

CONSERVATION COMMISSION

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



**ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNER/
CONSERVATION AGENT**
HOLLY JONES, MSCI

**Norwood Conservation Commission
May 31, 2023
7:30 P.M.**

**Present: Catherine Walsh, Carolyn Rocklen, John Gear, Peter Bamber, Kelsey Quinlan.
Absent: Stephen Washburn
Present: Holly Jones, Environmental Planner/Conservation Agent**

The May 31, 2023 meeting was held remotely using Google Meet and in person at the Norwood Senior Center, 275 Prospect St. The meeting was called to order by the acting Chair, Catherine Walsh, at 7:30 p.m. followed by a roll call and informative announcement to attendees regarding meeting procedures.

Public Hearings:

1. 76 Prospect St. Norwood No. 2023-06

Applicant: Marion Group, LLC Representative: Dan Merrikin of Legacy Engineering
Project Description: A residential subdivision including roadway, stormwater infrastructure, and associated earthwork and utilities, in the buffer zone of bank and riverfront area of an intermittent stream.

Applicants requested a continuance to the next scheduled meeting on June 21st 2023.

Motion: Mr. Bamber made a motion to grant the request of a continuance to the next scheduled meeting on June 21st 2023.

Mr. Gear seconded the motion.

Motion passed, 5-0 by roll call vote.

151 Carnegie Way, Norwood No. 2023-07 Notice of Request for Determination of Applicability

Applicant: William Dunn of Consider It Dunn Inc.

Project Description: The repaving of a parking lot with existing footprint in the buffer zone of a bordering vegetated wetland.

Mr. Dunn, joining the meeting via telephone, explained that they proposed milling the existing parking lot and resurfacing it with 2 and a half inches of asphalt.

Ms. Jones stated that the project entailed removing the pavement and replacing in place. She stated that she did not anticipate a significant impact to wetland resources from the changes. She recommended issuing a negative determination of applicability, assuming that it is unlikely to impact wetland resources and measures like erosion controls are installed before work commences and no stockpiling of materials that are not stabilized overnight.

Mr. Bamber asked if the site footprint would be remaining the same and that no increase was taking place.

Mr. Dunn responded that no increase was taking place.

Motion: Mr. Bamber made a motion to issue a negative determination of applicability, so long as no increase in footprint takes place and all the conditions outlined by Ms. Jones are met.

Mr. Gear seconded the motion.

Motion passed, 5-0 by roll call vote.

1 Moderna Way Norwood No. 2023-11, DEP No. 251-0545, Notice of Intent

Applicant: Matt Ross of Moderna Therapeutics. Representative: David Mackwell of Kelly Engineering Group.

Project Description: Construction of three secured entry points on Moderna campus and the installation of guard shacks, security cameras, call boxes, and other security measures.

Mr. Mackwell described the current Moderna campus with the aid of a site map/plan and outlined where on the campus the proposed changes would be located. He explained that they originally planned on permitting a fire access road as part of the plans being presented before the Conservation Committee, but it was decided that the fire access road would be filed under a separate notice of intent. Mr. Mackwell noted that the campus has multiple resource areas. He stated that the main improvement to the site would involve installing a guard shack and placing it in the middle of the existing roadway at Gate E, as well as the reconstruction of a sidewalk. Mr. Mackwell stated that approximately 1,000 square feet of impervious surface would be added to the area. To mitigate and offset this increase in impervious surface area, Mr. Mackwell proposed removing impervious pavement in another resource area on the campus, which he believes is not in heavy use. This measure would eliminate 2,500 square feet of impervious sidewalk and pavement from the site. Mr. Mackwell then went on to outline the proposed plans for Gate H, which included the installation of turnabout pavement to allow trucks or cars that had been turned away by security to leave the premises without first having to be admitted into the campus itself. He noted that a significant amount of greenspace would be added to this area, as well as the planting of native shrubbery. Mr. Mackwell said that they requested a waiver as part of their filing, which would allow for the installation of a sidewalk within the undisturbed buffer area. This area is currently lawn/shoulder of the roadway. He stated that retaining walls would not be necessary. Mr. Mackwell then drew the committee's attention to the truck route that encompasses the perimeter of the campus. He stated that they proposed removing all the parking to the North of the campus and converting the area to accommodate trucking lanes. Mr. Mackwell stated that they have applied to remove a piece of pavement that would impede the proposed trucking route if it were to be left in place. However, this stretch of pavement is in multiple resource areas, such as the riverfront area, and an isolated wetland.

Mr. Bamber asked where the perimeter fencing in relation to the brook was.

