

5/23/2024 12:17:15 PM

I have been looking at this website, in particular the two articles about removing dams and the potential ecological benefits. The only thing is, they only refer to rivers. I have yet to see one article proposing the benefits of dam removal for ponds. I'm actually getting a little tired of these references since I don't think they necessarily apply to a pond like Warner's Pond.

Enid Boasberg

48 Laws Brook Road

5/29/2024 12:27:30 PM

As of today, May 29th, the May 9th Warner's Pond Task Force meeting video has not been uploaded to the MMN YouTube website. However, the subsequent TF meeting which occurred on May 21st has already been uploaded to the MMN for the public to see.

- What is the policy for releasing/uploading videos to the Minuteman Media Network (MMN)?
- Is there a reason the May 9th meeting has not being uploaded to the MMN yet?
- When will this video become publicly available?

Also the dredge bid review slides presented by Keith Hannon at the May 9th meeting have not been uploaded to the Task Force website yet.

- Is there a reason these slides haven't been uploaded yet?
- When will this important information be uploaded to the Task Force website and made available for the public to review?

Jill Korey

42 Laws Brook Rd Concord, MA 01742

5/31/2024 12:35:45 PM

Email from Miguele Echavarri to Task Force Co-Chairs, dated Tue, May 21, 2024 at 9:07 AM

Dear Chris, Bill,

I'm hoping you'll forward this to the Taskforce. These are the points that I wanted to make at the last taskforce meeting before we ran out of time.

My points were as follow:

1. For the first time since September 2022, it was generally acknowledged that dredging isn't too expensive. In fact, based on the presentation it appears we can dredge a larger area for less money.
2. The only reason dam removal was considered is because dredging was determined to be too expensive. That is the only reason it was brought up.
3. Multiple town meeting votes mandated that Warner's Pond be restored via dredging. To reiterate, the voters and taxpayers in our town put money aside toward that goal (nothing else). Following other options is counter to the will of Concord residents.

As a result of these points, and the fact that some of our CPA funds maybe expiring, I was going to urge that the taskforce follow the will of Concord taxpayers and focus on dredging. Mainly, I wanted to show support for Mark Howell's suggestion which basically was – how much can we dredge with the funds available.

On a final note – I'm worried that we may lose funding because we're spending too much time pursuing other options that Concord residents never authorized and, considering how much our taxes are going up, we may not get those funds back.

Can you confirm that you received this email and that it was forwarded?

Sincerely,

Miguel Echavarri

Homeowner – 255 Commonwealth Ave

Miguele Echavarri

255 Commonwealth Ave

5/31/2024 12:38:53 PM

A member of the public responded to the Task Force's survey on the 2018 Dredging Feasibility Study. Their response is too extensive to submit as a single comment through the online portal, so it has been submitted in multiple parts. Part 1 is pasted below.

Response date: 2024/05/04 2:13:39 PM AST

Your name: Dominic Ingegneri

What (if any) conclusions does this report make that you think are especially relevant to the Task Force's analysis? If so, what questions?:

Relevant sections from ESS Report

*Ultimately, the goal of the restoration is to retain the pond's historic character as an open water amenity within the Town while also maintaining the site's value as an ecological resource.

*Since at least the 1980s, the pond has undergone eutrophication - No Action for 40 years

*Sediment and excess nutrients are transported to the pond from its tributaries as well as from the nine stormwater outfalls that discharge directly to the pond or adjacent wetlands around its perimeter. - Have these outfalls been modified to remove sediments?

* ESS Group, Inc. (ESS) prepared a Watershed Management Plan in 2012 to provide the Town with a framework to guide future management decisions for the pond (ESS Group 2012). - 12 year old plan with minimal work completed to date

* VERY IMPORTANT POINT - Ultimately, the goal of the restoration is to retain the pond's historic character as an open water amenity within the Town while also maintaining the site's value as an ecological resource.

* The North and South dredge areas are suitable for dredging as they are not located within the main channel through the pond but are rather outside the path of the incoming sediments. Therefore, a dredging project targeting removal of sediment from these areas would be expected to last for many years while other areas within the pond continue to infill.

* LESS EXPENSIVE DEWATERING-

Dewatering sediment within standard dewatering basins would be roughly half the cost of using the Geotubes (\$12/cubic yard vs. \$24/cubic yard) to accomplish the same result. Given that land is available and suitable, ESS recommends the traditional dewatering approach over the more advanced dewatering methods based on the cost savings.

*** WORK WITH UPSTREAM MUNICIPALITIES -**

To address nutrient loading, the Town should develop an educational program for watershed residents and work with the upstream municipalities to continue to improve stormwater infrastructure.

*** DREDGING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS**

There are many benefits to dredging a pond, but the benefits to dredging only a portion of a pond, such is the case here, is even more significant as the project will enhance the variability and complexity of the habitats contained within the pond system. This complexity generally improves fish, plant and wildlife diversity.

*** EXPANSION OF IN-POND DISPOSAL AREAS FOR COST REDUCTION**

ESS also recommends re-using some of the dredged sediment by placing it along select areas adjacent to the island within the pond to create shallow wetland benches that will support a wide range of wildlife including wading birds, ducks, frogs, turtles, and juvenile fish. This approach would save costs of transporting all sediment offsite and would further enhance the natural ecology of the Warner,Ãs Pond system in areas outside of the dredged area. Conceptual engineering designs for this option are provided in Appendix C, Drawing D-3.

*** VERY LONG TERM RESULTS FROM DREDGING**

Assuming the estimated sediment accumulation rate of 43 to 64 cy/year derived in the Watershed Management Plan and a dredge volume of approximately 35,000 cubic yards in the North and South dredge areas, refill could be expected to take several hundred years.

(Comments continued in next part...)

Dominic Ingegneri

5/31/2024 12:47:02 PM

A member of the public responded to the Task Force's survey on the 2018 Dredging Feasibility Study. Their response is too extensive to submit as a single comment through the online portal, so it has been submitted in multiple parts. Part 2 is pasted below.

Response date: 2024/05/04 2:13:39 PM AST

Your name: Dominic Ingegneri

What (if any) conclusions does this report make that you think are especially relevant to the Task Force's analysis? If so, what questions?:

(Continuation of comments from Part 1)

* STATED RECREATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

In addition to the recreational improvements associated with dredging, the Town has expressed interest in improving the current public access point off of Commonwealth Avenue and constructing a beach in the northeast section of the pond, adjacent to the North dredge area.

100 YEARS AND BEYOND WITH SOUND MANAGEMENT

Fortunately, a dredge project such as the one envisioned would be expected to last at least 100 years before additional dredging might be required. The lifespan of the preferred dredge project option could be extended even further by implementing a storm water improvement program within the watershed that would target the reduction of sediment sources .

Are there questions raised by the report that the Task Force should address in order to fill in knowledge or data gaps?

Identify larger areas within the pond to deposit dredging spoils and create new beneficial environments

What other information about dredging does the Task Force need to have in order to evaluate dredging as an option?

Invite or contact an experienced dredging contractor or field engineer , cost engineer with recent , relevant experience (Charter) to discuss cost-saving strategies

Dominic Ingegneri

6/3/2024 12:18:44 PM

This article from the Army Corp of Engineers contains important, timely and relevant information for the Task Force to review and study regarding the use of selective herbicide control for invasive plants in Warner Pond.

<https://www.nbcconnecticut.com/news/local/aquatic-herbicides-hydrilla-growth-connecticut-river/3303161/>

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

6/3/2024 4:01:15 PM

Pardon my oversight but upon closer review I see that Keith Hannon is quoted in the story on herbicide usage

<https://www.nbcconnecticut.com/news/local/aquatic-herbicides-hydrilla-growth-connecticut-river/3303161/>

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

6/4/2024 9:23:59 AM

The US Geological Survey has a fish passage lab here in MA which can provide additional, relevant professional expertise for the Task Force analysis.

<https://www.usgs.gov/centers/eesc/science/fish-passage-design-and-analysis-so-conte-research-laboratory>

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

6/17/2024 7:19:30 PM

The creation of an All-Access trail at Brewster's Woods is an excellent example of the forward-thinking, innovative and very broad appeal for citizens inclusion experiencing all that nature has to offer. Applying that model of success would be very applicable for Warners transformation.

Imagine the possibilities for trails around the pond, perhaps built on new pathways created with the pond Dredging in addition to observation platforms on pontoons or decking on pilings. I'm very optimistic that the AMC has experience and expertise in wetlands projects . It's easy to imagine creating new innovative solutions where none currently exist. Gerow Park and the Bruce Freeman trail add to public access and recreational activities.

This wide-ranging concept can be a showcase for the integration of a wetlands environment on a grand scale to be utilized by townspeople who have never experienced the natural beauty of Warners. It will also show the positive cooperative nature of all the parties including the DNR, Friends of Warners, the AMC, MA Fish & Game, DEP, and all the citizens of Concord.

This conceptual framework certainly falls into the category of "feasible solutions" whereby future budgets, public & private fund raising, state grants and legislative allocations would leverage what can be achieved. The merits of this proposal certainly fall within the charge for the Task Force and warrant investigation and analysis.

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

6/20/2024 6:44:00 PM

I attended the June 20th meeting. Thanks for the opportunity to allow public comments. I'm not sure the comments were insightful or novel, but it is nice to be able to voice them. But my general impression is - we don't want to lose the current recreational uses or lose the potential uses we anticipated with the park development. If dredging was free, I think it would be the option selected because it would keep the recreational use. If dredging was the option (if free) then it seems to me the task force is being asked for a cost ladder — x level of recreation would be x initial and ongoing costs. The question to me is the town's willingness to invest in the ongoing recreational use of Warner's pond and is that level of investment enough to allow some recreation.

David Frink

61 Sunnyside Ln

6/21/2024 7:26:42 AM

Great meeting last night with an overwhelming number of participants. Hopefully this will get written up in our Town paper?

Paul Denaro (at our table) said he had brought Nancy Gerow to Warners Pond for a recent visit, and she had expressed her disappointment in how the Gerow facility had turned out so far. I think it would be very helpful if the Task Force could plan and record an interview with her about how she feels about this and answer the question: "would you have wanted the same arrangement for the Gerow parcel if you knew that Warners' Pond might disappear?"

Phil Brewer

132 Wright Rd, Concord

6/21/2024 1:57:44 PM

I feel strongly that the it would be foolish and extremely irresponsible to rush to make any irreversible decisions until we know more about the impact of the closing of MCI and how the land will be used.

I also believe that it's imperative that we understand the costs involved in all options: not only in dredging (and we certainly need to get another bid for dredging that allows for one of the more viable disposal alternative for the dredged material that had not previously been explored) but also for costs involved in dam removal (would it still require some amount of dredging? Do we have cost information on creating recreational opportunities -- boardwalks, viewing points, etc-- and maintaining the area to prevent it from becoming overgrown with invasives?)

Jill Korey

42 Laws Brook Rd

6/21/2024 3:50:30 PM

In response to the workshop, discussion, prompt, what would you like to see happen at Warner Pond, our family would like to share share the following:

- Incorporate and consider all of the developments in West Concord, including the closure of the state prison, the forthcoming changes to the rotary, and updates to Gerow Park, etc. and thoughtfully design a solution that considers/integrates all of these.
- It would be such a shame to lose the pond given all of the work that has been done to create new recreational spaces through Gerow Park and BFRT.
- We feel that the dredging assessment and exploratory research on a potential beach area was not comprehensive. It seemed like the quotes were collected once and then the town didn't like what they received and that was it. Just seemed like the whole activity was cut short and the town shifted strategy without any input from the town.

Victoria Neff

351 Commonwealth Ave

6/21/2024 11:15:08 PM

Back in the 60's, Warners Pond was drained to successfully kill off the weeds.

This procedure was done twice successfully. Please consider this technique to clean up Warners Pond.

According to The Army Corp Engineer, this technique will also work in the winter time to kill off the weeds.

William Gibson

186 Frost Road Unit 209

6/22/2024 7:49:05 AM

Hi. I wasn't able to be at the forum. I advocate for finishing the Gerow plan, and then doing nothing else. Do we really have the money to spend? I keep hearing fincom talking about living within our means. Embarking on a project like removing the dam just seems to be a tier two type project. Especially when defining and including all the resulting recreation uses are not included. Those would struggle to get funded. So I suggest focus on finishing Gerow so it lives up to the recreation it was envisioned. Right now, it is a lot of pavement and a dust trail with limited seating or views.

Liz rust

201 commonwealth

6/22/2024 3:28:30 PM

What do people want?

People want recreation opportunities on and near the water including boating, fishing, skating, and picnics/cookouts with a view of the scenic pond reflecting the sky. Given the rising housing density in W Concord, there is a need for local water recreation within walking and biking distance for nearby residents, especially kids and families with limited transportation.

Residents appreciate the long history and cultural heritage of Warner's Pond and want to preserve and extend family connections to this community resource.

People want clean, healthy water that supports a wide variety of wildlife habitats in the water, in the air above and on the shore.

The Way Forward:

The task force should explore Win-Win options that meet the needs of stakeholders on all sides. Entrenched advocates will insist that a solution for migratory fish and a solution for pond recreation are mutually exclusive. We should take the time to brainstorm and consider options for mutual gain.

Funding:

A Win-Win solution is likely more expensive than either Win-Lose scenario. The redevelopment of MCI Concord is a key opportunity. Developers will soon write proposals for housing, mixed use, retail and so on. The Town Planning department should require developers in West Concord (including on MCI land) to fund the Win-Win solution for the pond. We should not have to pinch pennies on dredging the pond or fish ladders or whatever is needed when deep pocket investors will reap fortunes from developing in West Concord.

Specific Ideas and Alternatives to Explore:

- A restored Warner's Pond will allow visitors to restore their mental and physical well-being.
- Nearby farms should plant "green buffer zones" that decrease fertilizer run off and highways should divert run off away from the watershed.
- New developments along the pond and wetlands should include sewer and avoid septic systems and residents should be educated on green lawn practices.

- There should be one master plan that includes future of MCI Redevelopment and Warner Pond. There is an opportunity to create a cohesive, integrated development plan rather than two competing, independent plans for MCI land and adjacent Warner Pond and watershed.

Patrick Guiney

62 Wright Rd, Concord, MA

6/23/2024 7:51:36 AM

Dear Task Force,

I thought the Public Workshop hosted by the Warner's Pond Task Force was a great success. The co-chairs did a wonderful job welcoming people into the process, and residents seemed most appreciative and respectful of the opportunity to hear from others and to have their voices heard. I do wish the meeting was recorded for two reasons: 1) so that folks following the Task Force who were unable to attend could watch it, and 2) so that many people could see how well the format worked! I think that having more public workshops for more issues would be a fantastic way to explore ideas and hear thoughts from the community on a variety of issues. Digital surveys have become a more common resource for collecting information from the public, and while they may serve a purpose, they lack human interaction and engagement. Digital surveys have limited value in the political process, whereas opportunities to meet people who care about an issue so that you can listen and share ideas seems very valuable. A combination of the two might yield less division and more collaboration on "heated" issues.

More specifically about Warner's Pond: I believe Concord needs to preserve the Pond as open space, not become a wetland. With growing population density in West Concord, interest in lower income housing, and rising temperatures – having a large aquatic resource within walking and biking distance to so many people is essential. Plus, even with the preservation of large open water habitat, there will still be several wetland ecosystems around the perimeter of the pond worth preserving too! Part of what makes Warner's Pond unique is the proximity of so many different kinds of aquatic habitats. Without the Pond, we lose the thriving open water habitat that is so awesome and inspires different kinds of people to get outdoors and to care about the outdoors.

Thank you for doing the important work you are doing for our community.

Warmly, Tracie Dunn (26 Laws Brook)

Tracie Dunn

26 Laws Brook Rd.

6/24/2024 5:36:58 PM

I would like the members of the Task Force to please keep the following memorable event in mind when considering the fate of Warner's Pond.

During one of the few ice skating days we had this year my husband and I offered hot chocolate, s'mores and a firepit for the skaters to enjoy. A grandmother with her two grandsons came over and one of the boys, aged 10, after skating around for a while and enjoying about 13 marshmallows, said, "I'm going to go home and write about this." We asked him exactly what it was that he was going to write. He had a hard time putting the words to his feeling, then finally exclaimed, "The freedom, the openness. I can skate and go where I want to and do what I want to, it's the openness! It's so much better than going around in circles at the skating rink!"

Here is history repeating itself. A young boy writing about experiencing nature in Concord.

Please let this sink in as to how important the open space is to these children. Number one, a young boy willingly going to write?! Number two, his enjoyment of being able to experience the wonder of nature. What a memory he had of that day and it wasn't just the marshmallows!

We also have young boys knock on our door to ask if they can fish from our dock. One young man did catch a pickerel. Another good memory made because of the pond. They need this open area.

Thank you for the time and effort you have all devoted to Warner's Pond.

George and Donna Tisdale

Donna Tisdale

335 Commonwealth Ave

6/25/2024 10:09:51 AM

I'm concerned that Ms. Clifford broke the WPTF's "no surprise" rule when, without the WPTF's approval (or, perhaps, even knowledge), on March 28th she presented her own perspective on the historical background of the pond and its restored dam to the Historical Commission and asked them to vote on it.

During the March 21 WPTF meeting, she brought up her maps. At that time, because there was not consensus among the members of the TF about the maps, the facilitators suggested that this discussion be resumed at another time.

A week later, without consensus or permission from the group, Ms. Clifford presented her maps to the Historical Commission, perhaps influencing their thinking. WPTF should let the HC know that what Ms. Clifford presented did not represent the work of the WPTF or their findings/conclusions.

And moving forward, the WPTF must resolve to prevent such unilateral actions by individual members of the WPTF.

Jill Korey

42 Laws Brook Rd Concord, MA

6/26/2024 12:51:39 PM

What is the email address I can use to send more detailed comments?

Ellen Quackenbush

206 Prairie St

6/26/2024 1:46:50 PM

To: Warner's Pond Task Force

Subject: Suggestions for Alternatives Analysis

First, may I say that the task of this group is important to all of Concord and may inform analysis of other town issues with similar levels of emotion and geographically-diverse perspectives.

My suggestions are limited by what I have read on your website or have gleaned from public information sessions, so please forgive any suggestions I make that don't fully incorporate the information that the Task Force has at its disposal.

I have organized my comments by broad needs.

Complete cost analysis and set timeframe.

- I suggest that the Task Force adopt the timeframe used by FinCom (10-years, I think) or Envision Concord (15-years, or until 2030).
- Include capital and operating (e.g. maintenance) costs in the analysis.
- Collapse these costs into a single dollar figure using a NPV (Net Present Value) calculation. This is the metric that businesses use when comparing competing investment options.
- Avoid the temptation to use long-term framing (e.g. 100 years). Too much uncertainty.

Clear definition of the benefits sought by various stakeholders.

Recreation

- Huge variation on what this meant to the attendees of the Public Information Center, with a lot of comments talking about what folks remembered from their youth/nostalgia
- Fishing—from a boat, pier, shore. What types of fish. Catch and release?
- Skating—how many days per year. Sustainable given climate change (although, this violates my suggestion of not considering long timeframes)
- Boating—how many acres of open water is sufficient?
- Swimming—is this viable, given the water quality?

- Enjoying nature—a pond view, wildlife trails, knowledge that the acreage is a sound, sustainable environment for a variety of flora/fauna. Mostly passive, photography, but highly-valued by many Concordians.
- Biking—linkage to Bruce Freeman Rail Trail
- Gerow—what, exactly, is being done with this kinda forsaken town asset?
- Scouts—a recent, but established need to access Scout Island

Ecological health/sustainability

- Ability to support a set type of fish, bird, plant, amphibian. Compare still ponds vs running stream.
- Native vs invasive species. How does each alternative deter invasives and support native plants.
- Water quality. First, measure current state. Then, project range of future measurement under various alternatives.

History/Character/Values

- Recognition of the local historic/cultural value of Warner's Pond. And the contention by some/many West Concordians that West Concord gets all the "housing density" but none of the protection of open space, specifically Warner's Pond.
- It should be noted that few abutters recognize that Warner's Pond is better termed "Warner's Impoundment," created in 1857 to power a wooden pail factory. So, value to industrial history. Not sure this is highlighted by any signage along Warner's Pond (I may be wrong here)

Stakeholders

The Task Force needs to define the stakeholders for their charge and, perhaps, for each option. If costs exceed the funds authorized by the 2023 Town Meeting (and not yet spent), then all Concord taxpayers must be considered stakeholders. Stakeholders include:

- Abutters, Friends of Warner's Pond
- Other interested citizens
- Environmental groups/experts
- DOC and decision-makers on the disposition of MCI-Concord
- Bruce Freeman Rail trail

- Various town committees
- State DEP, Dept Public Health, and agencies managing dams, etc.
- Etc.

