. Mr. Weed reviewed the peak flow rate summary chart with the Commissioners.

Mr. Anderson gave an overview of the wetland resource areas and resource area impacts; showed an aerial map view of the limit of disturbance and the area to the east where there was a bordering vegetated wetland that is associated with an intermittent stream. He said the wetlands were delineated by EcoTec. He noted that after a review of the Natural Heritage Mass GIS data, there were no mapped estimated or priority rare species habitat, no outstanding resource waters or areas of critical environmental concern. He said there was a potential vernal pool mapped within the bordering vegetated wetland area but that the project was outside of that zone. Mr. Anderson summarized the resource area impacts stating there would be 0 square feet of buffer zone impact, 200-foot riverfront area associated with the intermittent stream: 9,291 sq. ft., and said the locally jurisdictional riverfront area impacts represented approximately 3% of total riverfront area associated with the intermittent stream, and that the overall riverfront area impacts are on the order of 1.8% of the site parcel.

Commissioners asked questions and Mr. Gear noted that the project would yield a net improvement in drainage on the site. Ms. Jones pointed out that prior to the NOI, the area was already meeting stormwater standards.

The Chair opened the floor to the public and Ms. Jones read a letter from Mr. Mark Negron into the record. A resident from 95 Washington Street, that had submitted a written comment, was present and summarized his concerns. He said the applicant failed to meet the burden required of showing there was no practical alternative. He expressed concern with the amount of impervious surface proposed, the amount of wetland area impacts, the impact on the vernal pool and intermittent stream, lack of information provided, future development, stormwater runoff and flooding, and historical flooding in that area which he said already floods his property and neighbors property including basements. He stated that the current stormwater conditions were already inadequate and requested that the Commission utilize a stormwater specialist to look at existing and proposed conditions.

Several residents were in attendance. They stated the following concerns: stormwater runoff/discharge flows onto private property, property damage, water in basements, safety hazards from excess water, and inadequate drainage also causing hazardous freezing in the winter. The applicant representatives replied to the comments stating that the proposed project would decrease runoff from the property and would not negatively impact existing conditions. Mr. Weed responded to abutters' concerns, corrected some misinformation that was stated, and reviewed the details of the peak flow rates summary chart.

Mr. Washburn said that based on the information presented, it appeared that stormwater would be reduced during peak flow and in overall volume.

Mr. Gear asked for a peer review of stormwater runoff and stormwater calculations.

Ms. Rocklen asked about an alternative analysis. Mr. Weed stated that they had discussed other alternatives but it would have pushed it further into the wetlands. He mentioned that they also had to consider the future fire road access. Ms. Jones informed Commissioners that the project would be reviewed by the Planning Board and DPW.

Mr. Bamber said he would like to wait until they had more review information and Mr. Gear expressed that he would like an update on the DOT project.

**Motion: Mr. Bamber made a motion to continue to the next meeting on February 1st. Mr. Gear seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 6-0 by roll call vote.**

### **Wetland Updates and Issues:**

- 1. Request for a Certificate of Compliance – Pleasant St and 83 Morse St** gas line installation Mass DEP File No. 251-505, Norwood No. N2019-0, Norwood No. N2019-03, Norwood No. N2022-14

Ms. Jones said the Norwood Space Center work done over the past two summers, including the bridge crossing for the gas line, was complete and the areas had been stabilized. She noted 2

small bare areas along the bank where the pipes enter and exit. The applicant's representative, Lori MacDonald, stated that they had seeded the area at the crossing and will reseed the area in the spring as well.

**Motion: Mr. Bamber made a motion to issue the Certificate of Compliance.  
Mr. Gear seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 6-0 by roll call vote.**

**Conservation Commission Business:**

**1. Community Garden potential fence replacement**

Ms. Jones discussed the 4 options for the fence replacement and noted that there was \$12K+ available in the budget: Option 1: replace entire fence and hardware. Option 2: expansion only - buy new nylon mesh and extra for patches, Option 3: replacing all nylon fence leaving poles in place and Option 4: replacing nylon fence with steel, leave poles in place. Commissioners discussed pros and cons of each of the options.

**Motion: Mr. Bamber made a motion to purchase the steel option.  
Ms. Rocklen seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, 6-0 by roll call vote.**

**2. Willett Pond Access**

Ms. Jones informed the Commission that DPW removed the boulders on January 13<sup>th</sup>.

**3. Endean Orchard Subcommittee update –no updates**

**4. CPC report –no updates**

**5. Agent update**

Ms. Jones announced that they are starting the full engineering design for the Bernie Cooper Park. She said construction may be pushed out to 2024 in order to get lower construction bids. Ms. Jones discussed the outreach event at the Library that she hosted on 1/17. Huge success! Lastly, Ms. Jones informed the Commissioners that they have been working on a flood study with NepRWA and other towns in the watershed. She said there was a public meeting for the flood study on January 24<sup>th</sup>.

**6. Minutes: 10/5/22, 10/19/22, 11/2/22, 12/7/22, 12/21/22**

Prior to the meeting, Ms. Rocklen submitted an email to the Planning/Conservation Office with a list of edits that were needed. All corrections were incorporated into the final draft of the Minutes.

**Motion: Mr. Gear made a motion to approve the Minutes as noted on the agenda.  
Mr. Bamber seconded the motion.  
Motion passed unanimously, 6-0 by roll call vote.**

**Adjournment.**

**Motion: Mr. Bamber made a motion to adjourn.  
Mr. Gear seconded the motion.  
Motion passed unanimously, 6-0 by roll call vote.**

**Next meeting: January 18, 2022 at 7:30 p.m. via Google Meet & in person.  
Respectfully submitted by Lynn Marchand.**