Mr. Mackwell responded that it ran right along the head wall and that there would be no change in fencing.

Ms. Walsh inquired as to how trucks would actually turn around using the proposed infrastructure developments.

Mr. Mackwell utilized the project plans to show the route that turning trucks would have to take.

Ms. Rocklen asked if the safety of pedestrians walking on the pavement would be impacted by the removal of the grass strip between the sidewalk and the roadway. She asked Mr. Mackwell how fast the vehicles entering the Moderna campus move past the sidewalk generally.

Mr. Mackwell responded that the most practical solution to the issue is to install a fob gate access point to allow employees to enter the campus without having to walk along the roadway for long distances. He felt that the proposed site changes would not bring about any changes in safety levels.

Ms. Walsh asked Mr. Mackwell to clarify where on the campus the isolated wetland is located

and to state whether or not this wetland would be impacted by the new developments. Mr. Mackwell highlighted the isolated wetland to the North of the perimeter fencing, and also reassured Ms. Walsh that this area would not be impacted.

Ms. Jones brought the Commission's attention to the comments of the DEP on the matter, the first being a suggestion that the Commission requests calculations to ensure that the flagged isolated wetland is not regulated under the wetlands protection act and that it is isolated and subject to flooding. She noted that since these considerations will not impact the scope of the project for this particular filing, it would not be necessary for the Commission to seek these calculations. Ms. Jones recommended to the DEP reviewer that it be stated in the findings that the Commission is not determining whether the area is or is not isolated land subject to flooding as part of the order of conditions. Ms. Jones also noted other comments made by the DEP reviewer, such as that the compensatory river front area that is provided in the plan for perennial riverfront should have a planting plan and the commission should require at least 2 years of successful plant establishment prior to granting a certificate of compliance for the order. She also reminded the Commission that the total riverfront disturbance on the site has to be accumulatively tracked and that this disturbance must stay under 10% of the total riverfront on the site.

Mr. Mackwell affirmed that they would be happy to provide a planting plan at the discretion of the conservation agent for the site. He stated that any works that are proposed to take place will take place in the developed area and that no forest will be cut down. In the riverfront area he estimated that there would be 1370 square feet more of pervious pavement. Mr. Mackwell stated that they would be restoring the pervious surface area of the site at a ratio of 3:1.

Ms. Quinlan asked if it would be native grass that would be grown at the site as part of the planting plan.

Mr. Mackwell replied that they would be willing to grant the conservation agent the discretion to approve all of the planting plans in all the resource and buffer areas.

Ms. Jones suggested a motion to close the public hearing and to issue an order of conditions, with both findings and conditions included, so that the running total for riverfront disturbance can be included in the findings. For the specific conditions of this project, Ms. Jones recommended that the project not commence before a planting plan has been received and approved by the commission or their agent. She also stipulated that the restoration and the mitigation areas must be shown to be successfully established to at least 75% cover within 2 years prior to the issuance of a certificate of compliance and that by September 15th of each of the two year a report be received from the applicant indicating whether there has been successful establishment, as well as recommendations of any necessary action.

Motion: Mr. Bamber made a motion to close the public hearing, issue an Order of Conditions with the specific conditions recommended by Ms. Jones.

Ms. Rocklen seconded the motion.

Motion passed, 5-0 by roll call vote.

1 Technology Drive Norwood No. 2023-09, Notice of Intent

Applicant: Mike Argiros of Alexander-Argiros Trust. Representatives: Kevin Solli and Sam Malafrente of Solli Engineering Group.

Project Description: Isolated vegetated wetland clearing in violation of the Norwood Wetlands Protection Bylaw.

Mr. Kevin Solli, a Civil Engineer with Solli Engineering, said that they wished to file a Notice of Intent from a bylaw standpoint to address the unregulated activity that took place at the property of Mr. Argiros, as well as talk about their proposal to remediate and mitigate that impact. Mr. Solli drew the Commissions attention to the site plans and the current layout of the premises. He noted that there were two parcels of land to the North of 1 Technology Drive that drain onto the

property. Mr. Solli stated that the two properties to the North lacked any sort of storm water management system, which has resulted in the disturbance of the potential resource area at the site. To mitigate this, Mr. Solli proposed the construction of a pocket storm water wetland system, which would be designed in adherence to the Massachusetts Storm Water handbook. His intention is to design a wetland that will function as a wetland, include high marsh and low marsh areas, micro pools, as well as vegetated swales. Mr. Solli stated that these new measures would help address many of the deficiencies in the water drainage currently at the site today. He said that they wished to incorporate a robust design as part of the landscape plan that incorporated both seed and plant mixes. Mr. Solli added that a long-term maintenance plan was also included in the project proposal.