Feasibility

Options that are not feasible legally (state or federal regulations) or practically (e.g. influencing the pollutants entering the watershed from upstream towns) should not be considered.

Balanced Scorecard for Cost/Benefit Analysis

Balanced Scorecards are used extensively in business to compare investment alternatives. Using the Options defined by the Task Force and criteria from Envision 2030, a balanced scorecard might, roughly, look like this:

Elements to decide:

- Scores for each crite

Ellen Quackenbush

206 Prairie St

6/26/2024 5:54:01 PM

Dear Taskforce members – I have several comments to make:

[1] - Keep up the good work and thank you for the time you've dedicated in preparing and attending meetings – it's appreciated!

[2] - I would like to see more control given to the Chairs over this process. For example, at the June 13th TF meeting, I saw all members of the TF (and also the chairs) push back against a plan for breakout groups. It struck me as odd that the chairs didn't have input into the process – they should, have especially since the TF Charge mandates that they lead the group.

[3] I'm not a fan of placing public comments on a spreadsheet (via a web portal). This places the onerous on TF members to check the site and you already have so much to do. Also, how are attachments done? For example, earlier this year, I forwarded an email that showed a dialog between Concord officials and MCI Concord about a second disposal site. How would that be placed within a spreadsheet? What's the problem with just forwarding comments along, it's what all other committees do. In this -- I believe the planning team is overthinking the process. Also, Excel is a horrible way to display large amounts of text to read...

Miguel Echavarri

255 Commonwealth Ave

7/6/2024 2:13:25 PM

<https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/habitat-conservation/fish-passage-projects-selected-funding#massachusetts>

Recent NOAA grants have been awarded nation-wide and here in MA for several projects for fish passage. The grants show many creative solutions based on the individual characteristics of each location. These examples, including those in other New England states show well-thought-out, cost effective and environmentally sound practices worth studying for lessons to be learned for Warners preservation.

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

7/10/2024 3:45:03 PM

Analysis from the PARE corporation's inspection of the Warners Dam in 2023 includes the following information. This information is an important statement because it can reduce the hazard classification of the dam and its impacts on downstream areas along with future inspection requirements. The PARE report also adds another level of professional analysis to be weighed by the task force. Furthermore, it can contribute to the cost-reduction for regulatory requirements of the dam.

Complete a detailed hazard classification review to identify if reclassifying the dam from significant hazard to low hazard is warranted given the apparent limited anticipated impacts to the area downstream in event of dam failure at maximum pool. The review would need to include a dam break analysis to show the anticipated impacts to the downstream area and potentially a scour analysis of the Commonwealth Ave bridge culvert. If reclassified from significant hazard to low hazard, the following would change:

- The SDF would be reduced from the 100-year storm to the 50-year storm event, which may alleviate some of the concerns noted in evaluation #6 below.
- The Phase I Inspection frequency would be reduced from once every 5 years to once every 10 years.
- An EAP would not be required, although it would still be recommended.

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

7/13/2024 8:08:26 AM

The US Geological Survey has extensive expertise in fish passage research and real-world studies and analysis. The world-wide USGS body of knowledge can provide the task force with additional scientific fact-based information to explore cost-effective solutions at the dam.

<https://www.usgs.gov/search?keywords=Fish+passage>

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

7/13/2024 9:14:19 AM

More research on solutions to the Warners Pond issues, including the very large cost impacts affecting all citizens should be a priority for the Task Force. In addition, there are many examples of State grants which have funded highly cost effective remedies thus saving millions of dollars when compared to the current engineering estimate for dam removal.

The attached project on the Draka River in the Taunton Dighton area is an excellent example of a practical, cost effective, grant-funded , State and Federal supported project which cost \$90,000.

Concord Citizens should demand more fiscal responsibility and accountability for the Warners project through the application of sound project management and business practices And in-depth research well beyond the existing engineering studies to-date.

https://www.mass.gov/news/fishway-construction-at-the-draka-dam-on-the-three-mile-river?_gl=1*9qv8q7*_ga*MTQ4MDI2MzA1MS4xNzlwNDYxNjg3*_ga_MCLPEGW7WM*MTcyMDg3NTYxNi4xLjEuMTcyMDg3NTkwOS4wLjAuMA..

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

7/14/2024 7:23:09 PM

Eutrophication is described in the public narrative and in several reports as one of the issues with Warners pond. The scientific based study using Lanthanum to mitigate hard-to-control nutrient loading is attached. The multi-year research shows the many benefits of this approach and should be added to the task force toolkit as another feasible solution to mitigate pond issues. Based on the information in past engineering reports, there are no easy solutions to the effective control or reduction of nutrient loading due to the extensive land and drainage areas feeding into the watershed and pond.

<https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3298/10/2/20>

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

7/18/2024 5:44:59 PM

Creating alternative solutions at Warners should include the analysis of fish passage criteria, of which there is a large body of knowledge. The National Fish and Wildlife Service has a list of experts to contact including a representative for MA. Katherine Bozek is the person for MA and the site has her contact information.

<https://www.fws.gov/program/national-fish-passage/contact-us>

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

7/25/2024 9:54:52 AM

Dear taskforce members,

At the last TF meeting, a member stated (twice) that comparisons of Warner's and Bare Hill Pond in Harvard were apples to oranges. But are they? Both ponds are on perennial streams, both have dams and both are used for recreation.

Look at the committee's latest annual report, water quality/plant report and their overall website. It's obvious that Harvard has dedicated time and resources to managing their pond and have done so for decades with some degree of success. Unless town staff can provide a compelling reason otherwise (besides Bare Hill being larger), I urge the taskforce to review what Harvard's done right, what mistakes have been made and what can be incorporated into future management of Warner's Pond.

Sincerely,

-ME.

[bhp_comm_submission_letter2023wexhibits.pdf](#) (harvard-ma.gov)

[arc-bhp-2023-report.pdf](#) (harvard-ma.gov)

[Bare Hill Pond Watershed Management | Town of Harvard MA](#) (harvard-ma.gov)

Miguel Echavarri

255 Commonwealth Ave

7/28/2024 6:28:33 PM

In response to questions raised at the No Action subcommittee meeting on Thursday July 25th about the number of ponds in Concord, I have compiled an unofficial list (I couldn't find an official list) of what seems to be all of the ponds in Concord. We did this by zooming in on every blue body of water in the AllTrails app.

Angiers Pond

Annursnac Pond

Borden Pond in Great Meadows

Bateman's Pond

Concord Greene

Crosby's Pond

Fairyland Pond

Goose Pond

Great Meadows

Hutchins Pond

Little Goose Pond

Kennedy's Pond

Lindsay Pond

Macone's Pond

Mink Pond

Musketaquid Pond

October Farm

Silver Hill Pond

Walden Pond

Warners Pond

White Pond

Allison Aley

47 Warner St.

8/1/2024 9:29:32 AM

There have been several topics the Task Force has elected to follow up with small groups. One topic of critical importance is the impact on wildlife habitat and the impact of proposed changes to the pond. Here is a recent sighting;

There is a pair of broad wing hawks at Warners pond and I saw a juvenile bald eagle chase off an osprey the other day.

Certainly wildlife and DEP experts should be consulted to support the many creatures who don't sit at the table...

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

8/4/2024 6:17:05 PM

Fish passage designs can be feasible solutions which should be considered for analysis by the Task Force. The link below are the many engineering and technical design considerations compiled from government agencies, applicable to many sites and conditions.

https://www.fs.usda.gov/biology/nsaec/fishxing/fplibrary/NRCS_1990_Fish_Passage_and_Screening_Design.pdf

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

8/18/2024 2:12:37 PM

Incorporate the language from Envision Concord 2030 documents (passage copied below) as a template to guide the task force and inform town-wide citizens of the vast potential for improving Warners with wetlands paths, trails for connections where none currently exist

Connect hiking trails and pedestrian/bike paths for nature enjoyment, recreation, and access to the village centers. Enhanced connectivity will provide more opportunities for accessing the entire network of publicly accessible open space and may also support wildlife corridors and movement throughout the town. Ensuring the village centers are well connected to surrounding cultural and open space assets and trail networks may encourage residents and visitors to park their cars and walk, reducing automobile congestion. Examples of potential improvements include: another path over the Mill Brook to better integrate Concord Center, a pedestrian bridge over the Assabet River in West Concord, and a trail along the Assabet River connecting natural areas to Thoreau School. Trail access should also be included whenever possible in planning and redevelopment of larger sites, such as at the 2229 Main Street (Starmet) site.

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

8/18/2024 6:38:13 PM

I am in strong support of removal of the Commonwealth Ave dam to restore Nashoba Brook to an unimpeded stream. I grew up on Bayberry Road, 1962-1981, skated on Warner's pond in winters, and had swimming lessons there one summer. The dam should be removed for cost & wildlife benefit.

Laraine Armenti

Formerly 69 Bayberry Road (1962-1981)

8/19/2024 10:29:53 AM

This comment is for the No-action Subcommittee in support of their idea of a Ponds Subcommittee to the NRC that would congregate knowledge and best practices for all of Concord's ponds. Friends of mine live on Farmer's Cliff Rd in Concord and have a small pond wholly within their property. They watch turtles sunning themselves from their kitchen window and their screen porch. Recently I was discussing Warner's Pond frustrations and my friend told me his experience of going into the NRD to ask for advice and best practices on how best to maintain the pond and what to do about undesirable plant growth. He was told he couldn't do anything. He told me it was frustrating to not be advised and given helpful information or support. It occurred to me that the creation of a Pond Subcommittee could be a resource for all the people in Concord who care about ponds and could take some of the burden off the NRD.

Allison Aley

47 Warner St

8/23/2024 1:21:36 PM

This comment is a request for a clarification and confirmation from the NRC and Task Force relative to the dredging bid plan set and documentation, dated August 2022. The plan general notes (sheet G-002) indicate that:

ALL ELEVATIONS REFERENCE NORTH AMERICAN VERTICAL DATUM (NAVD)88 AND ARE IN US SURVEY FEET. BATHYMETRIC SURVEY WAS PERFORMED BY ESS GROUP USING WATER DEPTH MEASUREMENTS COLLECTED IN THE FIELD ON 10 AUGUST 2017 AND IN 2011 AND THEN GENERATING CONTOURS USING AUTOCAD CIVIL 3D. THE WATER SURFACE ELEVATION AT THE TIME OF FIELD MEASUREMENTS ON 10 AUGUST 2017 WAS 116.5 FEET. ADDITIONAL BATHYMETRIC POINTS WERE SURVEYED WITHIN THE AREA OF THE PROPOSED WETLAND SHELF BY EA ON 22 SEPTEMBER 2021 USING WATER DEPTH MEASUREMENTS COLLECTED IN THE FIELD. THE WATER SURFACE ELEVATION AT THE TIME OF FIELD MEASUREMENTS ON 22 SEPTEMBER 2021 WAS 116.6 FEET.

The bathymetric survey provided in the dredge bid plan set appears to utilize Elevations 116.5 feet and 116.6 feet NAVD88 as the reference elevations to determine the pond water level, the pond bottom elevations, and the specified dredge elevations. As indicated on the dam rehabilitation plans and the Phase I Dam Inspection reports, the pond normal pool elevation is 118.8 feet NAVD88 (i.e., the spillway elevation) and the typical water level downstream of the spillways spatially ranges from about Elevations 115 feet to 116 feet NAVD88. A pond water surface elevation assumption of 116.5 feet NAVD88, apparently used to establish the pond water level, pond bottom elevations and design dredge elevations, appears to be inconsistent with the Warner's Pond normal pool elevation of 118.8 feet NAVD88 and unlikely (i.e., Elevation 116.5 feet is 2.3 feet lower than the spillway crest elevation). Please confirm with the engineer: 1) that the assumption of Elevation 116.5 feet NAVD88 as the water elevation within Warner's Pond is correct and not a mistake; 2) that Elevation 116.5 feet NAVD was, in fact, used to establish pond bottom elevations and dredge elevations; 3) what the basis was for determining that water elevation (i.e., how and where that water level elevation was measured) and 4) whether or not impounded pond water surface elevations upstream of the spillways of 116.5 feet and 116.6 feet NAVD88 were possible given the flow conditions on the referenced dates.

Note that the 2012 Watershed Management Report states that for the 2011 (report indicates January 28, 2011) depths readings... "A datum measurement was taken at the pond outlet with water surface 5.5 feet below the top of the concrete spillway" but does not indicate explicitly where the measurement was taken. A logical assumption is that the reference measurement point elevation was the permanent Town of Concord survey benchmark mounted in the Main Spillway wall capstone (about Elevation 124.17 feet

NAVD88), and 5.5 feet would correspond to about Elevation 118.7 feet NAVD88 (the normal pool elevation).

It is assumed that the Town was not performing a mechanical pond drawdown on the referenced dates.

The USGS stream gage on Nashoba Brook in Acton indicates that the stream flow on 28 January 2011 was about 9 cfs (about 55% to 60% exceedance flow duration), on 10 August 2017 was about 4 cfs (about 75% exceedance flow duration) and on 22 September 2021 was about 17 cfs (about 35% to 40% exceedance flow duration), which would seem to be indicative of a normal water elevation in Warner's Pond (i.e., +/- 118.8 feet NAVD88). It is also noted that Massachusetts was in a general drought condition during 2016 and 2017; however, Nashoba Brook discharge during and prior to (for several months) the 10 August 2017 were relatively high.

Daniel Stapleton

20 Conant West Concord

8/23/2024 1:23:55 PM

Additional pond depth measurements were obtained by EA subsequent to the bid (December 20, 2022 and January 14, 2023) and presented in the Alternatives Analysis report; however, the pond water elevation at the time of the measurements appears to not have been provided in the report. This comment also requests that the Warner's Pond water surface elevation used at the time of the depth measurements be provided by EA. Note that the USGS stream gage on Nashoba Brook in Acton indicates that the stream flow on 20 December 2022 was about 24 cfs (about 30% exceedance flow duration) and on 14 January 2023, was about 48 cfs (about 10% exceedance flow duration), which would seem to be indicative of at least a normal water elevation in Warner's Pond (i.e., +/- 118.8 feet NAVD88).

daniel stapleton

20 Conant Street West Concord

8/28/2024 8:11:49 AM

Hi -- this is for the subgroup on dam removal regarding costs associated with dam removal for Talbot Mills. In the past, CBI has withheld this information until after a meeting has occurred, I hope this will reach members prior to the upcoming meeting.

Please note that Rachael (from CBI) was copied on the below email so it's possible you've already seen this information.

From: Gould, Joseph (FWE) <Joseph.Gould@mass.gov>

Sent: Monday, June 24, 2024 9:15 AM

To: Miguele Echavarri <miguele@intelimapinc.com>

Cc: Rachel Freed <rfreed@cbi.org>

Subject: RE: Talbot Mills Contracts

Hi Miguel,

Here is a pretty good sense of the cost for Talbot.

~100-120k - Concept/Preliminary Design – don't have all the contracts

\$121k - 75% design and permitting

\$45k – Final design and specs, bidding

\$40k – construction services - based on EOPC (engineers opinion of probable cost)

~\$300-350k for Engineering

\$100-150k – historical by PAL - \$27k design permit phase, \$22k construction phase, estimated \$50-100K for mitigation

\$900k-1.2M construction - based on EOPC w/contingency

\$1.3-1.7M Total Cost

Best,

JG

Miguel Echavarri

255 Commonwealth Ave

9/11/2024 11:06:58 AM

I listened online to the first hour of the WP Task Force meeting last night on Sept 9, 2024, as a member of the public and former resident of Concord.

Two points I would make:

1. Stop using the word "Pond" and replace it with "Wetland" or "Swamp." It is only a pond due to an outdated dam. Without the dam, there is no pond.
2. Stop using the word "Enhancement" which is a euphemism for "Development, Parking Lots, Increased Human Traffic, Trash & Plumbing."

A gentleman who expressed a wish to back an 8-canoe rig into water should use the South Bridge Boathouse, a historic site which desperately needs improvement and money to do it.

Ben Goldfarb's 2023 book 'Crossings: How Road Ecology Is Shaping the Future of Our Planet' is a fuller picture of the ecological importance of dam removal and remediation.

Laraine Armenti

418 Chestnut Street / formerly Bayberry Road, Concord, 1962--1981

10/5/2024 12:46:07 PM

My name is Diane Pearlman and I live on Warners Pond (237 Commonwealth Ave). I use the pond everyday. I canoe, paddle board and kayak. One of my neighbors borrows my paddle board almost daily. My daughter likes to fish in the pond and my dog likes to accompany me on my canoe rides. I love watching the swans and blue heron. I have turtles who sun themselves on downed tree limbs. I bought the house after seeing kids skating on the pond. I hope to enjoy many many more years on Warner's Pond

Diane Pearlman

237 Commonwealth Ave

10/5/2024 12:44:55 PM

I hope the town is doing everything they can to keep the pond. I travel to Concord several times a year from Minneapolis. Each time I visit I spend time on and around the pond. The wildlife I have seen because of the pond is amazing! Beavers, swans, turtles, otters, eagles, herons deer and more. This community is lucky to have this right in your back yard and the public access is great. Please keep pushing to keep Warner's pond!

Mike Palmquist from Minneapolis

Mike Palmquist

4134 Vincent Ave s

11/1/2024 7:16:22 AM

Dear Warner's Pond Task Force,

I am in favor of the town's latest Alternative Analysis report recommending the removal of Warner's pond dam. Warner's pond is not a natural pond (eg; White Pond or Walden Pond). It is a manufactured pond, a result of damming Nagog brook over a century ago for power generation. The dam no longer serves its intended purpose for water power generation, and the resulting impoundment (pond) created traps, silt, sediment, and chemical runoff from lawns, roads and highways. This includes fertilizer, pesticides, arsenics & other toxins entering the pond from the upper watershed. The pond's water quality is poor and unsafe for swimming. Siltation has shallowed the water depth and increased its water temperature. The increased water encourages invasive plant growth including milfoil, fanwort, water chestnuts and purple loosestrife. These invasives choke out our native plant life and rob the water of needed oxygen (eutrophication). The combination of siltation, chemicals, excessive water temperature, and reduced oxygen all result in higher levels of fish, wildlife and native plant mortality. Keeping the dam would result in added town expenses. The dam would need inspections and maintenance, and the pond continually managed for invasive plant eradication. State funds are available to help offset dam removal costs. The state encourages and supports the removal of dams that no longer serve their intended purpose, and view them as safety hazards in their quest to combat increased flooding, a result of global warming. Removal of the dam would result in improved wildlife habitat and offer residents a host of recreational activities including hiking, wildlife observation, kayaking & fishing. In my opinion, dam removal is the right choice. This is what's best for all residents of Concord, our wildlife, and our environment.

Sincerely, Jack Carlton
Harrington Avenue

Jack Carlton

81 Harrington Avenue

11/17/2024 7:18:31 PM

This is a partial list of FAQs to be answered for next public outreach. Pasting it here removed the formatting and cut off some questions, but I sent Chris Denaro a clearer version in October.

The health of the pond:

Is Warner's Pond polluted?

Would it be safe to swim in it?

Can the fish caught there be eaten?

When the engineers talk about water quality, what specifically are they talking about? (ie, people don't understand the difference between water quality from a pond management viewpoint (temperature, dissolved oxygen, transparency and nutrient content [nitrogen and phosphorus] and water safety from a human viewpoint)

Does the sediment contain anything toxic?

What is eutrophication and what causes it? (people are confused about whether it's caused by pollution or is a natural process)

History:

How long has Warner's Pond existed as a pond?

How long has there been a dam in that location?

What is the historical significance of the pond and surrounding areas to the history of WC and MA (ie, what has happened here, who has written about the pond and surrounds)?

Dredging:

When and why was the plan to dredge the pond abandoned?

Why did we get just one bid in 2022 and why was it so high?

Are there people interested in the dredged material? How have we tried to answer that question?

How deep would the pond need to be dredged to keep it from filling in with invasive plants? (and explain the relationship between depth and invasives growth)

How long would the dredging last (when would it need to be repeated next)?

Dam removal:

What would be the benefits of dam removal?

Who would pay for it and how much would it cost?

Will the state force us to remove the dam in the near future if we don't do it ourselves?

Is the dam in good condition?

What would the brook that's left look like (depth and width)? What sort of recreation could happen on it? How would it vary by season? What path would it take through the drained area? How would people access the water?

What would the town do about beaver dams that get built across the brook in the future?

How would the "deep hole" be made deep again?

How will invasives around the brook be managed? Do they need to be?

Flood risk:

Is the dam at risk of failing during a large storm?

Does the dam protect West Concord and surrounding homes from flooding, increase the risk, or have no impact?

Money:

How much money has the town invested so far in the pond, the dam, Gerow Park, money paid to consultants and engineering firms, money to operate the TF and hire mediators?

How much of that money is still left?

What sources of funding are available for various options aside from town funds? (state or federal)

Flora and fauna:

What kind of animals and plants are in and around the pond now, and how would that change if the dam came down or the pond was dredged?

IF Talbott Mills dam comes down:

How would dam removal impact diadromous fish passage?

What are the options for fish passage besides dam removal?

How important is Nashoba brook to the health of diadromous fish in this watershed? Do they need Nashoba brook or will they have enough space to spawn if TM dam comes down? Would the pond be useful to them?

Will dam removal make Nashoba brook fill with cold water fish, like brown trout?

Could we improve habitat for certain species (eg, piedbilled grebe, wood turtle, white cedar) beyond what we have now?

Scout Island:

Who owns it?

How do they use it?

What do the Scouts think about dam removal?

How would it be affected by dam removal (would it become a hill in a marsh or still be an island)?

Recreation and access:

How could the pond be used if it were dredged?

How could Nashoba brook be used if the dam came down?

What would be the access points in each scenario?

How could people use the water from Gerow Park in each scenario?

Other pond restoration methods:

What is possible with draw down?

Anna Feldweg

343 Commonwealth Ave

1/23/2025 8:34:24 AM

Dear WPTF members,

I'm forwarding a question that I sent to the Natural Resources Director and the planning team regarding wetland regulations and building boardwalks over wetlands. Below is the email.

Dear Delia,

Conceptual plans for Gerow Park originally included a boardwalk. As noted by Kate Hodges (Deputy Town Manager at the time) this idea was strongly discouraged by your office and plans were quickly dropped. As noted in your email to me from last June, "...It would be difficult to demonstrate that a boardwalk through the wetlands at the edge of the pond meets this standard, so would likely not be permissible...".

However, I've noticed that the WPTF Dam Removal subgroup has included boardwalks over wetlands and that your office hasn't (over the course of several months) discouraged this idea.

Can you tell me why? I assume that Wetlands Protection Act and Wetland Bylaw Regulations would apply equally to each project because each boardwalk would be built over wetlands. Why would your office allow boardwalks for the dam removal project but not for Gerow Park?

Miguel Echavarri

Homeowner - 255 Commonwealth Ave

2/10/2025 8:10:50 PM

I wanted to document that Warner's pond has now been frozen for about 6 weeks (since late December) and yet the Assabet River and Nashoba Brook are not frozen over. Those who claim that people could skate on the rivers and streams if the dam came down are not correct. I have photos if you would like me to share them, but my point is that the recreational value of Rivers and streams in winter is very limited and in no way equivalent to that of a pond.

Anna Feldweg

343 Commonwealth Ave, Concord

4/3/2025 8:14:42 AM

3/8/2025 2:13:37 PM

I just got a card in the postal mail. At the web address on the card there was a message that the proposal is coming soon. Do you know when?

Richard Fahlander

399 Old Bedford Road

3/9/2025 4:57:54 PM

Unlike White and Walden Ponds, Warner's is not pond at all, but rather a man made impoundment created well over a hundred years ago to help provide a mill with water power generation. The mill is long gone and as such the pond no longer serves it's intended purpose. Dam removal will not only help naturally flush out tons of sediment and toxins from that have been trapped behind the dam for decades, but will help eliminate many invasive plants such as fanwort, loosestrife, and water chestnuts that also became trapped and took up residence within the impoundment robbing native plants and wildlife of needed oxygen.

The state of MA. is supporting the removal of dead dams across the state to help reduce our ever- increasing flood events. The state has made grant money available to help offset the removal costs.

Anything less than removing the dam and allowing Nagog brook to return to it's more natural state is not in the best interest to either the town or it's wildlife.

john carlton

81 harrington avenue

3/12/2025 9:37:40 AM

Dam removal once in a lifetime opportunity

While I understand that many people have an emotional or physical connection to the Pond and/or its place in the history of West Concord, I have to say that I am surprised that so many argue in support of investing town money and unnecessarily expending resources in what will be a never-ending process of maintaining the pond. To state the obvious, the pond is man-made and is not and never has been a part of the natural topography, ecology or environment of the area.

It is surprising to me that so many typically eco-friendly Concord residents, in this instance, feel that the brook returning to its natural course and that allowing fish to migrate or beavers to build dams is not the “natural” thing to do.

There will still be skating and fishing and canoeing and camping, etc. in other parts of town and, equally as important, the history of the dam and the pond will still be part of the history of West Concord. With the removal of the dam and the return of the brook to its original path there will also be the knowledge that we as a community were able to look beyond the imposition of our will over nature for industry or our personal enjoyment and come together to restore nature, and our own little part of the planet, to environmental health.

The removal of the Warner’s Pond dam is a once in a lifetime opportunity. Please, let us seize it and do the right thing.

3/14/2025 8:46:51 AM

I understand it, the first phases after dam removal - muddy, lots of water-logged vegetation - would not make the then-former Warner's Pond pretty. And after you paid big bucks to buy a house near or bordering it, you would be against dam removal. Facts point toward taking the dam out, though. The pond is a dying environment. Plants not native to the area grow there, die, sink to the bottom, choke off native plants, and reduce pond depth which reduces oxygen to living things even more. A pond is not a natural part of this area. It is a human addition that no longer serves its major purpose, power for businesses. Dredging is expensive. The town has recently taken on highly costly projects (e.g., middle school) and is contemplating others (e.g., the former prison). Many lower-income residents are frightened they won't be able to afford to live in Concord. Let nature take its course. Let the pond go.

David Downing

Concord Greene

3/31/2025 10:07:45 AM

Subject: Risk of Contaminants at Warners Pond

I have been serving on the 2229 Main Street Oversight Committee for several years as the NRC representative. In that role I have become aware of the difficulties and costs of dealing with contaminated soil. After reading the recently completed "Warner's Pond Task Force: Alternatives under Consideration", I have some concerns.

These comments represent my personal opinions. The 2229 Main Street Oversight Committee has not discussed or taken any position on these matters. Neither do these comments reflect a position of the NRC.

I am concerned about the risk of contaminated sediment in Warner's Pond and the potential cost of remediation, if required.

The second paragraph on page 16 states,

"The remaining quantities would be piped to the North Field for dewatering and ultimately final disposition, pending testing of sediment samples (including any needed testing for hazardous substances) to confirm that dredged sediments are appropriate for disposal at the new location and to determine what volumes, if any, need to be disposed of in other regulated landfills."

This is ambiguous regarding the timing of the tests. The tests should be done in situ prior to moving any sediment from the pond.

On Page 18, the section "Data Collections in the pond", there is a reference to sampling for contaminants where only Arsenic is mentioned. There is an explanation that new sampling will be required because previous sampling is out-of-date. There is no indication what contaminants were the subject of the previous tests. There is no discussion of the scope of future testing. The list of possible contaminants has probably grown since the previous sampling was done at Warner's Pond (e.g. PFAS).

The Dredging Estimate in Appendix G, assumption #1, assumes there are no contaminants present other than arsenic. Assumption #6 assumes that dredging water would be released without treatment. There is no indication how the extent of arsenic contamination will be determined. I wonder if this is adequate, as I am not knowledgeable about the chemistry of arsenic in soil. These assumptions are premature since the need for new tests is known.

The plan should explicitly state that a sediment sampling plan will be developed prior to dredging. The list of possible contaminants to be investigated should be specified. The plan should indicate the extent of sampling (e.g. intervals, depth).

I think that before the town can make any decision on dredging, the financial risks must be explicitly stated. This may mean that testing for contaminants should be done prior to asking the town to make any decisions regarding dredging at Warner's Pond.

The presence of contaminants may also have implications for the "dam removal" scenario.

Nick Pappas

1743 Monument Street

3/31/2025 12:18:02 PM

I discovered an error in the previous submission. It should have said, "These assumptions are premature since the need for new tests is unknown.". Here is a corrected version.

I have been serving on the 2229 Main Street Oversight Committee for several years as the NRC representative. In that role I have become aware of the difficulties and costs of dealing with contaminated soil. After reading the recently completed "Warner's Pond Task Force: Alternatives under Consideration", I have some concerns.

These comments represent my personal opinions. The 2229 Main Street Oversight Committee has not discussed or taken any position on these matters. Neither do these comments reflect a position of the NRC.

I am concerned about the risk of contaminated sediment in Warner's Pond and the potential cost of remediation, if required.

The second paragraph on page 16 states,

"The remaining quantities would be piped to the North Field for dewatering and ultimately final disposition, pending testing of sediment samples (including any needed testing for hazardous substances) to confirm that dredged sediments are appropriate for disposal at the new location and to determine what volumes, if any, need to be disposed of in other regulated landfills."

This is ambiguous regarding the timing of the tests. The tests should be done in situ prior to moving any sediment from the pond.

On Page 18, the section "Data Collections in the pond", there is a reference to sampling for contaminants where only Arsenic is mentioned. There is an explanation that new sampling will be required because previous sampling is out-of-date. There is no indication what contaminants were the subject of the previous tests. There is no discussion of the scope of future testing. The list of possible contaminants has probably grown since the previous sampling was done at Warner's Pond (e.g. PFAS).

The Dredging Estimate in Appendix G, assumption #1, assumes there are no contaminants present other than arsenic. Assumption #6 assumes that dredging water would be released without treatment. There is no indication how the extent of arsenic contamination will be determined. I wonder if this is adequate, as I am not knowledgeable about the chemistry of arsenic in soil. These assumptions are premature since the need for new tests is unknown.

The plan should explicitly state that a sediment sampling plan will be developed prior to dredging. The list of possible contaminants to be investigated should be specified. The plan should indicate the extent of sampling (e.g. intervals, depth).

I think that before the town can make any decision on dredging, the financial risks must be explicitly stated. This may mean that testing for contaminants should be done prior to asking the town to make any decisions regarding dredging at Warner's Pond.

The presence of contaminants may also have implications for the "dam removal" scenario.

Nick Pappas

1743 Monument Street

4/3/2025 8:14:42 AM

4/3/2025 8:15:45 AM

Wondering about DOT and necessary work on Rte 2 as development proceeds in next years. Will this effect dredging alternative using West field.

The traffic flow seems imperative to resolve before any plans are implemented.

What's Task Forces thoughts on this.

Lucia Ballantine

6 Concord Greene

4/3/2025 9:06:02 AM

Speaking for myself and my 15 year old son who has been a Cub Scout and now Scout for 9 years we would hate for this recreation resource to go away. Scouts have been enjoying Scout Island for years and it's been a right of passage for many Concord Scouts to camp on the island. Currently my son kayaks and enjoys fishing just about every weekend, even ice fishing on the pond. As a parent I'm so happy he has found a passion and can access nature right in our neighborhood. My brother in-law did the same as a kid growing up in West Concord and many generations before that have been enjoying recreation on and around the pond. Please recommend keeping this beautiful place intact.

Krys Streeter-Tarlow

1295 Main St, Concprd, MA 01742

4/3/2025 12:58:13 PM

I would like to go on record in support of Proposal 3 in the March 2025 Alternatives Under Consideration document. Every time I drive from West Concord to South Acton I am stunned by the beauty of Fort Pond Brook. Proposal 3 represents an opportunity to bring that beauty into the heart of West Concord. Let's not pass it up.

Marty Plotkin

54 Frances St

4/3/2025 9:14:38 PM

I would like the task force to keep in mind 4 criteria:

- 1) mitigating upstream flooding.
- 2) agitating any pollutants currently in the substrate
- 3) increasing/maintaining biodiversity
- 4) allowing access to nature

Gwen Shipley

89 Wilson Road

4/4/2025 9:56:22 AM

Part One: This is the comment I had prepared to make at the public forum.

Allison Aley

47 Warner St.

I've been a member of the Friends of Warner's Pond since it's founding and I am here speaking on their behalf.

The Friends of Warners Pond came together in the summer of 2023 in response to the abrupt pivot away from the long term plan of dredging and pond restoration.

It was the Friends who organized the petition that led to the creation of this Task Force. We've been appreciating the hard work of this task force and want to share our perspective on the proposals being considered. It is the Friends position that Warners Pond itself already embodies all of the Envision Concord criteria that the Task Force must meet and therefore only proposals that retain and restore the pond should be recommended.

Taking away the pond through dam removal squanders this amazing resource. Dam removal squanders the pond's benefits to the Town and its residents, and the large investments that have been made in the pond.

Warners Pond is 59 acres of open water and rich wetlands habitat within walking distance from West Concord Village. Think about that. Warner's Pond is a highly desirable community asset.

The Town has invested hugely in this asset, first by purchasing the pond, then by rebuilding its dam, then by allocating money to restore and maintain it, then by purchasing seven acres adjacent to it so the public can have increased recreation opportunities with this asset. Let's not discard this asset and squander all of these investments. Instead, let's preserve, and restore this open space and the well-established, bio-diverse pond we have. Let's save it for both current and future generations as well as the new neighbors and businesses who will be joining us soon on the MCI property right next door to Warner's Pond.

Allison Aley

47 Warner St

4/4/2025 4:00:52 PM

When I first learned of the plan to remove the dam, my gut reaction was, “Take it down and let nature do its thing.” But the more I considered the full picture, the more complicated it became.

When do we decide a place is truly “natural”? If the pond has existed for over 150 years, hasn't "nature" already happened here? Over that time, the ecosystem has adapted—plants, animals, and people alike. In a town where much of the land has been developed and paved over, this pond is a rare and beautiful oasis—a refuge for wildlife and a daily joy for residents.

As a biologist and medical professional, I think carefully about the trade-offs we make in the name of ecological restoration. Removing the dam and engineering the brook may benefit certain species that prefer a running stream—but it comes at the expense of those that depend on the pond and surrounding wetland habitat. Can we say for sure how many species would be lost, and how many would move in? And who gets to decide what those changes are worth?

Furthermore, disturbed landscapes are highly vulnerable to invasive species. Japanese knotweed, purple loosestrife, garlic mustard, and other invasives would move in—altering soil chemistry and choking out native plants unless constantly removed. Without intensive and ongoing management (including the use of herbicides that won't be permitted), these invasives could overwhelm any newly created wetlands.

Are we sure that removing this dam will restore fish passage between the ocean and this area? Even if the man-made dams are cleared, what about beaver dams, which are protected by state law and cannot be removed? A fish ladder could help. The idea of creating a clear path for migratory fish is unfortunately more symbolic than practical.

We should also remember that Great Meadows, our treasured local conservation area, is manmade. Nature adapts, and sometimes the systems we've shaped over time come to support rich and important ecosystems. This pond is no exception.

In a rapidly warming climate, this pond also serves as a natural cooling zone for West Concord—a place for boating, bird watching, fishing, and peaceful reflection. Canoeing and kayaking are already well-supported by other rivers in town. And with today's unpredictable winters, a brook would rarely freeze enough for meaningful skating.

We've already lost a significant wildlife corridor and green space to the Warner Woods apartments, and more development is planned. This pond, surrounded by the pressures of growth, is more valuable than ever.

So when we talk about cost, I ask: what is the value of a pond like this? Not just in dollars, but in community, ecology, and spirit. What would we spend to protect it?

Let's not rush to erase 150 years of co-evolved history. Sometimes, keeping something is the more thoughtful choice.

Marcia Schloss

86 Hillside Ave, Concord

4/12/2025 8:45:57 PM

Please consider protecting and preserving Warner's Pond because it is a valuable and beautiful resource for recreation, accessible by car, bicycle, or on foot, to our community. To destroy it would seem to be an enormous waste, and a great loss.

Roy Westerberg

145 Range Road, Concord, MA 01742

4/12/2025 10:29:59 PM

I would like the Warner's Pond Task Force to consider protecting Warner's Pond because the pond is an important recreational space for our community and an accessible resource for underserved populations. People who can't afford a country club or swim club membership can access the pond for fishing, canoeing, kayaking and skating. Kids with two working parents or otherwise without an adult to drive them after school can access the pond by foot or bike. As plans for the MCI property are expected to include affordable housing, the pond is a chance for Concord to provide corresponding, much-needed, affordable recreation for residents. For all these reasons, I hope the Task Force will act to preserve the pond for families to enjoy.

Catherine Neijstrom

316 Commonwealth Ave., Concord, MA 01742

4/13/2025 7:36:03 AM

I am a kayaker living in West Concord. When I bought my kayak, the first place I went was Warner's Pond. I soon learned that the growth of weeds limits this activity to a much shorter season. My view is that dam removal would increase the number of days the area can be used for recreational use.

Mike Jacobs

167 Prairie Street, Concord, MA

4/13/2025 8:31:45 AM

I love being outside and treasure Concord's open spaces. The differences between a healthy place and one full of choking invasives is obvious. I'd love to see the dam removed so the Warner Pond area could come to full health. It may look different than now, but it would be even more beautiful. Don't be afraid of change. Change is the rule of nature.

Mary Ann Lippert

19 Cranberry Lane

4/13/2025 10:12:02 AM

I cannot understand why, after investing to rebuild the Warner's Pond dam, and then investing in buying the Gerow Land, we would suddenly abandon this project and turn the area into a swamp. That is not what people wanted when asked twice before, so why are we revisiting this issue yet again? We want Warner's Pond to stay!

Linda Haynes

353 Thoreau Street, Concord, MA

4/13/2025 10:27:37 AM

Please protect Warner's Pond because this is a precious town resource that once gone -- can never be replaced.

The town already voted to rehabilitate the dam -- not to destroy it! Removing the dam would be going directly against the votes of the people. Doing that would be a disturbing betrayal.

I believe the entire dam removal conversation began as a result of a single astronomical bid that came in during Covid. Since then, we've received a much more reasonable bid (and it would likely have been even lower had we gotten multiple bids originally) and the task force has come up with some excellent solutions to pond management.

Removing the dam would so clearly be against the interests of the community. At a time like the one we are living through at the national level, please listen to the people and put their interests and well-being first. Protect the pond. Protect the interests of Concord citizens.

Jill Korey

42 laws brook rd

4/13/2025 1:04:25 PM

Thank you for the work the Task Force has been doing to figure out the best path forward for Warner's Pond, I appreciate the time and care that has gone into this process. That said, I must say I am troubled that the community has become divided over this issue. I don't believe we should be in this position at all.

I voted for this pond as a recreational set for West Concord, as many others did, and that vote passed with strong support. For years, this was the long-awaited plan people were eager to see happen. And then, quite suddenly, the conversation shifted to removing the pond altogether. I still do not understand the benefit of such a drastic change, nor how it ever became a serious consideration.

We raised our family in Concord, and we frequently spent summers at White's Pond. Even after the kids grew up, my husband and I still kept our membership so we could swim and spend time by the water. But in recent years, White's has often been close during the summer due to algae blooms. When we voted for Warner's Pond to become a swimming and recreational resource, we were told this would ease the burden on White's and give residents more reliable access to water. It was my understanding that both were needed to meet the needs of our community--- not just now, but for the future as well.

Now we are in our 70's, and considered older residents in Concord. With a more careful budget these days, we no longer buy memberships to White's, and find Warner's Pond to be one of the most accessible and enjoyable free natural spaces in the area. I walk into town regularly to the post office, shops, bank, gardens, and then head over to the pond. Even in winter, I make my way out there to see skaters and chat with neighbors. It's a quiet joy in my life, and I know I'm not alone in that feeling.

I do hope the Task Force sees that investing in Warner's Pond was, and still is, a wise thing to do. It will serve many residents well for many, many years to come. Especially now, as more high density housing is being built in this area, more people, young and old will be looking for a nearby, free and accessible place like Warner's Pond to relax, gather, and enjoy the outdoors.

Thank you for listening,

Cosette Dunn

131 Ministerial Drive

Cosette Dunn

131 Ministerial Drive

4/13/2025 12:25:31 PM

The Case for Warner's Pond and Gerow Park

The case for preserving Warner's Pond and Gerow Park I believe can be broken down into 4 categories.

1. Health Benefits

In 2023 the Surgeon General published an advisory describing the epidemic of loneliness and isolation in the country. There have been many studies, published and peer reviewed demonstrating the relation of not only the mental but physical consequences of loneliness. This includes depression and anxiety as well as cardiovascular, pulmonary complications as well as diabetes and strokes.

Looking at our community and the societal dynamics over time one is able to understand why this epidemic has not spared Concord. Long term residents experience the growth of children who eventually move away to begin lives of their own. In addition, spouses grow old and infirm and eventually die. The surviving spouse and parents are left alone.