Ms. Rocklen asked if this project was a wet land replication or just a storm water treatment system.

Mr. Solli responded that a traditional storm water system or basin would not include many of the features that are being proposed as part of the landscape plan.

Ms. Rocklen asked if it would be possible for the landscape architect to specify whether or not each proposed plant species in the plan is a native species.

Mr. Solli responded that this would be done.

Ms. Jones added that functionally, a replicated wet land and a constructed storm water wet land are very similar. She stated that a constructed storm water wet land has the capacity to replicate the interests that are protected under the Norwood storm water bylaws. She added that moving forward, storm water BMPs would not be regulated as a resource area, this would allow for the maintenance of storm water BMPs, which is often necessary to preserve water quality. Ms. Jones noted that her concern over the construction of a storm water BMP as opposed to a replicated wetland is that the Commission could potentially lose jurisdiction over the storm water BMP. She suggested that if the Commission allows for the relocation of the wetland and for it to function as a storm water BMP at a different location at the site, the area constituting the constructed wet land should be protected with a restriction on the deed, be it a conservation restriction or an easement. Ms. Jones also added that due to the fact that the Norwood bylaws regulates the buffer zones as a resource area themselves and not just a regulatory trigger for review, that the replication must include a calculation of the buffer zones that were disturbed.

Ms. Quinlan asked where the new BMP was in relation to the removed wetland.

Mr. Solli responded by outlining on a visual map where the new BMP would be in order to achieve the two goals of creating a vibrant wet land, as well as adequately handle storm water.

Mr. Gear noted that this design mitigates any water coming from the North, but there is nothing addressing the East side of property, where there is run-off and water coming down the slope.

Mr. Solli responded that there were in fact measures in place and that the East side of the property drains south to University Ave.

Mr. Bamber stated that he would like to see a conservation restriction.

Mr. Solli agreed with Mr. Bamber and suggested the possibility of a conservation easement in the future.

Ms. Quinlan asked if the operation and maintenance plan is that more for preserving the quality of storm water management in the future and not for any other benefits that were previously a part of the wetlands.

Mr. Solli replied that it is specific for the pocket wetland system and that a storm water basin normally consists of mowing everything down and scraping out the muck. But he assured Ms. Quinlan that it is very different because they were talking about specific elements that were unique to this particular system. He added that it extends beyond just the maintenance but also how the rest of the area has to be managed, to protect the vibrancy of that area in the future.

Ms. Walsh stated that she was in agreement with Mr. Gear. She said that storm water on the site was being treated, and now what is being done to rectify this is to divert water off the site. Ms.

Walsh believed that the conservation easement was very important. She stated that water is being

removed from the site as opposed to being treated at the site.

Mr. Solli responded by stating that when addition rainwater came, it all went to the same place, it did not exfiltrate, it did not do anything but fill up and drain out. He said that the site in question was a previously a wooded area and now that it has been cleared, they to overcome the storm water challenges and the necessary bylaws that arise with the loss of water absorption.

Mr. Malafronte added that in the southern corner of the site where the connection is being proposed there is an existing curtain drain that runs to the south of the 1 Technology Analog building. He notes that the proposed changes are essentially an expansion of the curtain drain that is already in existence.

Ms. Jones asked Mr. Solli to clarify what a curtain drain was.

Mr. Solli responded by stating that a curtain drain is a stone trench that has a perforated pipe in the base that can intercept surface water and water coming in from the sides.

Ms. Jones said that it sounds as though they are taking ground water and putting it into the storm water system.

Mr. Solli responded that there is a curtain drain there now and that drain has been there for a long time. All the water drains into the municipal system at University Ave.

Ms. Rocklen asked if there was a way for this to be changed to an infiltrated system as opposed to an exfiltrated system.

Ms. Jones replied that it seems like a very wet site with a lot of hydric soils. She stated that she does not believe there is a lot of potential for infiltration. Ms. Jones also stated that unless more digging is conducted, they will not know what the storage capacity is for the isolated wetland.

Mr. Goddard, joining the meeting online, stated that he agreed with Ms. Jones' assessment of the infiltration potential for the site, as this site is cut into the groundwater table. Mr. Goddard believes that Solli Engineering's proposal to deal with the issue is a good engineering solution given the lack of other options.

Ms. Rocklen asked for clarification on if they are sending groundwater and storm water out after it has been treated by pocket wetland on the north side of the lot, will it be dumped out into the wetlands on the opposite side of University Ave.

Mr. Malafronte replied that the water eventually culverts to the south of the Ram dealership.