The support for these individuals, living alone, has been woefully inadequate. The ponds and parks in towns and cities has been shown in numerous studies to reduce the loneliness and affords these citizens the opportunity to gather, enjoy the serenity and beauty of these spaces.

Specifically, the blue, green and grey spaces not only attract people but reduce the loneliness, increase participation in the community and afford an opportunity to exercise. This again is supported by multiple published, peer reviewed studies (On line titled - The Effect of Parks on the Well-being of Communities written by Norman Weinberg MD).

The components of parks that have been proven to contribute to the medical and mental benefits are as follows; 1) Blue spaces – defined as oceans, rivers, lakes and ponds . This does not include small streams; 2) Grey spaces – including benches, paths, railings and accessibility. The grey spaces have been shown to be a factor in attracting citizens, especially the elderly who are the most impacted by isolation; 3) Green spaces - include natural vegetation and natural elements that enhance the attraction of the park.

2. The Unique Contribution of Warner's Pond and Gerow Park to the Community

The central location and easy accessibility of the park is unique for the town. White's pond now requires a fee to belong and does not have the ease of access that Gerow park affords. In addition, it does not have the green space that is found in Gerow Park. As has been

amply shown, the ease of access is an important factor in attracting people, especially the elderly and disabled.

Walden Pond is clearly not accessible without a car or bike. The topography of the pond, although beautiful and historic, makes navigation for the elderly and disabled a great barrier.

3. Historical Relevance

Much has been raised about returning the pond to its original status when native Americans lived in this area. It has been noted that removing the dam would significantly reduce the “footprint” of Warner Pond. As noted in the review of the effect of the parks and ponds, reducing the “Blue Space” will reduce the attractiveness of the park. The result of this would be reducing the attraction of the pond.

See part 2 next page

Norman Weinberg MD

26 Hillside Ave, Concord, MA.

4/13/2025 1:45:28 PM

3. Historical Relevance

Much has been raised about returning the pond to its original status when native Americans lived in this area. It has been noted that removing the dam would significantly reduce the “footprint” of Warner's Pond. As noted in the review of the effect of the parks and ponds, reducing the “Blue Space” will reduce the attractiveness of the park. The result of this would be reducing the attraction of the pond.

Although the historical relevance of returning the pond to pre 1600's state is of utmost importance in Concord, with its remarkable historical background, where does one draw the line for restoration. The town is dynamic as are its needs. Native Americans did not need to commute to Boston. Route 2 and the commuter rail were not present. The post office did not exist, etc. The need to harvest eels and Alewife is not the critical element of survival it was in the era before Concord became occupied by settlers.

The evolving nature of society has created an environment that has resulted in the epidemic of isolation and loneliness. We must acknowledge this dynamic nature and facilitate methods to adapt, not only with methods of commuting but addressing the negative impact of modernization that has resulted in the epidemic of loneliness we have today.

4. Costs

The financial burden is always a major consideration in the decision of how to manage the park and pond. There are those who may never use these facilities and object to the costs. This may create division and resentment among town residents. However, there are many projects in Concord that benefit only a fraction of the population. Were this to be a factor in the decision of how of manage Gerow Park and Warner's Pond, it must take into consideration the health benefits the elderly who have contributed so much into making Concord the beautiful town it has become.

Norman Weinberg MD

Noman Weinberg

26 Hillside Ave., Concord, MA.

4/14/2025 5:52:24 PM

Warner's Pond should be preserved and improved for the many recreation opportunities available to residents including boating, fishing, skating, and picnics/cookouts with a view of the scenic pond reflecting the sky. Given the rising housing density in W Concord, there is a need for open water recreation within walking and biking distance for children and families with limited transportation. Residents appreciate the long history and cultural heritage of Warner's Pond and want to preserve and extend family connections to this valuable community resource.

Why deprive residents and many other species of animals and plants that depend on Warner's Pond when fish ladders are a proven solution to allow migratory fish to access upstream spawning areas? A solution for migratory fish is not an immediate need, since additional dams in other towns currently block migratory fish access to Warner's Pond.

In 2006, Concord invested \$2,000,000 to rebuild Warner's Pond dam. In 2018, residents voted to spend \$3,000,000 to acquire the Gerow property for public access to the waterfront. Squandering \$5,000,000 of voter approved investments less than 20 years after rebuilding the dam and less than one year after completion of Gerow Park is irresponsible and disrespectful to voters that approved these initiatives.

Between 2018 and 2022, Concord voters approved funds of over \$3,000,000 for pond restoration including dredging. How and why has the town redirected and spent substantial consulting funds on dam removal that was never approved by voters?

Patrick Guiney

62 Wright Rd

4/14/2025 3:13:39 PM

I am very much in favor of retaining Warner's Pond as a pond. The appeal as a body of water that benefits the town far outweighs removal of the dam and returning the waterway to its "natural" state by letting the brook "run free." The "natural state" of the area would require removal of neighborhoods, sewer systems, bridges, retaining walls and a major highway! West Concord has evolved along with the pond over the years and as the studies have shown, it is possible to maintain a healthy pond with more economical dredging options.

My family has enjoyed numerous outings to Scout Island as part of the Scout organizations in town and it serves as a special milestone tradition for so many kids who pass through Concord Scouting. For a typical 5th grader, nothing beats the excitement of boating out to the island with their gear, setting up camp, making a rope bridge and crossing over it to move from a Cub Scout to a Boy Scout! Cooking dinner, watching the swans and listening to the birds and frogs is all part of that experience. Not all families are outdoorsy enough to go out in a boat on their own, and having the chance to do it so close to home with Scouts was great for kids and parents alike.

Warner Pond has an appeal unlike the masses who flock to the disappearing shore at Walden, or the exclusivity of White with its private member-only parking-sticker beaches and docks (remember the town portion is exclusive if you aren't quick enough to get a pass.) It's a beautiful hidden gem that serves regular people of this town and should not be lost.

Laura Ely

279 Ministerial Dr., Concord MA

4/14/2025 7:06:22 PM

I love the idea of removing the dam. Since it is obsolete I feel that we should restore Nashoba Brook to its natural state. Concord is known for its environmental leadership and removing the dam would be in line with our town's ecological stewardship.

Gwen Shipley

89 Wilson Road

4/14/2025 7:10:49 PM

I am in favor of restoring Warner's Pond to its natural state by removing the dam. We as citizens are not always given the opportunity to revert something to its natural state, we should take this unique opportunity to do so and restore this important ecosystem.

Meaghan Sinclair

785 Barretts Mill Road

4/14/2025 7:52:54 PM

4/14/2025 8:15:49 PM

I am a huge supporter of saving the pond. It is a regular destination for my boys and their friends to go fishing. It is a safe and accessible location where they successfully catch and release for hours and stay off screens! I also frequent the rail trail and enjoy the view, tranquility and wildlife on the stretch adjacent to the pond. Please keep this precious natural resource intact.

Lauren Beresford

604 Old Marlboro Road

4/14/2025 8:24:28 PM

I would like to state my support for the saving and continued commitment to Warners Pond as an asset for the Concord community. Warners Pond is important culturally, and important for the Town in that it supports free access to water in the center of the Concord community. It provides an outlet for those who potentially have less and are more vulnerable with less recreational opportunities. Warners Pond also is thriving with wildlife and frankly one of the gems of the entire Town. The community has been consistent in its support for Warners Pond from voting the new park next to the pond and for the support of this asset over the years, including dredging and other ways keeping it a viable resource. The Task Force has come up with viable economic approaches to protect this asset and make it a water recreational area for community use, and I urge the Task Force to consider those alternatives.

Troy McClelland

50 Wright Road, Concord, MA 01742

4/14/2025 8:16:51 PM

We have lived in West Concord for over 30 years and raised 4 children here. Our community has experienced extensive housing and population growth over these years and West Concord's inclusion in the new MBTA Communities Multi-family Zoning Overlay District (adopted at the 2024 Annual Town Meeting) promises more explosive growth.

While more affordable housing in West Concord is promising, we are concerned about the lack of open recreational space for our expanding community. We believe it is critical to preserve our local environmental resources within a walkable distance.

Our back yard abuts Rideout Playground (across the street from Warner's Pond) and over the years, the West Concord community has banded together to protect Rideout as a multi-use open space area for all to enjoy. Well intended people have sought to convert the open space at Rideout into a premiere baseball stadium with 3 to 4 fenced in baseball fields. While it sounded like a good idea for the baseball families (which we were), this effort was short-sighted and would have limited the range of open space activities such as soccer, frisbee, and kite flying that the broader community enjoys today.

We are concerned that removing the dam from Warner's pond is similarly short sighted.

In July of 2018, Town Meeting approved over \$2.7M to purchase and build out the Gerow Recreation Area (7 acres) on Warner's Pond. The approved plan included a shoreline walk, kayaking and a beach/swimming area. The community was excited about expanded recreational plans.

At one point a survey was sent out to gather feedback on the cost of the Gerow Park efforts. Many residents I know were not aware of the survey or the impact it would have, however it appears the findings were used to make dramatic changes to the approved town meeting plan eliminating many recreational benefits in favor of a much smaller "park" and setting the stage for dam removal. Detailed summary of the timeline:

<https://concordma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/25677/Public-Update-Meeting-Summary--72820-B>.

As the town continues to add more housing and more residents to West Concord, I would recommend that we consider the future recreational needs of an expanded West Concord population and retain the Pond. Removing the dam now is short sighted and would not only eliminate current recreational activities but it would also eliminate future opportunities for expanded recreational activities for all to enjoy.

That all said, we appreciate all of the hard work this task force has put in to research and gather feedback from the community on the future of this treasured West Concord resource. Thank you for your service!

Jean Easterday

48 Maple St

West Concord, MA 01742

easterdayfamily@omcast.net

978-888-7515

Jean Easterday

48 Maple St Concord MA

4/14/2025 8:31:29 PM

I am writing to encourage the Warner's Pond Task Force to support recurring pond management & dredging as the next steps forward.

In 1961 residents voted to purchase the pond, in 2006 residents voted to rehabilitate the dam, in 2018 residents voted to purchase the Gerow property and in the following years residents voted for funds for the Warner's Pond Restoration Project.

When we moved to West Concord in 2017 we heard countless stories of how the pond was a great community asset and that residents were looking forward to the restoration project to bring more of those opportunities back. It was a positive factor in our decision to buy a home in West Concord.

The residents of Concord have never voted to remove the dam! Quite the opposite. With the MCI property changing, there most certainly will be population growth in West Concord...but if the dam is removed and the pond is not restored as voters expected, where are the recreation areas for this growing population? If the dam is removed, you lose a recreational asset to this community forever.

Nicole McClelland

50 Wright Road

4/4/2025 5:25:41 PM

I am in support of dredging the pond and maintaining it as a recreational spot for Concord residents.

Lana Grom

141 Mildred Circle

4/4/2025 4:17:15 PM

I would like to know more about how exactly the brook would be engineered if the dam was removed. When would that rerouting of the brook happen and what would it cost? Am I right to assume that the brook would not naturally follow the path by the new park, by the scout island, and by the landing at Comm Ave? If it needs to be forced to touch these areas, what happens if/when it overflows the engineered banks and goes its own way? Is frequent maintenance needed to keep it flowing where we would want it to go?

And huge thank you to everyone on the task force who has put in so many hours of volunteer time to try to come up with the best plan!

Marcia Schloss

86 Hillside Ave

4/4/2025 9:03:53 PM

This process is causing the residents to lose confidence in the town government. When I first read the task force report, my reaction was that it is littered with bias towards dam removal. Last night's meeting reinforced that perception. Everything from the poster board displays to the sequence of the presentations reeked of bias. The risks of the dam removal option on the poster board had rebuttals underneath them. Where were the rebuttals for the other options? Dam removal was presented last, the prime spot for persuasion, and being last meant that questioners of dam removal were limited. The answer to my question on why a bid from three years ago is now cut in half was uninspiring. We asked the prison, and they said we should put it inside their compound! Really!! and we didn't ask about more cost-effective options. A kindergartener could have pointed across the street and said what about over there. That is either incompetence or severe bias. I implore the task force to openly discuss the issue of bias in the process and its impact on the community. If citizens lose trust in their government, nothing good follows, and we are on our way down that path.

Don Parker

43 Pond Street

4/5/2025 8:23:10 AM

Please describe how all of the Task Force options will be evaluated upon final submission. For example, say the dredging and maintenance of the pond received the most votes but the Task Force is that result binding for future expenditures? Does the NRC have veto powers? Does the Select Board have veto powers? Is there a straightforward path to bring the decision-making to Town Meeting if the preferred alternative is not selected?

Will the Task Force include future financial/fiscal management proposals to improve the expenditures based on the selected options? Will a formal timeline and schedule be produced to ensure approved options are available and implemented in a timely and effective manner? (for example; 2025 - improve public access at Gerow, existing boat landing, & primitive pathway; 2026 dredging and boat launch & dock at Gerow.

Will the Task Force make recommendations to appoint a new citizen body or upgrade the West Concord Advisory Group charge to include continuing implementation of pond improvements?

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

4/5/2025 10:04:46 AM

I grew up near Great Meadows wildlife sanctuary, and it's the most cherished memories I have as a child. My two young boys, and I love exploring all the different green spaces in Concord and Carlisle to hike and explore, and it breaks my heart thinking that Warner's pond may not be available to them because of some people who value money over serenity and community and animals. Natural habitats must be protected at all costs, especially with the trying political climate we need more green spaces and less developments. Warners pawn should be certified as a habitat area and be protected from continued influence by parties only interested in making money. If you need money so badly, go back to charging people to pay for parking longer than 15 minutes. Their problem solved! There's many fundraisers we can do to pay for keeping warner's pond, free of invasive that are swallowing up the ecosystem. One of my favorite childhood memories was when Ed Begley Junior came to lead a March through town In support of Walden Woods. We can do that again!!

Julie Walker

161 River Rd

4/5/2025 12:09:49 PM

I appreciated the TF requiring a uniform presentation of the three proposals, especially of the risks/uncertainties associated with each.

I want to inform the TF about an area of potential risk/exposure associated with one of the proposals that I have become aware of in the last year - the possible financial and legal risk to the Town from taking an action that negatively impacts property values.

I have had three appraisals of my property done by two different appraisers in the last thirteen months. Both appraisers noticed the Save Warners Pond signs in my neighborhood and asked about them during their property visits. Both appraisers informed me that the appraised value of my property would be significantly lower without the water view. Neither would specify how much lower. Both said they would have to see it because appraisals of property values are made on existing conditions. The first appraiser asserted that, in his opinion, if the dam was removed and the open water view was replaced with a marsh view, that would make for a winnable case against the town for the negative impact on property values. I confirmed this opinion with the second appraiser just last month. Apparently appraisers often testify to property values in property disputes.

Many others have discussed this issue of property values with real estate brokers and have been told that their listing price would decrease by up to 20% if their water view over the pond goes away. FOWP has actively discouraged raising property values as an issue, assuming that the TF would eventually take this issue up, especially when TF members discovered that some property lines extend into the pond. Now that the forum has happened and the TF is nearing the end of its work, it seems critical to get this issue out there on the record for both the Task Force and Town leadership to understand.

This seems to me to be a risk that Town leadership needs to be made aware of and thoroughly explore with Town Counsel. Whether or not the TF recommends dam removal as the best course of action right now, I strongly urge the TF to make the NRC, the SB, and Town leadership aware of all of the risks and uncertainties associated with dam removal, including the potential financial and legal exposure to the Town that could result from dam removal's impact on property values.

Allison Aley

47 Warner St

4/4/2025 7:33:32 PM

I have some concerns about the information given by the Dam Removal Task Force at Thursday night's meeting at the Town House. We were shown some colorful pictures of where the water will go if the dam is removed from Warner's Pond. However, without a bathymetric survey—which would provide accurate data on the depth and contours of the pond—such modeling is speculative. Certainly, you can't even begin to consider dam removal until that survey takes place. Apparently, the current cost of a survey is \$18,000. The NRC got a bid of \$15,000 in 2024 which raises the question of why the survey wasn't done when that information could have been useful to all three of the task forces. If a survey could have been done for \$15,000 in 2024, it does raise a valid question—why wasn't that prioritized before commissioning a \$300,000 design for partial removal?

It seems to me that, if the dam is removed, there will need to be potentially millions of dollars spent on engineering so that water will flow past the public landings and Scout Island. And then a great deal of money will need to be spent annually to manage the newly emerging wetlands.

I am one of those very lucky people who has lived on this glorious body of water for over 4 decades. Not a day goes by that I am not grateful to live here where I can see a Great Blue Heron go stalking by my shore. Where I can watch our teens fishing from the dam in the summer and groups of kids playing hockey when the pond freezes each winter. If the dam is removed I will apparently have a stream in my backyard possibly surrounded by wetlands. That makes me concerned about mosquitos. Has there been any discussion of how the insect population will be affected? Despite the great work done by all of our incredible volunteers, it seems there are still questions to be asked and answered.

Enid Hart Boasberg

48 Laws Brook Road

4/6/2025 7:55:43 AM

Please save anything that help people to preserve green space and natural settings in general because is about our health as society.

BK Bazhe

325 Collage Road, Concord, MA 01742

4/6/2025 11:30:31 AM

Though the pond gets overgrown with water chestnut and other growth, it is wonderful and canoe-able for the spring and fall. The winter provides skating and a great view. Please do not remove the dam and destroy the wonderful pond that we have.

Richard McGirr

50 Church Street

4/6/2025 12:14:45 PM

To the members of the Dredging WPTF subgroup on Dredging.

Thank you for your excellent presentation.

A question was asked about the Northfield disposal site and why it wasn't included in the original dredge plan. The subgroup responded that, when asked by the Town, MCI hadn't identified the site as an option[a].

However, this isn't true. On August 31, 2022, Jeffery Quick of MCI emailed town officials to offer the Northfield location as an alternative disposal site[b]. That was seven days BEFORE proposals were due. Contrary to what was stated, it was an option and it's likely the RFP could've been quickly amended using the Northfield location.

A better question to ask – WHY was the Northfield site EXCLUDED from the Alternative's Report? Its exclusion was spelled out in the justification letter the Natural Resources Division sent to the Town Manager requesting the hiring of EA[c]. Specifically, it stated,

"..The first alternative is to modify the dredging approach to move sediment within the pond, instead of pumping the spoil outside the pond and relocating it another location on MCI property.." The other location was likely the Northfield site.

This severely limited EA's ability to provide the public with a viable dredge option and ultimately led to a dam removal recommendation. Please note that, with the exception of a brief mention to the NRC, it appears the Northfield site remained unknown to the public until February 2024, when related information was forwarded to the WPTF.

Can someone on the subgroup provide the public with an answer to these questions, the first on why the RFP wasn't amended to include the Northfield site and (more importantly) why it was omitted from the Alternatives Report?

Respectfully,

Miguel

Footnotes:

[a] <https://youtu.be/yUbT32k8FVv?si=i3tG4TzBgQr54nKo&t=2893>

[b] Source: Email between Jeffery Quick (MCI) and Delia Kaye (Concord NRD) – this document was previously shared with the WPTF in February 2024 – document can be reshared and provided upon request.

[c] Source: November 9, 2022, letter from Delia Kaye (NRD Director) to Kerry Lafleur (Town Manager) seeking a sole sourced justification to hire EA Engineering to produce the Alternatives Report – document available upon request

Miguel Echavarri

Homeowner - 255 Commonwealth Ave

4/6/2025 2:33:04 PM

While attending the FOWP meeting last Thursday I was somewhat surprised to see so many interested town folks wanting to hear more current information through committee members and their awareness-of-facts, up-to-date historical information and an honest rough estimation of cost-data available concerning Warner's Pond. In short, I was pleased to see the Task Force panel "knock-it-out-the-park".

Richard Loynd

20 Crest Street, West Concord

4/7/2025 10:05:48 AM

We have listened and read much information about Warner's Pond and what to do. Having lived both on the pond previously and in West Concord since childhood, we feel that keeping it as a pond is the best option. The influx of new residences and the higher density of population here will welcome the many different uses the pond offers. We voted to purchase the Gerow property with a plan to provide recreation. Let's follow through so we can enjoy the flora and fauna of Warner's--a treasure not easily given up.

Hank and Lauri Bertied

1563 Main Street

4/7/2025 12:54:09 PM

Please save the pond! It is an invaluable piece of recreation and beauty for our town!

Gabe Ellis-Ferrara

351 commonwealth avenue, concord

4/7/2025 1:25:56 PM

I attended the meeting on April 3 and also read your report. My heartfelt thanks for all the work you have put into seeking the best path forward for Warner's Pond. I am an enthusiastic supporter of dismantling the dam and working with nature to allow this area to revert to its original state; i.e. a much smaller pond and a river and various kinds of marshes and wetlands. I am excited at the prospect of anadromous fish returning! I realize from listening to comments at the meeting that abutting residents are opposed this option. I have sympathy for them wanting to keep the pond, which absolutely has its beauty. But it seems to me that trying to keep the pond at its current size will inevitably lead to periodic expensive dredging and the constant need to deal with invasive plants. The pond was artificially created and will always require a high level of maintenance. Also, with climate change causing increasing droughts and higher temperatures, the water temperature of the pond, if kept at its current size, will most likely continue to rise, leading to increased eutrophication. It could well be that the pond that residents cherish today is already an artifact of the past that will not be possible to hold onto.

Pam Swing

54 Frances Street, Concord

4/7/2025 5:01:37 PM

Subject: Feedback on Last Week's Task Force Meeting

I was very disappointed by how the April 3rd task force meeting was conducted. Given the significant community interest in this topic, future meetings should be extended or followed up with additional sessions to ensure everyone has a chance to ask questions.

I'm also concerned about the experience of those who joined via Zoom. Many participants, including myself, felt excluded. It was disheartening to find that Zoom attendees were blocked from participating live, and their questions were not addressed in real time. Personally, I had a question in the queue for over 30 minutes, and it was never acknowledged.

This setup made many of us feel unheard and disconnected from the discussion. I urge you to reconsider how these meetings are structured going forward. This is an important issue for our community, and everyone deserves the opportunity to be heard and involved in the conversation.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Lisa Theriault

118 Wright Rd

Lisa Theriault

118 wright road

4/7/2025 6:46:20 PM

I think it is important that the proposal that gets backed by the task force 1) has a clear timeline included and 2) if it is proposal 1 or 2, that it includes establishment of a Warner's Pond Stewardship committee.

Anna Feldweg

343 Commonwealth Ave

4/8/2025 1:32:38 PM

Hello FOWP Task Force Members,

My name is Nancy Gerow Sumski and I, along with my family, wish to convey our gratitude to all who have worked so diligently on the many issues regarding Gerow Park and Warner's Pond preservation! The detailed documents explaining the history and what has occurred over the years were extremely well written, concise and informative. The Park is a treasure for us to come back to visit and we're so thrilled to see many people enjoying the area as much as we did for many, many years. We hope in time that the recreational piece that was a part of the original plan does come to fruition. Good luck on the next steps.

- Nancy and family

Nancy Gerow Sumski

9 New South Drive

4/9/2025 9:50:44 AM

I walk my dog at Warners Pond/Gerow Park 6 of 7 early mornings a week and wanted to note that for about 3 weeks every year beginning in mid-March as the ice recedes, Warners Pond is host to a huge number of migratory birds that head north to the lakes and ponds of northern New England. This year there were >100 hooded mergansers, ring-necked ducks and common mergansers of both sexes (all diving waterfowl). During this time there were also a pair of broad-winged hawks, a pair of bald eagles and an osprey. I have also seen multiple times a family of 4 otters use the partial ice shelf that time of year to fish/frog from. Almost all of the birds have moved on but I think this is a critical stopping point for them.

Andrea McClatchey

79 Old Bridge Road

4/9/2025 2:19:33 PM

I am grateful to the Task Force for all the work they have done exploring options for the future of Warner's Pond.

After hearing the presentations on April 3, 2025, I am very interested in the dam removal option. In a time where natural ecosystems are being lost with increased development, I would welcome a project like this which would increase diverse habitat types for many species. I envision a beautiful landscape of wetlands, marsh and swamp areas teeming with life. The proposed walking trails would give the public an opportunity to become familiar with these rich habitats.

I was also interested to hear that there would be interpretive information about human history near Nashoba Brook and later Warner's Pond.

A successful dam removal and wildlife habitat restoration here in Concord could be a helpful example for other communities considering a dam removal.

Lyell Slade

17 Orchard Rd

Concord, MA

Lyell Slade

17 Orchard Rd, Concord, MA

4/9/2025 2:32:29 PM

Hats off to the tax force for their Herculean efforts to inform the citizens of Concord about options for Warner's Pond! After listening to their comments at the April 3 meeting, I am convinced that the Town should dredge the pond to preserve it, for several reasons:

To maintain and enhance the current ecosystems in and around the pond, which are disappearing in many places.

To offer the recreational resources that the pond offers to Concordians and our visitors.

To enjoy the beauty of a picturesque body of water, set in a charming historic village.

To preserve evidence of Concord's history, not only during the American Revolution, but also the Industrial Revolution.

Pamela Sogard

312 Deacon Haynes Road, Concord MA 01742

4/10/2025 2:14:26 PM

Back in the 1960s, some of our rivers were so polluted that they caught on fire. It was easy to see that we needed to clean up our environment and in the 55 years since then, we have done a lot. One of the ways devised to protect further damage to our rivers was the enactment of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968. This act authorized Congress to preserve certain rivers with outstanding natural, cultural and recreational values in a free-flowing condition. Note the words free-flowing, because way back in 1968 Congress realized the value of free-flowing rivers to protect the water quality and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes.

The free-flowing portion of the SuAsCo watershed, from the dam in Framingham and the Damonmill Dam in Concord, downstream to the Talbot Mill Dam in Billerica and its tributaries, were designated in 1995 as a Wild and Scenic River. A partnership river stewardship council was formed specifically to protect the river resources. Since its designation the River Stewardship Council with its partner organizations, including members from the towns, OARS, SVT, and CLCT, have done a yeomans job in protecting and enhancing the rivers. Among other efforts, we have removed hundreds if not thousands of tons of trash and invasive water chestnuts from the rivers and associated streams and ponds.

As a result of such efforts the Assabet River is no longer called “the cesspool of Massachusetts.” But, also we no longer have as clear signs that our rivers are in danger. However, the danger to our rivers remain. As long as we have dams on our rivers and their tributaries that no longer serve their intended purpose, we have dams that unnecessarily disrupt and impair the natural ecology. When dams are removed, water quality improves as do the recreational and ecological values of the restored streams.

The Warner’s Pond Dam is one such dam. It is time to remove the dam and restore Nashoba Brook.

Elissa Brown

5 Concord Greene, #1, Concord, MA 01742

4/10/2025 2:11:11 PM

I am one of the owners of Nashoba Brook Bakery. I am also one of the principals in the ownership of the building where the bakery is located. We obviously have a vested interest in the outcome of the decisions made about what to do with Warner's Pond and the Brook. My background as an attorney and my early career working for The Conservation Fund in Arlington VA and then as a legal intern at The Natural Resources Defense Council and also at The Conservation Law Foundation in Boston also color my view of the questions presented. I think we begin this debate with an acknowledgement of the deteriorating and unhealthy condition of Warner's Pond. I don't think there is controversy about the poor health of this resource. If I am right about that, then this debate should properly be about what we might do to mitigate that deterioration. One option, dredging the Pond, presents as likely to be prohibitively expensive. A second option, removing the dam and restoring the free flow of Nashoba Brook, is almost without qualification the best option for the health of the resource. The benefits of dam removal have been much discussed and documented. However, local residents who enjoy the amenity of Warner's pond are strongly opposed to this option. I think, all things considered, a third option presents as the choice most likely to satisfy the greatest numbers of stakeholders. As I understand it, there is the possibility of removing the dam AND dredging a much smaller section of the pond. If what I have been told is correct, this third option would restore the free flow of the Brook, engendering the associated environmental benefits, AND create a pond that could be the locus of future recreational opportunities and aesthetic qualities prized by local residents. Perhaps a boardwalk through wetland areas created by such a project might also be something that Town could choose to develop. It seems to me that this third option would satisfy more of the goals articulated over the last years by stakeholders in the outcome of this debate than either of the other two options.

John Gates

Nashoba Brook Bakery, 152 Commonwealth Ave, Concord

4/10/2025 2:16:54 PM

As a Concord resident and homeowner whose property abuts the Assabet river, I fully support the removal of the dam in an effort to restore Nashoba Brook. I believe this is important for both ecological and climate resiliency purposes. Our property, along with that of many neighbors, is prone to flooding; a risk that is heightened being downstream from a dam which could fail and release a large volume of water in a short period of time. Other dam removal projects have demonstrated a reduced flooding risk by eliminating the potential for such dam failure. Thank you for your consideration of my perspective.

4/10/2025 2:55:38 PM

I am in favor of removing the dam. Thanks for your efforts to do so!

angela

stow street Concord

4/10/2025 5:23:43 PM

I support Task Force Option #3, removing the dam, restoring Nashoba Brook, and building amenities to provide access to the resulting wetlands, pond, and Scout Island. It seems like the most fiscally, ecologically, and recreationally sound option. While I appreciate that the pondfront properties regret the loss of their access, the pond's usability decreases every year, and #3 is the best way to preserve some pond while improving the ecosystem and providing additional recreation for the whole town, including the ability to paddle all the way from Egg Rock to Gerow Park.

Michael Dettelbach

89 Assabet Avenue

4/10/2025 6:20:43 PM

Please make all the comments from the public that came in after the meeting available publicly, because they are part of the meeting, and unlike the sticky notes, people are identified as Concord residents.

Anna Feldweg

343 Commonwealth Ave, Concord

4/11/2025 5:10:49 AM

I support removal of the dam.

Christina Kendrick

46 Peter Spring Rd Concord

4/11/2025 7:39:03 AM

Dam removal and the returning of Nashoba Brook into its original natural state is extremely important. The dam was built to run a mill that was used so for several future enterprises. There is no longer a need for mills. The dam cut off fish passage and disconnected ecosystems. It has become too costly to keep this shallow pond dredged. It is time to reestablish the natural flow of the Brook.

Patricia Wolfe

12 Kay's Walk, Carlisle

4/11/2025 9:30:18 AM

I support the removal of the Warner's pond dam because it is the best for the environment. Dam's are a relic of the Industrial Revolution and the science is clear that the dam's disrupt the ecosystem. While I realize the residents surrounding Warner's pond fear the elimination of the pond I believe they will be happy with a more robust sanctuary for wildlife once the dam and pond are gone. If Concordians truly "walk the walk" for sustainability the obvious choice is to remove the dam.

Dave Wester

33 Spring Road Concord

4/11/2025 10:17:55 AM

I attended the Public Forum last Thursday and brought a written public comment with me to read. I chose not to read it because Toby specifically encouraged people to send in written comments to the Task Force at the end of the meeting. He led us all to believe that submitted written comments would be a continuation of the public comment process and that the Task Force would consider all comments sent in. This made sense as the Task Force is now moving toward generating recommendations to the NRC and wants to hear from the public.

I've since learned that the Task Force is indeed receiving a lot of written public comments, which is wonderful news since that is what they requested. But I've also heard that they have yet to figure out how to make these written comments public so that everyone can see them. I am writing to strongly urge the Task Force to make all of the written comments public immediately, before the Task Force meets again. The technological know how to make written public comments available to the public exists within the town as the Select Board already does this. So there is no excuse for the Task Force not to. Not making written comments public after specifically requesting people to write them is disrespectful to the public commenters and prevents the public, town leadership, and other town entities from having the same information and perspective that the Task Force has.

How can anyone understand or assess the Task Force's recommendations if they don't know the public response to the proposals? How can the NRC assess public support for the Task Force's recommendations if they have not seen the public comments to the proposals? How can the Select Board or the Town Manager know if the Task Force is considering public comments if they can't see the public comments? How can people become educated about differing points of view if the public comments are not made public? The public, the town commissions who are represented on the Task Force, and Town leadership all deserve to hear/read all voices that contribute to and inform the Task Force's deliberations and recommendations. If public comments are not made public, the recommendations will lack credibility due to lack of transparency about public support. Keeping public comments secret allows mischaracterization or disavowal of those public comments now or in the future and that creates dissension and division in the community. This is a critical time for the Task Force to be transparent.

The Task Force should not meet until the Public Forum closes out, meaning that all public comments have been received and made public. The integrity and credibility of the Task Force is at stake. Toby specifically called on people at the Public Forum to submit written public comments to the Task Force. OARs has just sent out a broad appeal to its members to submit public comments to the Task Force by this Monday. Many people have already

submitted written public comments. It would be a great disservice to the Task Force and the public for the Task Force to move forward before all of the public comments are made public.

Allison Aley

47 Warner St

4/11/2025 10:41:18 AM

The dam should go. Restore the natural flows of the Nashoba Brook.

Chris Schaffner

534 Old Marlboro Rd Concord, MA 01742

4/11/2025 11:44:00 AM

I am in favor of restoring something like the "native" flow of the brook. I do wonder how long the ca 4-5 acre remaining pond would last, given the possible high rate of sedimentation from upstream.

I passionately hope the Talbot dam on the Concord river will be removed soon...

John Emery

21 Thoreau St Concord, Mass.

4/11/2025 12:50:58 PM

Part 1.

Dear Members of the Task Force, I am writing to recommend that you support Proposal #3, dam removal and restoration of Nashoba Brook. As a conservation biologist who has worked primarily in this area, I know that our rivers and streams are among the most critically degraded of our natural systems. At the same time that our forested landscape has regrown, albeit in altered form, from the height of land clearing in the 19th Century, our rivers and streams continue to suffer from interruption by dams, from channelization, pollution, climate change, and the widespread introduction of non-native species. Here in New England, the ability of our wildlife populations to recover from past anthropogenic damage is largely restricted by our infrastructure - primarily our roadways on land and our dams and inadequate culverts in riparian aquatic systems.

As the Task Force notes in their excellent "Alternatives Under Consideration" document, Warner's Pond was created in 1857 for narrow economic interest. The raising of the dam on Nashoba Brook would have caused massive ecological disruption to the fauna and flora of the Brook at that time. This was, of course, not an isolated action. Other dams were built on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers, on Nashoba and Fort Pond Brooks, and on almost every notable river and stream in the Commonwealth. Today, there are over 3,000 extant dams in our state, most of them no longer fulfilling their original economic functions. As the result of all of this extended interruption of free-flowing riparian ecosystems, our wildlife species that are largely dependent upon rivers and streams have been devastated. Wood turtles, brook trout, shortnose sturgeon, brook snake tail dragonfly, and brook floater mussels are among the many species that likely once occurred in the Concord River / Nashoba Brook system and all are barely clinging to existence now in eastern Massachusetts.

Warner's Pond certainly provides habitat for many fish, birds, frogs, and other wildlife. Yet, the habitat provided is the aquatic analogue of large mowed fields on land - a simplified system, dependent (as is the focus of this task Force) on repeated human disturbance (i.e. dredging), and inhabited by a low diversity community of mostly common species, many of which (primarily the fish, crayfish, and submergent plant species) are non-native. Concord has dozens of dam-impounded open ponds that provide similar habitat yet almost no long stretches of free-flowing perennial stream habitat.

My familiarity with the Nashoba Brook system derives primarily from 5 years of work not the restoration of wood turtle populations in areas of Fort Pond and Nashoba Brook just upstream of Warner's Pond. These river-dependent turtles were once a familiar icon of the

Concord area and were often written about in Thoreau's journals. Today, there are likely fewer than 10 individuals left in Concord, mostly in a short free-flowing section of Elm Brook. The upstream populations in Acton are tiny and greatly restricted by available habitat. Our native brook mussel and crayfish populations are extirpated, or nearly so, and, because of Warner's Pond, the population of creek chub suckers (a Species of Greatest Conservation Need) that occurs in sections of the brooks in Acton, are absent from Concord.

We have a wonderful opportunity to take a strong step towards restoring the ecological health of one of our most significant stream systems. Dam removal would help a number of rare and declining species and would represent an important step towards allowing our riparian ecosystems to undergo some of the same ecological recovery that has happened with the regrowth of our forests. We should not wait until Billerica and Lowell solve all of the upstream dam-related problems. We have this opportunity to take an important step towards restoring the health of Concord's ecosystems.

Bryan Windmilller

65 Arrowhead Road, Concord, MA

4/11/2025 1:21:21 PM

Part 2:

Dear Members of the Warner's Pond Task Force,

Having just recommended to you that you support Proposal 3, the removal of the Warner's Pond dam and the restoration of Nashoba Brook, I am writing here to suggest that you consider a possible modification of Proposal 3 that better takes into account the very legitimate desires of so many of the residents of the area bordering Warner's Pond.

Although, as I have argued, I believe that Warner's Pond provides very little in the way of locally or regionally significant wildlife habitat, it does provide something very special to the residents who use the pond for boating, fishing, skating, camping on Scout Island, and just generally enjoying the open views and the wildlife that uses Warner's Pond.

It occurs to me that it might be possible to remove the Warner's Pond Dam and thus restore flow to Nashoba Brook and to preserve a considerably larger section of open pond than is envisioned in the 30% design plan presented at the public meeting on this matter on April 3 of this year. Perhaps it is possible to do some more limited dredging around the deeper basin of the pond that would remain permanently-flooded after dam removal, and to use a low dike and a gated water control system to allow some degree of water circulation between the pond area and the Brook. Such impoundments, like the ones at Great Meadows National Wildlife Refuge, are very common and the management of such systems is well understood. Moreover, shallow impoundment ponds with managed flow are often tremendously productive for wildlife. Witness the fact the Concord Impoundments at Great Meadows are among the most visited areas in our entire National Wildlife Refuge System.

I don't know if the simple vision that I describe here is feasible. The area may be too small and otherwise constrained. It would also be a more expensive option than dam removal alone, as it would require a limited amount of dredging now and, like at Great Meadows, it would also require future small-scale dredging operations. This scenario would certainly not provide lovers of Warner's Pond with their ideal solution. The resulting pond would be much smaller than it is now. Much of it would doubtless be covered by submergent vegetation, not ideal for activities like skating and it might make canoeing in the shallower parts of the pond a real pain in the summer months. However, it could provide both a restored Nashoba Brook ecosystem and a fairly large open pond that, because of this greater vegetative complexity (mix of stream habitat, open water, and various kinds of emergent and wooded wetland habitats), would truly be a wildlife oasis in West Concord. It

could also, crucially, provide a more open, expansive viewshed that is so attractive to we humans.

Respectfully Yours,

Bryan Windmiller

Bryan Windmiller

65 Arrowhead Road, Concord, MA

4/12/2025 12:40:29 PM

Thank you for your work on this task force. I'm a Concord resident, writing in support of restoring Nashoba Brook because of the myriad positive environmental impacts it will have on local/regional wildlife and ecosystems, water quality and overall climate-resiliency of the SuAsCo watershed.

It revives critical cold-water habitat for native fish and wildlife

It improves fish passage, allowing migratory species like brook trout to return upstream

It improves water quality and reconnects fragmented ecosystems

It offers a healthier, climate-resilient future for the SuAsCo watershed

Carolyn Wilkins

51 Hillside Avenue, Concord

4/12/2025 4:04:17 PM

Please save Warner's Pond. This body of land and water should be considered a nature preserve! Stop what is being planned before it's too late.

Carole Lee

37 Wells Road Lincoln, MA 01773

4/12/2025 4:17:58 PM

I appreciate all the work that the task force has done and the three options (or mix of) that were presented recently. I like the option 1, to do some real pond management, learn from that and see what happens w all that will happen (For example, upstream dam removal and plans to develop MCI Concord area) before deciding further. It is possible the development in that area could also ask for contributions to pond management and dredging. Keep up the great work! We love the pond!

Betsey Eltonhead

33 Conant street, west concord, MA 01742

4/12/2025 4:25:25 PM

Dan Stapleton's comment at the public meeting about considering the cost of dredging over the 100 years that it would last is an important one. The pond has had minimal maintenance since its construction, so ongoing costs after dredging would be trivial. 7 or 8 million dollars over 100 years is ~75,000 a year. We should recalculate the other two options in terms of cost over the long-run. If we could go with recurring pond management for now, until we can either raise more money or get a developer to invest in the Gerow recreation area and contribute money towards dredging, then dredging might prove to be the most cost effective solution. Certainly dam removal will lead to an ongoing battle against the same invasives that have filled in all the other wetlands in this area. And battling invasives would be required to save what little recreational value a stream in a marsh would provide.

Anna Feldweg

343 Commonwealth Ave, Concord

4/12/2025 5:05:26 PM

I was fortunate enough to have enjoyed this treasure growing up on Pond St. Please Keep this from being destroyed.

jack melanson

47 marlboro hudson ma.

4/12/2025 7:02:29 PM

Please save the pond. It means so much to so many people. It's a source of unifying people when times are difficult. We need our large blue space to breath and feel free.