Ms. Jones asked what the depth of the shallow and the deeper areas of the wetlands.

Mr. Malafronte responded that the depth of the micro pools is 3 feet, while the shallow area is roughly 1.5 to 3 feet deep.

Mr. Solli confirmed that the depth in the high marsh area is 2.5 feet and 4 feet in the low marsh area. The micro pools are standing water.

Ms. Rocklen stated that they would most likely need new dimensions for the pocket wetland to account for the buffers of the isolated wetland being disturbed.

Ms. Jones added that the Commission should consider whether the area be considered a wetland as opposed to an upland buffer, which would help elevate both the storm water and groundwater breakout. The idea would be to substitute the undisturbed buffer area in favor of a wetland area.

Mr. Solli stated that the applicant has also been reaching out to the property owners to the North, as this is the source of much of the storm water. He noted that if some of the drainage channels could be expanded in the direction of the properties in Westwood, additional impervious pavement area could be removed.

Ms. Quinlan asked Ms. Jones if the area to the south of where this BMP is being proposed will ever act like a wetland again. She asked what Ms. Jones envisioned for that area.

Ms. Jones stated that she had a strong suspicion that the owner of this area planned to develop the parcel and would try to prevent that from occurring.

Ms. Walsh said the shift from a pocket wetland to a delineated wetland should be considered.

Ms. Jones responded that it would be within the Commission's right to require the replication in the location of the wetland that was disturbed. Ms. Jones stated that wetlands tend to do better in

the areas where they already existed due to the existing soils. However, when the required hydrology is there, Ms. Jones stated that wetland replication projects are usually successful. Mr. Gear stated that this was a problem created by people developing without foresight over the years. He stated that all the problems got pushed towards that site and it created the wetland. He asked the Commission if they should now just mandate it, or try to find a viable solution.

Mr. Bamber replied that they should consider Ms. Jones' decision.

Ms. Quinlan added that clear cutting the remaining forested area would not improve the storm water issues.

Ms. Jones asked if the storm water calculations conducted are what accounted for the change in land cover class and that the Commission would need to see a replication of the tree cover zone in the buffer zone.

Mr. Gear asked if the east side of the site is an area with a lot of tree cover.

Mr. Solli replied that it was a highly vegetated area with an abundance of tree cover. He added that they were exploring including this forested area into a possible easement area. Mr. Solli stated that the buffer could be expanded to be a forested-type wetland.

Ms. Jones recommended to the Commission that they continue the public hearing to June 21st 2023.

Motion: Mr. Bamber made a motion to continue the public hearing on 1 Technology Drive to the 21st of June 2023.

Mr. Gear seconded the motion.

Motion passed, 5-0 by roll call vote.

Conservation Commission Business:

1. Master Plan Steering Committee update

Ms. Jones stated that the Conservation Commission has been requested to appoint a representative to the Master Plan Steering Committee. She stated that this is estimated to be a two year planning process, with monthly meetings. It is planned to be a working committee. Mr. Donnelly added that the 11 person Steering Committee is the group that is going to manage the master plan process, with the primary objective initially being the procurement of the planning consultant needed to assist the committee in the development of the master plan. The initial work of the Steering Committee will be working with town management to develop the necessary RFP to go out to bid and then to act as the selectmen committee for that consultant. Once the consultant is onboard, the Steering Committee will be working with the consultant to define and put context around what are the key elements that are going to be included in the master plan.

The Committee decided to nominate Ms. Rocklen for a position on the Master Plan Steering Committee.

2. Dean Orchard Update

Ms. Jones stated that the irrigation is fully functional, thanks to the DPW, who dug up the lines. Ms. Jones also stated that she was in touch with Mark Negron to organize a volunteer day to address the high level of invasive plants and weeds at the site.

3. CPC Report

Ms. Walsh brought the Committee up to date on the CPC Report. She stated that all the projects that were brought up at town meeting were approved, so they were marching forward. She stated that the total dollar value was approximately \$887,000.

4. Agent Update

Ms. Jones stated that the Agent position had been posted. She said that she would keep the Committee in the loop regarding what the selection committee will look like.

5. Minutes: 4/19/2023

**Motion: Mr. Bamber made a motion to approve.
Mr. Gear seconded the motion.
Motion passed unanimously, 5-0 by roll call vote.**

Adjournment.

**Motion: Mr. Bamber made a motion to adjourn.
Mr. Gear seconded the motion.
Motion passed unanimously, 5-0 by roll call vote.**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:07pm.

Next meeting: June 21, 2023 at 7:30 p.m. via Google Meet & in person.

Respectfully submitted by Lynn Marchand.