Donna Tisdale

335 Commonwealth Ave

4/12/2025 7:44:18 PM

I addressed this initially to the three presenters at the April 3rd Task Force presentation at the Town House - copy to Delia, of course - but was subsequently encouraged to submit it to the Task Force as a whole via this Public Comment Form

It was a good session last night. I had to leave before the end, but I learned a lot - and there is a lot left for me to learn - but I want to share a comment about the financial analysis that each of you presented. I understand that at this point in the process you have more confidence in some of the numbers than in others, and that projecting future costs is particularly hard given changes in technology and inflation. I don't take issue with any of the numbers, themselves, but the presentation of the numbers. It appeared that all of the costs were shown in current dollars. If I am wrong, then don't read any further.

My impression is that the timing of the cash flows of each of the three scenarios are different - some perhaps quite different. One seemed to be weighted almost entirely upfront; another had lower upfront costs followed by annual costs thereafter, etc. We all know that a dollar today is not the same as a dollar 5, 10, or 100 years from now, so the only way to compare these projects is to lay out the cash flows year by year and calculate their present value (cost). Once the PV is calculated, then any grants can be deducted to get an estimate of the net cost.

This analytical enhancement may or may not lead to a clearer sense of direction, but it is the best methodology to use when faced with projects with such dissimilar cash flows.

I'd be happy to discuss further if appropriate.

Hastily,

Sandy

Sandy Smith

25 Academy Lane, Concord, MA 01742

4/13/2025 2:25:01 PM

Please keep Warner's Pond. Do not remove the dam. No need to remove the dam.

4/13/2025 2:24:54 PM

Removing the dam would take away recreational opportunities from the youngest generations of Concord. Turning this relatively easy to paddle pond into a much smaller faster moving body of water poses significant concerns for recreational opportunities and water safety.

4/13/2025 2:30:49 PM

The dam provides opportunities for ice skating during the winter, a cherished experience for kids all around New England. It also allows for easy and enjoyable youth kayaking. Something that would go away if it became a brook

4/13/2025 2:10:32 PM

Hello. Warner's Pond is an important resource for Concord residents and wildlife alike. One of the reasons that the Bird Flu is being transmitted between water fowl is because their open space is being taken away and they are being crowded into smaller areas. Please keep this open water pond in place. Also, please consider dredging the pond as planned five years ago so it may be enjoyed for another hundred years.

Paul DeRuzzo

76 Laws Brook Road

4/13/2025 3:55:26 PM

The Recreation Department has approved funding and should take the lead to implement improvements for accessibility to the pond from Gerow Park - as shown on existing plans. Installation of a pathway and ramp to the water's edge, the installation of an appropriately-sized beach with a floating dock, creation of a sand-bottom boat landing area. The purchase of an electric-powered pontoon boat to ferry residents of all ages and particularly the many elderly folks who are otherwise restricted to the waters edge would create a direct connection to all the nature Warners has to offer.

Dominic Ingegneri

247 Old Marlboro Road

4/13/2025 5:04:10 PM

Warners pond is a precious Concord jewel

Kate kavanagh

409 old Bedford road

4/13/2025 6:36:42 PM

As a small business owner in West Concord as well as one who grew up in West Concord I would hate to see the dam removed. I understand there are some valid reasons but there are even more reasons to keep the pond as is. What happens to all the wildlife that rely on the pond? What about property values for people who live around the pond? Healthy outdoor recreation for our youth at a time when too many children have their faces glued to an electronic device is imperative. I grew up fishing, boating and skating on Warners and the memories are some of my best. It's sad to think children in West Concord won't have those same opportunities.

Helen Halloran

Concord Flower Shop 135 Commonwealth Ave

4/13/2025 7:03:28 PM

I don't live in West Concord but have a strong interest in keeping Warner Pond for conservation purposes. It is the right thing to do for our town

Cortney Rowan

101 Fairhaven Hill Road Concord

4/13/2025 7:27:21 PM

April 13, 2025

Warner's Pond Task Force

Town of Concord

Concord, MA 01742

Dear Members of the Task Force,

The Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Wild and Scenic River Stewardship Council (River Stewardship Council) welcomes the opportunity to provide comments on the potential dam removal project at Warner's Pond in the Town of Concord. Dam removal is the preferred alternative identified in the Warner's Pond Alternatives Analysis Report to address the currently degraded ecological and recreational conditions and Warner's Pond. This alternative would help to protect and enhance the water quality and ecological resources of the Assabet Wild and Scenic River downstream of the project site.

As part of our effort to support removal of Warner's Pond Dam and thereby restore Nashoba Brook, our Council produced this video in the hopes that others will see the clear benefits of this decision. (Link copied here: <https://youtu.be/hBe9U55NtLI>)

Removal of the dam at Warner's Pond will restore Nashoba Brook to its natural, free-flowing condition. The return to a natural flow regime will improve flow velocities and water quality. Sediments and nutrients will be able to flow downstream into the Assabet River where they will benefit the outstanding ecological resources for which the River was designated as Wild and Scenic, including the diverse array of plant and animal species that live in and along the river and adjacent wetlands. Elimination of the impoundment upstream of the dam will help to minimize the occurrence and spread of aquatic invasive species that may move downstream into the Assabet River. Dam removal will re-establish habitat connectivity for aquatic organisms in Nashoba Brook. This, coupled with other dam removal projects in the SuAsCo watershed, will open up many miles of critical spawning habitat for diadromous fish.

In 1999, Congress designated twenty-nine miles of the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers as a component of the National Wild and Scenic River System. This federal designation recognizes the rivers' free-flow and nationally significant outstanding scenic, ecological, recreational, historical and literary values. Comprised of representatives from local, state and federal governments, and local non-profits, the SuAsCo River Stewardship Council coordinates the protection and enhancement of the Wild and Scenic River segments and their associated outstandingly remarkable values.

The Sudbury, Assabet and Concord Wild and Scenic River Conservation Plan (2019 Update), which is approved by the eight municipalities with representatives on the River Stewardship Council, identifies priority strategies for water quality protection and ecological enhancement including:

- Preserve habitat connectivity, water quality, ecosystem services, tributary and headwater water quality.
- Support diadromous fish restoration in the Concord River and its tributaries. Raise awareness regarding the need for aquatic connectivity.
- Monitor aquatic and riparian biomass in order to track progress in reducing eutrophication and maintaining habitat quality.
- Monitor and manage water chestnut, with a focus on upstream and headwater populations beyond the wild and scenic segments of the rivers.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments. The River Stewardship Council looks forward to engaging with the project as it moves forward.

Sincerely,

Carlene Hempel, Concord Representative

Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Wild and Scenic River Stewardship Council

Carlene Hempel

50 Highland St. Concord, MA 01742

4/13/2025 7:39:14 PM

I strongly believe that the town should focus on preserving warners pond.

I think there are two viable options to preserve the pond.

My preferred option is the revised dredging plans with drastically improved costs as this will protect the pond for future generations. Failing that, managed drawdowns and other management of Invasive plants seems like a very cost effective solution. The town has already voted repeatedly to preserve warners pond.

Removing the dam and destroying this oasis in west concord is a terrible idea. It goes against our goals as a community. The pond is a resource for young children and adults alike for fishing, boating skating and simply being in a bucolic water area within Town. With so much development in west concord we are sorely in need of preserving these oasis for people.

For all the bluster about expensive

Walkways and other Amenities a swamp like wetLand will not benefit the people of concord and will no longer be such an oasis. Please do not remove the dam.it will be a disaster

Of course there is also the wildlife to consider with migratory birds, otters and beavers all calling the pond home. What right do we have to deprive these animals of a home - that has been there For hundreds of years?

The town voted to restore the dam

The town voted to dredge and preserve warners pond AND The town voted to buy gerow how much more proof is needed that this is a loved and cherished resource with town support?

michael o'sullivan

42 laws brook road

4/13/2025 7:36:27 PM

I would like the Warner's Pond Task Force to consider protecting Warner's Pond because it has cultural and historical significance. Although it may be manmade, that does in any way diminish its impact on Concord's history. Since the 1800s, it's been the site of Christmas tree bonfires, picnics, swimming lessons, fishing, Boy Scout camping trips, ice hockey games, and ice skating. An icon of America, Henry David Thoreau himself wrote about Warner's Pond. As the 250th Anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord rolls around, Concord has been very adamant on promoting its pride in our history. Warner's Pond is part of that history.

Olivia O'Sullivan

42 Laws Brook Road

4/13/2025 4:57:34 PM

I urge the WP Task Force to protect and restore Warner's Pond through dredging and other beneficial measures to restore the health of this large pond. Important considerations and key reasons for dredging include:

Historical and Cultural

- The West Concord Village continues to grow with population pressures from recent development and the planned redevelopment of MCI Concord to include substantial new housing. We need this blue open space connected to nearby green spaces for residents' mental and physical well-being.
- We need to protect the pond for its long, unique cultural history that often goes unrecognized and the ease of access to recreation. Many nearby residents can enjoy the pond by walking or biking (carbon free) without having to drive miles away to other Concord ponds.

Fiscally responsible

- The town spent \$2.1 million in 2006 to rebuild the dam and if the pond is well-managed, it will continue to work well.
- Concord residents voted to approve over \$3 million in funds over a 5-year period (2018-2022) to dredge and remove the invasive plants that degrade the pond, following the dam restoration in 2006.

Ecological

- The pond supports a rich ecosystem of freshwater invertebrates, fish, reptiles, birds and mammals. This rich habitat currently supports river otters, bobcats, beaver, wood ducks, kingfishers, migratory waterfowl, sharp-shinned hawks, great horned owls, screech owls, peeper frogs and other diverse species.
- Our children grew up ice skating, canoeing, kayaking and fishing on the pond. This unique stream-fed pond allows families to explore Warner's ecosystem year-round.
- Adaptations to the dam would allow migratory fish to move upstream without having to remove the dam and consequently losing the entire Warner's Pond Ecosystem.
- The generous gift of waterfront land from the Gerow family was predicated on access to Warner's Pond for boating and water recreation. The Town of Concord needs to honor the commitment of the original Gerow bequest for public access at Gerow Park for kayaking, canoeing, fishing and other forms of water recreation.

Future Outlook

- The open water and shallow depth of Warner's Pond is by far the safest and most ideal way for people of all ages and families with diverse abilities to learn boating skills. Visitors will fall in love with the unique plants and wildlife and become our future stewards, as shown by the children who have eagerly participated in recent water chestnut removal events.
- We should not let this beautiful pond go away. Dam removal at Warner's Pond poses the huge risk of invasive phragmites getting a foothold and forming impenetrable mats in much of the wetlands over time. These aggressive plants are already present and spreading in nearby wetlands in West Concord Park conservation area.

Priscilla Guiney

62 Wright Rd., Concord

4/13/2025 7:56:20 PM

I'm a Scout in Concord with troop 132. We would like the pond to stay as it is for recreation so we can canoe over to scout island. Would you consider the option to work on removing the vegetation and ask for volunteers to do much of the work. I know the Scouts would be happy to do this kind of work in the community.

Breck Tarlow

1295 Main St

4/13/2025 7:55:00 PM

I believe the best and most affordable plan is to keep the dam and work with volunteer groups like the scouts and others to help remove vegetation. That and hired divers can keep the space useable for everyone in the area. As active members of Scout troop 132 in Concord, my son and I see Warner pond and Scout Island as invaluable community resources for promoting outdoor activities. It would be a shame to lose them

Jeff Hillman

4 Ivanhoe St, Billerica

4/13/2025 8:14:53 PM

Please keep the pond so that ice skating and kayaking for young children can continue. With a free flowing brook, young children will lose access to their recreation activities on the pond.

Liz Mauer

4/13/2025 8:14:05 PM

Dear Members of the Warner's Pond Task Force and Natural Resources Commission,

My name is [Your Full Name], and I am a Scout with Troop 132 here in Concord. Every year, my troop visits Scout Island, and I've had the opportunity to connect with Warner's Pond in a meaningful way—not just as a place for outdoor fun, but as a living part of our town's natural heritage.

Last year, our troop spent multiple meetings learning about the different options for the future of Warner's Pond. We invited representatives from the Friends of Warner's Pond and the Town's Natural Resources Division to speak with us. We asked questions, reviewed the pros and cons of each proposal, and had thoughtful discussions as a group.

After considering everything, Troop 132 came to the conclusion that removing the dam is the best choice—for the environment, for the future of the pond, and for the broader community. I strongly agree with that assessment.

Removing the dam would:

Restore Nashoba Brook to its natural flow and support fish migration and native biodiversity

Improve water quality and allow a healthier, more diverse wetland habitat to form

Honor the long history of Indigenous stewardship in this area, particularly the Nipmuc people

Reduce long-term costs for the town while creating new opportunities for education and recreation

As Scouts, we're taught to be good stewards of the land and leave it better than we found it. Returning Warner's Pond to a more natural state is a way to do just that. I believe that future generations—of Scouts, students, families, and wildlife—will thank us for making the courageous and responsible choice now.

Thank you for your thoughtful work on this issue and for listening to the voices of young people like myself.

Sincerely,

Lincoln G

Scout, Troop 132

Lincoln Green

25 Bolton st Concord ma

4/13/2025 7:09:36 PM

I grew up in a place where having a pond to skate on in the winter and kayak on in the summer was only a dream. West Concord has this and i can't imagine why anyone would want to take that away from all of the people and wildlife that benefit from it. There so many uncontrollable tumultuous and terrible things happening all around us right now, Please let this resource stay as it is. Let us all have this small bit of beauty remain in our lives. Thank you for your kind consideration.

Cameron Kulewicz

40 Lowell Rd

4/13/2025 7:52:28 PM

Years ago, I received a questionnaire from the town about Warners Pond, asking about my interests in recreational activities. The options were incredible—swimming and kayaking, among others—and I envisioned a beautiful recreational space. Later, I learned the town was planning just that, including swimming options, and I was so excited at the prospect of having a freshwater space as an alternative to Walden Pond and White's Pond. Unfortunately, the plan was abandoned.

Over the years, my connection to the pond has grown. A friend moved there, my son kayaked on it, and we participated in the annual water chestnut weed-pulling events. I've seen stunning photos of the wildlife and spoken with experts about ways to maintain the pond's beauty and protect the nature it nurtures. However, I worry that many people in town have been misled to believe that the cost of preserving the pond is far higher than it truly is. This kind of misinformation only fosters tension and conflict within our community.

This town is beautiful, with incredible wildlife, and it's essential to honor the community's voices and wishes. Decisions like this should take time and be based on complete and accurate information. Personally, I want to see the pond preserved. While I have friends with differing views, I find the therapeutic value of the pond undeniable. Many young people I know seek solace and retreat there. As a psychologist specializing with children and teens, I firmly believe our town would benefit more from investing in the pond than in school-based pseudoscientific curricula that don't align with science or with any future investments in marketing the schools. Public schools should not pay for marketing services. Hold the schools accountable for any wasteful spending and put some of that money into preserving and enhancing the pond. And please let the citizens know the real expense for taking care of the pond, not an inflated number, but the real number. The town owes that especially to our friends who live on the pond who've had to spend the past few years correcting misinformation about the costs involved.

Thank you.

Karin Maria Hodges

230 Harrington Ave

4/13/2025 7:34:18 PM

WHAT IS THE NRC THINKING?

Back during the pandemic, when the Natural Resources Commission suddenly began pushing the idea of destroy Warner's Pond and turning the area back into what it was before the 1600's - WHAT THINKING?

THE TOWN HAD CLEARLY BEEN IN FAVOR OF RESTORING THE POND FOR DECADES, AND HAS EXPRESSED THIS OVER AND OVER, AS EVIDENCED BY THE FOLLOWING:

*** in 1995, Anne McCarthy Forbes completed the "Narrative Histories of Concord and West Concord" - commissioned by the Concord Historical Commission (the Blue book). On page 47: "For too long, West Concord was generally regarded as the historically insignificant section of one of the most historic towns in America. Today, however, with growing respect for the complex culture of late 19th and early 20th century America, West Concord is being recognized as a community that epitomizes some important patterns of the times and which possesses considerable character of its own, much of which remains intact in its buildings and PHYSICAL FEATURES and topography: The Assabet River winds through every section of West Concord.... On each of the brooks, a beautiful pond -- it's form created by the dams of early mill builders - enhances the local landscape... (to find a digitalized copy, go to the Planning Dept or Historical Commission). With all this history, WHAT WAS THE NRC THINKING?

***What about all the years that the NRC worked with long-term West Concord residents Ruth Gerow, Joanne LLOYND, Charles Simpson, Dorothy Higgins, and others - who understood the strong ties this community has to Warner's Pond? Together with the NRC, they established the Warner's Pond Stewardship Commission, which in 2004 produced the booklet "Warner's Pond - A Community Asset." After all these years of cooperation, WHAT WAS THE NRC THINKING?

***The town of Concord acquired the Gerow property with approval from the 2018 Town Mtg Article 25 which "authorized requisition of 369 Comm Ave and adjacent properties on Warner's Pond" with slides showing plans for a future BATH HOUSE, FLOATING DOCK, CANOE LAUNCH, SWIM AREA, BEACH. Residents voted for that, not dam removal. No one every requested dam removal until the NRC suddenly started pursuing it with determination, spending money allocated for dredging on dam removal instead. WHAT WAS THE NRC THINKING?

***In Dec 2018, a community feedback survey (both online and in paper at Harvey Wheeler, each elementary school, the Town House, Beede Center, Hunt gym) which was released by the town and was clearly intended to reach as many people as possible

(UNLIKE the community meetings in 2022 and 2023, which were very "subtly" advertised)- generated 3602 responses. The results identified "most desirable amenities": Interest in swimming- 72%, Canoe/kayak launch - 70%, Use of boardwalk and boating - 65%, boardwalk along shore's edge - 55%. That number of responses clearly exceeded the subsequent biased and confusing survey that lead up to the 2023 meeting pushing dam removal. The excitement of West Concord residents about this upcoming development was clear. WHAT WAS THE NRC THINKING?

WHAT WAS THE NRC THINKING IN REVERSING COURSE IN 2022 WHEN THE DESIRES OF THE COMMUNITY WERE EXPRESSED SO STRONGLY AND PERSISTENTLY FOR DECADES? WHAT ARE THEY THINKING NOW? WHY DOES THE NRC KEEP ASKING, OVER AND OVER, IF WE WANT THE POND - HOPING THE ANSWER WILL CHANGE? IT WILL NOT CHANGE - WE WANT TO RESTORE WARNERS POND.

Mari Weinberg

26 Hillside Ave, Concord, MA

4/13/2025 8:52:47 PM

Warner's Pond is a great natural resource for the town, and we should ensure it remains one for years to come.

Jen Coty

300 Ministerial Drive

4/13/2025 8:30:26 PM

The pond has been an enduring part of the history of West Concord. Living on Warner's Pond we appreciate all the people who come kayaking, fishing, picnicking, trekking, observing and taking pictures of its natural beauty. It's a vibrant ecosystem hosting great blue herons, ducks, kingfisher birds, muskrats, sunfish, water snakes, and beaver are some of wildlife we have observed first hand. I can't imagine where all this life would go if it were to disappear. It would be a travesty! With so many reasons to keep the pond why think otherwise? Please do not disturb this stunning yet viable resource for people and wildlife.

Richard and Deborah Krug

169 Commonwealth Ave Concord, MA 01742

4/13/2025 8:59:13 PM

Hello, I wanted to just drop a message about the importance of Warner's pond being kept open and maintained for recreational use.

It is one of the money things that makes West Concord, a wonderful place to have a business And adds to the life of all of us that work and live in West Concord. Thank you for all that you all are doing to hopefully make the right choices for this beautiful part of Concord. Take care.

Hilary Taylor

621 west st Carlisle

4/13/2025 9:54:02 PM

I support the option to dredge Warner Pond so it is sustainable blue space for the next 100 years! It is important to support our natural resources and this is one with special memories from growing up in Concord too—taking a small boat out and rowing there are fond memories and I'd like to see generations continue to use it well!

Jenny Barker

457 Sudbury Rd

4/13/2025 10:12:50 PM

We are writing in support of keeping Warner's Pond, managing the invasives, and dredging it when economically feasible. We are against dam removal because dam removal equals pond removal and we are all for keeping and caring for the ponds we are so lucky to have in Concord.

Our family moved to Concord fifteen years ago from Somerville. We chose Concord for its beauty and the access to nature. We have kayaked on all of the rivers and all of the three major ponds in Concord, including Warner's Pond. I, Anna, have also paddleboarded on those rivers and ponds. And we are lucky to have a very small pond on our property, so we know something about ponds.

Ponds are very special, especially large ones like Warner's Pond. I've noticed that all ponds, including our own small pond, are always changing in water levels and all ponds seem to need routine care and maintenance to keep them healthy and vibrant. I've read about the problems at Walden (algal blooms, sediment runoff, and erosion), White's (cyanobacteria blooms that are potentially toxic and overcrowding), and Warner's (sediment build up and invasive overgrowth). We strongly support the town providing the routine care and maintenance that is necessary to keep Warner's Pond healthy and vibrant.

The wildlife we've seen while on Warner's Pond has been spectacular. We've had beavers slap the water close to me, we've had swans teaching their grown babies to fly go right over us so that we heard the powerful whoosh of their wings. We've seen ducks with their ducklings and geese with their goslings in the spring. We've seen bald eagle and osprey and great blue heron. Being at Warner's Pond inspired us to get the Merlin Bird ID app because there are so many bird calls out there on the water that I wanted to know more about.

I, Anna, also attended the sunset picnic community event at Gerow Park this past fall and it made me so excited for more community events in that amazing setting so connected to nature. The sunsets over the pond from Gerow Park are spectacular and it made me count myself lucky, yet again, to live in a town that invested in such a spectacular recreation space beside such a beautiful pond. I am all about community. In fact, the Concord Museum has commissioned me to write a song about Concord with the theme of community for the 250th. I feel certain that everyone in Concord who values community and nature the way I do will be thrilled to participate in more community events at the magnificent Gerow Park overlooking Warner's Pond.

Anna and Jim Tull

86 Farmers Cliff Rd.

Anna Huckabee Tull and Jim Tull

86 Farmer's Cliff Road Concord MA

4/13/2025 10:18:18 PM

WP is a beautiful oasis for birds and other wild life. Enriching our relationship with the natural world. Creating beauty and habit.

Dominica

4/13/2025 10:25:16 PM

Warner's Pond is a community treasure. We voted to keep it and care for it, we invested taxpayer funds into Gerow Park, and we have a duty to the town, to voters, and to today's and future residents of Concord to care for it, as a pond, now and in the future.

Abigail Jenney

99 Tarbell Spring Road

4/14/2025 6:49:22 AM

I think dam removal is the best option.

Evan Hultgren

73 Nashoba, Rd

4/14/2025 8:11:47 AM

I want to keep the dam because adults AND kids can kayak and canoe. If they take down the dam, the pond turns into a brook it is not really safe for young children.

4/14/2025 8:34:48 AM

I'm writing to express my strong support for restoring Nashoba Brook by removing the Warner's Pond dam.

This is a rare opportunity to bring a living, flowing brook back to life. The dam has outlived its usefulness and now holds back more than just water—it holds back the health of the ecosystem, the movement of fish and wildlife, and the natural beauty of a functioning stream.

Letting the brook run free again would mean cleaner water, fewer invasive weeds, and a better future for native species that depend on cold, connected habitats. It would also mean a more sustainable, resilient system in the face of climate change—something that benefits all of us.

I understand that change can be difficult, especially when a place holds personal or historical meaning. But what's at stake here is bigger than a pond—it's the chance to restore something truly alive. Something that can adapt, evolve, and thrive.

Although I live in Sudbury, I'm part of the same watershed community as Concord. What happens to Nashoba Brook and Warner's Pond affects the health of the entire SuAsCo river system. This is not just a Concord issue—it's a regional opportunity to lead with science, sustainability, and long-term vision.

Please support dam removal and help bring Nashoba Brook back to life—not just for one town but for the entire watershed we all share.

Sarah Kwan

818 Concord Road, Sudbury, MA 01776

4/14/2025 8:50:38 AM

Warner's Pond brings peace to the area for walking and relaxing. Something definitely needed during these times,

Betty Coty

300 Ministerial Dr

4/14/2025 10:49:02 AM

Joe Soberg

Joe Soberg E&S Mobile Service, Inc

166 Commonwealth Ave

4/14/2025 11:12:55 AM

Please keep the dam and keep it as a local pond for recreation. I believe we should try to rely on local efforts (such as Scouts, including the 2 living in my house) to rehab and improve the pond by removing weeds and invasive plants.

Rudd Coffey

121 Seymour St Concord MA

4/14/2025 10:51:08 AM

I grew up in West Concord and now own my family business in West Concord, which overlooks Warner's Pond. The business started in 1955 and moved to this location in 1968. As a kid I spent a fair amount of time at Warner's Pond fishing, canoeing, camping on Snake Island (small island behind Scout Island), ice fishing, skating and playing pickup hockey games. It would be a real shame to remove the dam and lose all of that, especially for the young kids and adults as well. It's so nice to see kids fishing both above and below the dam on a regular basis. I thought that was a huge reason why the town bought the Gerow property...to keep the recreation going at Warner's Pond. Also, there is a ton of wildlife, especially birds and ducks, the swans and the ducks raising their young, the eagles, ospreys, among others that thrive on the pond. It's so neat, if you haven't seen it, to watch the swans land and take off. They need a long landing strip, which the pond provides for them. If you are concerned about fish coming upstream to spawn, the sluiceway, on the side of the dam, could be used to build some type of fish passage. The cost should be minimal since the basis of the fish passage is already there. I have to ask, why did the town buy the Gerow property and start construction only to now consider taking the dam down and losing the view and recreation. I am in favor of keeping the dam and all the good that goes with it.

Joe Soberg E&S Mobile Service, Inc

166 Commonwealth Ave

4/14/2025 11:39:56 AM

I would like the Warner's Pond Task Force to consider protecting Warner's Pond because it is a wonderful place to enjoy personally and with visitors. We enjoy watching the wildlife and the peacefulness of the water. The task force has come up with a more economical dredging plan which would in the best interest of our community and the numerous visitors to Concord!

Tish Dray

252 Commonwealth

4/14/2025 2:15:27 PM

This post is about the problem of controlling invasives if the dam were to come down. Right now, after hundreds of years of the pond existing, we have relatively few land invasives along its banks, even without measures to control them. Do we honestly think that if the dam comes down and 50 more acres of wetland are exposed, that the town will be able to control invasives in that area? The town couldn't keep the riprap of the dam free of brush and trees. They are going to have the manpower to maintain 50 acres? I simply don't believe this is true.

Naomi Miller

343 Commonwealth Ave, Concord, MA

4/14/2025 2:32:21 PM

The recent Town Hall public meeting failed to reach many online participants questions on Zoom, leaving numerous voices unheard. As someone fully invested in the dredging project, and saving the pond, I recognize the myriad unanswered questions swirling around. To address this, I propose a new three-hour town meeting to ensure everyone's concerns are aired and tackled comprehensively.

Greg Theriault

118 Wright Rd

4/13/2025 11:15:45 PM

Well ..

I'm not sure where to begin .

The pond has a long partnership with my family.

It's memory is rooted deeply in many of our lives and the ponds impact is not standing still!

Every day the pond continues to give life memory's to all creatures great and small .

Why would anyone want to alter that ?

We loose so much every day .. why not support and build instead of breaking things apart ?

My stepdad the CCHS Athletic Director John O'Connel taught classes on the pond .

We slept on the island for scouts ..

I'm from a local family of nine and we all skated on this pond .

My seven children also learned to skate on the pond and my girls all ended up playing D1 hockey ..

I bring my mom down the humble little dirt road and park with lunch .

We watch the ice melt the ducks and swans grace thatv the pond .

Magic and moments abound here please don't steal the opportunity 🙏 from us our the young generation that so needs Warners .

Mary Klioff

33 Comm Ave.

4/14/2025 3:45:37 PM

I am concerned that if the dam is removed and the pond becomes a marsh/swamp it will be a terrible eyesore. The thought that it will be a beautiful space to view wildlife is just not likely. The backdrop of the pond makes it a spectacular destination to view wildlife.

Diane Pearlman

237 Commonwealth Ave, Concord MA 01742

4/14/2025 4:17:07 PM

I am against pond removal. I have deep concerns about the finances, egological impact, and general welfare of the community if this is done.

Anna O'Sullivan

42 Laws Brook Rd

4/14/2025 4:30:23 PM

Public Comment from OARS (Watershed organization for the Assabet, Sudbury, and Concord rivers):

As the watershed organization for the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord rivers, OARS respectfully urges the Warner's Pond Task Force to support the removal of the Warner's Pond Dam and the restoration of a free-flowing Nashoba Brook.

This decision is about more than infrastructure—it is about choosing the future health of one of the Concord River's most important tributaries. Nashoba Brook is a cold-water stream with the potential to support native brook trout and other sensitive aquatic species. Right now, that potential is blocked.

Dam removal would reconnect more than 10 miles of upstream habitat, restore natural sediment flow, improve water quality, and reestablish critical fish passage for native and migratory species. It would also reduce invasive aquatic plant overgrowth, which has made the pond increasingly difficult to access and enjoy for paddlers and other users. The current impoundment is shallow, warming rapidly in the summer months, and vulnerable to harmful algal blooms. In contrast, a restored brook would offer dynamic habitat, shade, and flow that support biodiversity and climate resilience.

We understand that Warner's Pond holds sentimental value for many. Change can be hard—especially when it's connected to a place that has long been a part of the community. But we believe this is not a loss—it's a renewal. The future of this waterway can be vibrant, living, and self-sustaining. Restoring Nashoba Brook through dam removal is the most ecologically responsible, sustainable, and inclusive choice.

This is a moment to lead—not just for Concord, but for the health of the entire SuAsCo watershed. We ask the Task Force to embrace this once-in-a-generation opportunity to bring back the brook, support native wildlife, and invest in a living river legacy for the future.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

OARS: The watershed organization for the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord rivers

oars3rivers.org/warner-pond-dam

The OARS 3 Rivers Team

23 Bradford St

4/14/2025 4:12:40 PM

I support protecting Warner's Pond by the dredging option. Concord needs to preserve its lakes and ponds rather than increase its already abundant wetlands. The Town already has done the hard part, reconstructing the dam, and now just needs to do the dredging.

Dredging could be also adjusted by routing the brook to the south of Scout Island so that the bulk of incoming sediment and nutrients bypass the pond and continue downstream. To the extent that the pond is separated from the brook it could become a clear water lake more suitable for swimming. It's currently used for swimming but increased water clarity would help. Changing the storm drain from Rt. 2 to an infiltration basin rather than direct discharge to the pond would also help with water clarity and would help Concord's surface water hydrology problem where storm drains and stream channeling short circuit water routing to the Assabet and Sudbury Rivers. With increasing intensity of storms associated with climate change the Town is seeing increased flooding like behind the Brookside Square development and, I've noticed, in Emerson Playground. So changing the Rt. 2 to storm water discharge to infiltration, the land for which is available between the pond and the highway, would be a hydrological step in the right direction regarding the flooding and would help with the water quality of Warner's.

John Colman

65 Central Street, Concord MA 01742

4/14/2025 8:50:55 PM

I attended the Public Comment meeting held earlier this month, and have some concerns about the info presented by Task Force member who presented the case for Dam Removal. His contention is that a Task Force priority is to "retain and enhance the {current} recreational activities of Warners Pond". He needs to be challenged by other Task Force members on this point: it cannot be possible for any resource to be reduced in size by 90% and retain, let alone enhance, the recreational opportunities which are available. For this to be stated as a conclusion is utter nonsense.

Further, he stated that reducing the Pond to a stream would keep the water moving - as opposed to its current condition - is also nonsense. You only need to look at all the water pouring over the dam to know that the water in the Pond is currently moving. A Scouting "adventure" to Scout Island would mean crossing a narrow stream and then tramping thru the marshy muck to get to the solid ground of the island.

Warners Pond should be maintained in its current state as a pond because it provides 4 seasons of recreational activities that are free, and it's right in the middle of downtown W. Concord, close to many homes and businesses. W. Concord may see more development in the coming years, and the Pond is a welcome refuge for both humans and wildlife and as such is a reminder that nature still exists among us.

I urge Concordians to vote for either the dredging solution, or the combo solution, so we can continue to enjoy the valuable resource we now have.

Phil Brewer

132 Wright Rd, Concord

4/14/2025 9:10:38 PM

As a concord resident and frequent visitor of Gerrow Park, I've come to appreciate the beauty of Warner's Pond. The task force should prioritize maintaining access to nature and recreational activities that the pond offers.

Steve Siravo

476 Old Marlboro Rd

4/14/2025 9:10:35 PM

I would like the Warner's Pond Task Force to consider protecting Warner's Pond because our community values Warner's Pond. Warner's pond provides a community with a place for everyone to enjoy the natural beauty at especially at Gerrow park -a place for anyone to enjoy the natural beauty of warners pond. The recreational activities the pond provides is enjoyed by many, I have many fond memories of skating and kayaking on the pond. The best part of the pond it's free and has great access for all to enjoy. This is especially important in area of concord that has higher density of population with easy access with walking/biking distance on the bike path and close to the commuter rail west concord stop. I support a more economical dredging plan the task force has come up with.

Caitlin Siravo

476 Old Marlboro Rd

4/14/2025 9:26:37 PM

Warner's Pond has been a great source of recreation for me and my family over the years. We have spent wonderful days skating there in the winter time and walking along its shores in the warmer months. It is an important resource for the community.

Kate Clarke

179 Thoreau St Apt 1

4/14/2025 10:10:14 PM

We moved to Concord more than 50 years ago. Until I hung up my skates recently, one of the joys of winter was skating as a family on the expansive sheet of ice which surrounded the islands

of Warner's Pond. Walden and White ponds were great, too, but Warner's Pond was shallower and hence froze much more quickly early in the season or after a mid-winter thaw. My children and grandchildren continue to enjoy skating there. I hope that any modifications to the Pond

do not eliminate this wonderful skating space.

David Clarke

26 Bartlett Hill

01742

David Clarke

26 Bartlett Hill Road, Concord, MA 01742

4/14/2025 10:13:12 PM

Warner's Pond has been a joyful place for my three generations of family. My almost 93-year-old father skated on it for many years and introduced my three sisters and me to its icy wonders through games of crack the whip and long skates around the perimeter. My two young sons now look forward to hockey games on it every winter and often meet up with friends to take in a few hours on the ice. We have also discovered the parks surrounding Warner's Pond, and enjoy picnics while taking in the beautiful and restorative vistas. It's a wonderful community meeting space as well. I feel strongly that Warner's Pond continues to be a source of joy for the generations to come.

Maura Clarke

26 Bartlett Hill Road, Concord, MA 01742

4/14/2025 11:39:00 PM

Dear Warner's Pond Task Force, thank you for working to maintain Warner's Pond as a treasured natural resource for the Concord community and beyond. Our family lives on the other side of town and we ave often had lovely skates on Warner's Pond in winters past. It was nice to meet other families and friends who enjoyed the pond as much as we did. Please continue to work to keep Warner's Pond accessible to all of us.

Kareem Talhouni

26 Bartlett Hill Road, Concord MA 01742

4/15/2025 12:33:03 AM

Veiled oligarchies rarely make the best decisions for the long term good of a community whether they originate from the left or right. Overriding the overwhelming, educated viewpoint of those most effected by a decision is the very definition of tyranny no matter the intent. Please listen to the community on the eve of the 250th anniversary.

Andrew Koh

231 Commonwealth Ave

4/15/2025 6:55:44 AM

Please don't drain the pond. It is a beautiful resource!

Mike McDonald

208 Wright Rd

4/15/2025 10:10:41 AM

I would like the task force to save Warner's Pond because it is a place where Concordians have paddled, fished, bird watched, gazed, picnicked camped and even swam. This is what we want for future generations. Concord has the opportunity to show its investment in natural beauty which can only contribute to the health of its residents and visitors. Preserving a beautiful water view and blue space is of utmost value. The proposed plan would turn this source of beauty and its diverse eco-system into nothing but a mud flat overrun by invasive plants, specifically ten foot tall phragmites which will not feed birds. This invasive plant overcomes the natural beauty of all indigenous plants and sends its seeds uncontrollably. Local naturalists have stated this to be true. In Warner's we can see the reflection of the sky, hear aquatic birds and take in the benefits of a view that makes one aware that there is more in this world than we know. It is worth the investment without a doubt to save Warner's Pond.

Denise Gilbert

5 Concord Greene unit 6

4/14/2025 4:12:47 PM

Hello. I have lived in West Concord for over 80 years. Warner's Pond has been woven into the fabric of this section of town for all of my time and well beyond. My sister in law, Joanne Loynd, spent a lot of time lobbying for dredging and maintaining this great resource. This was eventually approved and funded, but it was never done. I hope that the town does finish what she started.

Gertrude DeRuzzo

76 Laws Brook Road

4/15/2025 11:03:28 AM

I support removing the dam and restoring Nashoba Brook.

Brad Hubbard-Nelson

221 Nashawtuc Rd

4/15/2025 10:35:38 AM

I would like the Warner's Pond Task Force to consider protecting Warner's Pond because we voted to rehabilitate the dam, we voted to purchase Gerow Park, and we voted to restore Warner's Pond.

Additionally, the task force has come up with a more economical dredging plan that many residents at the last public meeting are more interested in. I also feel it would be more efficient to combine upgrades (e.g., Gerow Park upgrades for facilities/structures/landscaping/trail upgrades) instead of parsing it out into non-related items, and phasing projects to later more appropriate time points (e.g., fish ladder) until the project is completely feasible (e.g., after other limiting dams are removed) this would be a more economical approach. (please don't make us a laughing stock in this respect; we would have a fish ladder that won't be used for X number of years due to other dam limitations). economic & recreational value for all.

Warner's Pond has a positive impact on our community by providing our with community various recreational activities which can be combined and compounded with both Gerow Park & Freeman Trail activities. It also provides a gathering place for the community (picnics,, music gatherings), a place for solace/wellbeing activities, communing with nature (boating/boarding, birding, fishing, photography). These areas provide easy access to multiple members of our community young and older alike, please keep Warner's Pond a part of the West Concord community.

Lynda Olsen

54 laws Brook Road, Concord, MA

4/15/2025 2:20:10 PM

I have three comments that I think are pertinent to this.

1. I have heard that because Warner's Pond is man made, it doesn't "count as a real pond." Great Meadows was man made in 1928. Dikes were built to allow for better hunting. There isn't talk of returning GM to its original state. Warner's Pond is historically older and represents the working class people of Concord.

2. Another argument is that dam removal will allow fish to travel between here and the ocean. I understand beaver are endangered, and therefore protected in MA. Their dams can't be removed (unless a nuisance to housing) so even if our dam is removed the beaver dams between here and the ocean will remain and will restrict fish from traveling between here and the ocean.

3. There are numerous soil-based invasives surrounding the pond. Removing the dam allows more land mass and therefore more soil for invasives to take over. Among these are garlic mustard which changes the chemistry of the soil, not allowing any other plant to grow. I have serious doubts this area will ever be 'replanted with native plants' as some have suggested.

Pat Brewer

132 Wright Rd

4/15/2025 9:37:36 PM

I would like the WPTF to protect and preserve Warner's Pond. The work of the task force has developed economic plans for dredging the pond and smart solutions for managing it. It adds so much to the West Concord community, and removal of the dam would be so short sighted. We've already paid for the Gerow Rec area, the beautiful Bruce Freeman Trail crosses right by it... and the community has expressed their desires to maintain the open water element of the pond.

This pond is an important part of West Concord history, and it's removal would be an erasure of a part of our community. We want to protect all the blue spaces of Concord, it provides lush habitat for a number of wildlife species including Great Blue Heron, eagles, beavers and more. Not only that it provides a peaceful retreat for the many Concordians who walk, kayak and otherwise enjoy the calm respite it provides.

Cristina Aspuru

269 Commonwealth Ave

4/15/2025 9:53:15 PM

Dear Warners Pond Task Force,

I am writing as a Concord native, a longtime local business owner, and most importantly, someone deeply invested in this town.

We see changes to the Concord landscape daily due to constant development of our small, historic suburb. Most of the time, we can't control those changes. It feels like our open spaces are disappearing. With Warners Pond, we have an opportunity to preserve not only open space, but an important part of West Concord's history.

By now, I'm sure you've heard the stories of Boy Scout Island, swimming lessons, ice skating, and other forms of passive recreation that are quintessentially Concord.

Warners Pond serves as a natural buffer at the entrance to Concord, softening the impact of the surrounding hardscape—the rotary, Route 2, and not one, but two state prisons.

It feels unfortunate that historic memory isn't valued the way it once was. Once we lose something like a beautiful pond, we can't get it back. It makes us feel like a disposable community—too comfortable deleting the important things that have shaped who we are, and who we've been, as an attractive and unique town.

I urge the Task Force to preserve—not lose—this West Concord treasure.

Sincerely,

Meg Gaudet

62 Maple Street

Meg Gaudet

62 Maple Street

4/16/2025 8:37:56 AM

I want to provide some comments on the future of Warner's Pond from the point of view of bird life. Specifically, I want to make some observations on what birds are telling us about the health and ecology of Warner's Pond, and what this might mean for its future. About me. I teach Field Ornithology at Southern New Hampshire University, I am coordinator of the annual Christmas Bird Count in Concord, and I have been observing birds at Warner's Pond since 2010. I live nearby on Central Street in West Concord.

Birds are telling us pretty much what we already know about Warner's: it is rapidly filling with silt, choking with vegetation due to fertilizers, and losing fish life. Because it is a pond, it's prime use is by waterfowl—ducks, geese, and swans. But compared to other ponds nearby such as the impoundments at Great Meadows, Nagog Pond, and Flint's in Lincoln, it is relatively under-utilized by waterfowl. Yes, a lot of geese spend the night on Warner's during migration, flocks of mallards drop in for a time, and in winter some diving ducks use it, but these are stop-overs, primarily. As a breeding site for waterfowl, some local Canada Geese nest on its shores, and in the past few years, Mute Swans have taken advantage of the lack of management and have successfully bred here. Mute Swans are pretty, but they are invasive, aggressive, and actively suppress the breeding of native ducks. Wood Ducks and Hooded Mergansers breed back in the marsh where Nashoba Brook enters the pond, and they can occasionally be seen on open water at the pond, but without any nest boxes or management of the swans, there is little to attract them to the pond itself. Mallards breed around the edges in small numbers, but like the mergansers, tend not to use the pond itself for foraging and stick to the inflow and outflow areas.

It was usual a dozen years ago to see large flocks of Common Mergansers using the unfrozen west side most winters. No longer. Other diving ducks like Ring-necks occasionally turn up, but the pond is so shallow and the bottom so mucky that there is little food for them. Every Fall a few Pied-billed Grebes stop by, but only for a day or two. Green-winged Teal gather along the west shore on migration but never stay.

One important proxy for pond health is Great Blue Herons, who often use shallow ponds and marshes for foraging, catching not only fish but frogs. Yet it's unusual to see one using the ample shallows on the east side; instead, one can sometimes be seen using the edge of Scout Island near the outflow area and I usually flush one or two upstream from the inflow. This tells us something important: there is little food for them in the pond itself. Another, similar, proxy is the rarity of Osprey fishing the pond, despite there being several nearby breeding pairs. I have never seen one successfully catch a fish on the pond. And finally, Belted Kingfishers actively fish along the Assabet River and upstream on Nashoba Brook, but tend not to use the pond itself. Although they aren't birds, river otters may have

abandoned Warner's as well; as recent as ten years ago, a family could be seen fishing or hauled out on the ice on the west side.

To imagine what Warner's Pond once was, and could be again, I suggest people visit the wetland and meadow at the back of the School Street fields where Fort Brook flows freely before its junction with Nashoba Brook. It's a marvelous area, with lush wet meadow grasses teeming with life, from browsing deer to spotted sandpipers to abundant blackbirds, sparrows, and ducks. Nashoba Brook has a similar, now hidden watercourse running through Warner's Pond, but with some deep pools and a healthy marsh as added features. Removing the dam would reveal these features and improve the health of the watercourse and the biodiversity of its surroundings. It would be a natural area West Concord could be proud of re-creating and protecting for the future.

David Swain

239 Central Street

4/16/2025 10:02:31 AM

I respectfully request that the Warner's Pond Task Force protect Warner's Pond. As a former resident of West Concord (1964-1986 on Laws Brook Road), I know that the pond is a valuable and necessary asset to residents, visitors, and the natural environment of West Concord and Concord.

By integrating beneficial aspects of the dredging and recurring pond management options, the pond can be preserved long-term as a vibrant "Blue Space" for humans, flora, fauna, and aquatic life. In addition, if and when other dams lower in the regional watershed are reconfigured to let the valuable anadromous fish species reach Concord, the low dam on Warner's Pond can be adapted to accommodate and promote their health as well.

My many youthful years spent on and around Warner's Pond led me to explore the broader natural world, which directly caused me to become an environmental geologist. Those formative years developed in me a curiosity and a desire to understand and protect our natural resources. After getting two degrees, I spent twenty years studying and restoring soil, surface water, and ground water. Preserving Warner's Pond and the rich surrounding environment will encourage future generations of Concord's young people to discover, study, and protect our natural world.

Visiting and exploring Warner's Pond and its islands sparks youthful imagination and fuels people's adventurous spirit. For me, ever since my first winter campout on Scout Island about 45 years ago, I have gone on mountain climbing adventures on six continents, including Mount Everest. Preserving the wildlands around Warner's Pond for recreation and exploration brings Concord's youth, residents, and visitors closer to nature. That precious time around the pond can encourage Concord's young people to explore and protect our wider world.

Over the last twenty years, I have written and spoken professionally about nurturing resilience so that we can face change, challenge, and uncertainty. Our current world has plenty of those difficulties. Fortunately, many research studies have shown that being in nature for even a few hours per week provides humans with crucial restorative benefits. Being active and in nature allows us to seek awe and to rebuild our resilience. Preserving Warner's Pond provides the critical space and time to help residents and visitors be happy, healthy, and productive. That is why I always visit Warner's Pond when I return to West Concord several times per year.

As a child of Concord, an environmental geologist, and a resilience professional, I would like the Warner's Pond Task Force to reject removing the pond's dam. Instead, please

maintain and protect the priceless gem that the community has in Warner's Pond for generations to come.

Respectfully,

Jim Davidson

Fort Collins, Colorado

jim@speakingofadventure.com

Jim Davidson

2731 Dixon Creek Lane, Fort Collins, Colorado 80526

4/20/2025 10:11:03 PM

Scout Island is a very special place. Each year we set up camp and have our cub yo scouts crossing ceremony with the troop and families. Canoeing over and setting up rope bridges is a troop tradition and would love to see the island and pond preserved. Growing up in Concord and skating on the pond in winters had been great. Even the time I fell through thin ice as a youngster. My brother put his scout skills to work and gave me a hockey stick to grab into. Otherwise I was just spending energy breaking the ice. My aunt, Mary Dee (Mansfield) grew up on Lawsbrook Road. Now 90, and living in the Cape, she remembers times where they rented boats. The pond is pretty special to many generations and hopefully preserved. Regards, Hill Duggan. Scoutmaster Troop 132.

Bill Duggan

115 Upland Road

4/22/2025 6:58:37 PM

I am troubled by the lack of agreement among Task Force members about basic facts. I suggest that the Task Force would benefit from taking the time to come to agreement among all of its members about certain basic facts. One basic fact is that Warner's Pond is, and has been for at least 150 years, a public resource, just like our rivers, woods, fields and meadows.

Another basic fact is the Town has substantially invested in this public resource by purchasing the pond, by replacing its dam, and by setting aside substantial money for dredging. The Town has also invested substantial money in expanded public access to Warner's Pond, through the pocket park, Gerow Park, the BFRT, and the public boat launches.

To take away the pond by removing its dam, the NRC would be taking away this public resource and taking away access to this public resource. How can the Task Force deem it fiscally responsible or sustainable to walk away from these investments.

Allison Aley

47 Warner St.

4/23/2025 12:05:56 PM

My family has lived on Sunnyside Lane in West Concord for 30 years! My husband Rich and I raised our two boys there and absolutely love the location. Being near town, a park and a beautiful pond was a big win for us in 1995. Our boys learned how to fish, catch frogs, watch turtles lay eggs, enjoy TONS of bird watching, not to mention, many deer, coyote and fox sightings! We also enjoy canoeing, kayaking and ice skating on Warner's Pond. So many firsts and lots of fond memories! We, like many people in the community really enjoy nature and all the pond and it's surrounding wildlife has to offer.

-Gretchen Hollworth

Sunnyside Lane

West Concord

Gretchen Hollworth

30 Sunnyside Lane

4/24/2025 5:06:27 PM

Based on the consultant's report and the recent community meeting, I believe dam removal is the most responsible economic and environmental option. I have great sympathy for the emotional ties and fond memories of many residents for the pond. I hope that once the Assabet runs free that Warner Pond neighbors will find some pleasure in discovering the transition from a manufactured environment to a more natural one.

Richard Fahlander

399 Old Bedford Road

4/27/2025 3:26:43 PM

I am writing to offer comments on the alternative plans for managing Warner's Pond. Thank you to the Task Force for assembling, vetting and clarifying all the information about the options.

Regarding the first two criteria for evaluation from Envision Concord – historical character, cultural heritage and desirability – all of the options offer some value. But for me, comparing an open water body to a flowing stream in terms of these factors, and of aesthetics and recreational opportunities as well, is like comparing apples and oranges.

Where I see clear differences between the dam removal and the dredging options is in their ecological values and their costs, and the dam removal option seems the more compelling.

Returning Nashoba Brook to a free-flowing condition offers the opportunity to restore both aquatic and riparian habitats and to increase the biological diversity beyond what is afforded by Warner's Pond.

The cost of dredging is, at a minimum, almost twice as much as the cost of dam removal. Regardless of where that money comes from, that's a substantial difference. It's fortunate that we have the option of saving this much money and still realizing so many potential benefits – including the likelihood of ending up with a four-acre pond in the course of the stream.

P.S. CPA funds are largely – up to 80% -- paid for by a property tax surcharge so I suggest that this not be represented as a funding source that does not affect taxpayers.

Joan Ferguson

62 Nashoba Road

4/27/2025 4:15:57 PM

Polly Reeve - comment part 1

Dear Members of the Warner's Pond Task Force,

I watched your public meeting earlier this month with great interest, and am grateful for the very thoughtful, thorough, and balanced way you have approached this important decision for our town. Clearly it is an issue charged with strong feeling – memories, hopes, and anxieties, along with dreams for a healthy future and nostalgia for the past. Change is never easy, and this section of Concord is changing rapidly, and will continue to do so, whatever is decided here. But we can make changes that are positive for our community, if we make wise and informed decisions, and I appreciate the Task Force's work in gathering information and leading this process as it relates to the future of the Pond.

After reading your report, and listening to the presentations about the options you are considering, I want to offer a few thoughts. These are my personal comments, and do not reflect any organizational position. In order to support greater biodiversity, particularly once the dam in Billerica is removed, I support plans to remove the dam and return Nashoba Brook to its former life as a free-flowing waterway. I believe that this can (and must) be done in a way that enhances the area aesthetically, recreationally, and environmentally. I do sympathize, however, with neighbors who have never known West Concord without Warner's Pond, and who believe sincerely that a precious asset will be lost, negatively affecting their property values, day-to-day activities and pleasures, and sense of community. Their concerns are real, and must be addressed.

I would start by sharing whatever information is available from before 1857, when the dam was constructed. Are there any drawings? Early photographs? It would be helpful for people to know that for many millennia, including more than 200 years after the town was colonized by Europeans, Nashoba Brook flowed through the land freely, supporting a healthy, balanced ecosystem and countless generations of human inhabitants. The Pond is a relatively recent human construction that has outlived its initial purpose and has interrupted and degraded natural systems.

I would also offer a more complete picture of what the area will look like after the dam is removed, assuming that its restoration is managed carefully and nature is allowed to heal as powerfully as possible. There are many examples to offer, as dams across the state and the country have been removed, and we have the advantage of learning from these experiences. What lessons are we taking from the most successful projects? Are there before/after photographs that communicate the beauty and biodiversity of the resulting landscape? What can Pond abutters expect to see from their backyards? There are

examples right here in Concord of spectacular wetlands and wet meadows, full of wildflowers and birdsong, even some that offer glorious wintertime skating – will the Warner’s Pond area look like these places in a few years? How will the management plan increase the chances of a positive outcome and reduce the chances of the buggy, phragmites-filled, muddy area that so many people are imagining? Committing to and adequately investing in a successful outcome is essential.

Polly Reeve

429 Williams Road

4/27/2025 4:19:50 PM

Polly Reeve - comment part 2

Finally, I would try to educate the community even better about the biodiversity crisis that we are facing – locally, regionally, and across the planet – and the dire consequences it will bring for human populations as well as the natural world. Concord is just one small place, but we have a history of acting locally in ways that support the greater good, and I think that we can and should do this here. What are the data showing about the specific species that will benefit from dam removal? With bird populations plummeting, pollinators disappearing, amphibian species declining rapidly, it seems to me that we have an obligation to do our part to support the wildlife with which we share this place, and to join with efforts across the country to connect and improve habitat, waterways, and migratory passages whenever we can.

Thank you for all your hard work, and good luck as this effort continues.

Sincerely,

Polly Reeve

429 Williams Road

Polly Reeve

429 Williams Road

5/2/2025 7:03:24 AM

Dear Members of the Dredging Subcommittee,

I came across cost estimates that our Natural Resources Division (NRD) provided CPC members on 11/15/2022 related to dredging and dam removal options, later to be formally presented within EA's Alternatives Analysis Report (AAR). To my knowledge these CPC estimates were never shared with the WPTF.

What I found striking is that (to CPC members) NRD estimated \$3.8M to relocate 55,000 cubic yards within Warner's Pond, which is an attractive option. But six months later, EA informed the public via the AAR that the dredging option was only for 14,000 cubic yards at a cost of \$3.1M, which is not an attractive option and led to a dam removal recommendation.

Wait, what? – How did NRD and EA go from estimating total project costs from \$69K per cubic yard (to CPC) to \$221K (to the public) for dredging?

The estimates likely played an important role in CPC's decision to redirect the \$550,000 application written for dredging to include other options such as dam removal. Would CPC have voted for those funds to be redirected if NRD had presented the 14,000 cubic yards option at an estimated cost of \$3.1M? Somehow, I think not.

By the way, I can't help but notice that the dam removal estimate was (mostly) spot-on. The CPC estimate was \$2.3M and the AAR estimate was \$2.5M. The only items that were understated were design costs; the CPC estimated costs at \$55K for a 60% design and the AAR estimated it at \$65K for a preliminary design...

...but in reality, EA charged Concord taxpayers ~\$280K for a 30% design (it's notable that they were the only bidder on the project). Why were EA's actual costs approximately 4.5x higher than what EA previously estimated? Shouldn't their actual costs reflect what they estimated?

Miguel Echavarri

Homeowner - 255 Commonwealth Ave

5/3/2025 7:57:46 PM

Removal of the dam is an environmental no brainer. There would be so many benefits to the Nashoba Brook ecosystem and to the town as a whole, not to mention other towns that share the waterway. It would be a wonderful way for Concord to do its part in helping restore ecological balance to our natural surroundings.

Dudley Goar

40 Upland Road, Concord, MA

5/17/2025 3:05:09 PM

Dear Task Force members,

Because decisions related to the future of Warner's Pond will affect the recreational, scenic, and ecological characteristics of our community, the Concord Land Conservation Trust is writing to express support for the option of removing the Warner's Pond dam, along with the adoption of a comprehensive, ongoing stewardship plan.

CLCT is our town's private, nonprofit land trust. Founded in 1959, the Land Trust's mission is to conserve the natural resources of Concord and the town's traditional landscape of woods, meadows, and fields. We own nearly 1000 acres in fee, and hold conservation restrictions on more than 300 additional acres of permanently preserved land. Our 26 miles of trails are open to all, and we actively steward our properties to maintain habitat value, provide recreational enjoyment, and support local farming. Our current membership includes approximately 500 households in Concord.

Across the world, we are witnessing an unprecedented loss of biodiversity due in large part to the effects of human activity. Here in Concord, we are not exempt, and we are fortunate to have this opportunity to improve our local environment in meaningful and long-lasting ways. While Warner's Pond has been a valued community asset since the dam was constructed in 1857, it is an artificial element created by people for purposes that are no longer relevant. Its health is by definition unsustainable without great effort, and, as we all know, its ecological condition has degraded significantly over time. This decline has in turn diminished its recreational value, as sediment makes swimming unappealing and arguably unsafe, invasive aquatic plants limit open water boating and fishing, and good skating conditions have become increasingly rare. Despite its current compromised condition it continues to be loved and actively enjoyed, especially by those who live nearby, and we know that this makes the work of the Task Force particularly difficult.

However, we believe that removal of the dam would provide many benefits to the residents of Concord and to the health of the local environment, benefits that outweigh the costs and risks of this undertaking. Removing the dam would create a landscape that is closer to the natural one that preceded its construction. A free-flowing Nashoba Brook would support renewed habitat for resident and migratory fish and other species, particularly once the Talbot Dam in Billerica is removed. A free-flowing stream would provide the cooler and cleaner waters that native fish and their predators rely on, and the newly revealed, healthy floodplain and wetland will provide rich habitat for birds, amphibians, mammals, and other wildlife. Importantly, this restoration will continue to provide recreational opportunities such as fishing, boating, and walking in addition to a healthier ecology. Concord has the

advantage of being able to learn from the successes and challenges of many other recent dam removal projects, and the Town's maintenance and management plan will help ensure a positive outcome.

Many of CLCT's most treasured lands are adjacent to our waterways; these are beautiful in all seasons, providing our community with opportunities for walking, skiing, running, and simply enjoying the pleasure of being in nature. A restored landscape around a freely flowing Nashoba Brook would create similar opportunities, and would, we believe, quickly become as beloved as the Pond has been.

Sincerely,

Polly Reeve, Chair

Concord Land Conservation Trust Board of Trustees

Polly Reeve, on behalf of CLCT

PO Box 141, Concord

5/22/2025 5:39:55 AM

Dear WPTF – this comment is in follow-up to an earlier comment regarding the 30% dam removal design (design) estimates and the contract awarded to EA.

Specifically, I've had a chance to dig into the design estimate presented to the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) and to the public via EA's Alternatives Analysis Report (AAR), and while I originally understated those estimates, my concerns have grown. QUESTION- were these estimates and supporting data ever provided to the WPTF? If not, why not? Consider the following...

First, as told to me by Joseph Gould, the restoration specialist with the Mass. Dept. of Fish & Game, the Talbot Mills dam removal design (DR) in Billerica was between \$100K to \$120K. But the DR design awarded to EA Engineering was \$215K for the Warners Pond Dam (WPD).

Wait, what? Why did Talbot Mills cost ~\$100K less than WPD? Talbot Mills holds back a river with a significantly larger volume of water, which is also the drinking supply for Billerica; WPD holds back a small brook. Further, the WPD design likely had more data available, data that was collected via the 2018 Warners Pond Dredging Feasibility Study and the 2012 Warner's Pond Watershed Management Plan. This should have reduced data collection costs.

Second, EA's DR design estimate presented by DNR to the CPC was \$140K. And the DR design estimate that EA provided via AAR to the public was \$115K. The AAR estimate in particular was spot-on with what was paid for at Talbot Mills.

Why did DNR accept a bid that was \$100K over what EA estimated? Has EA ever explained why it quoted the public \$115K but then submitted a cost of \$215K? Did EA help write the RFP and if not, who wrote the RFP? Did EA have (or is there a perception they had) an unfair competitive advantage on this award?

With the WPTF nearing a recommendation, I don't expect answers to these questions but please understand that DNR's actions related to dam removal and EA are viewed with skepticism by our community and feeds the distrust we hold toward this "option". Further fueling our distrust is that much of the information contained within the AAR (a report we paid a premium for) is not accurate and frankly should be questioned (e.g. claims that dam removal will help reduce flooding events caused by climate change - false).

A version of this comment (with footnotes) was sent to the Chairs and is available upon request, as are the actual CPC estimates and other information shown by the below link - If the link doesn't work, please send me an email at miguele@intelimapinc.com

https://concordma.sharepoint.com/:f:/t/TownClerk/EnwfEORPk6BOondsNzfC_hUBg5CEY3X3yGu3SgJq1XlZgQ?e=GdiWu0

Miguel Echavarri

Homeowner - 255 Commonwealth Ave

5/25/2025 9:39:59 AM

Dear WPTF members, (1 of 3 comments)

At last Thursday's meeting I was struck by the uncompromising stance of the dam removal (DR) contingent and their position that unless dam removal was voted upon, the last 15 months have been a "waste" of time.

I was further struck by how they completely disregarded Envision 2030 to focus solely on environmental sustainability. And I was left speechless when a member stated that future pond management will be done by people who "love" the pond and stunned that they believed this was a matter of concern.

To quote the WPTF NRC Charge, "The Task Force will recommend a course of action for the Pond that reflects community criteria identified in Envision Concord: (i) History + Character, (ii) Livability + Values, (iii) Mobility + Accessibility, (iv) Environmental Sustainability, and (v) Fiscal Sustainability".

The DR contingent's stance of go "dam removal" or "go bust" is not in keeping with the WPTF Charge or the spirit of cooperation by which it was established. I hope that all members understand this and don't allow them to undermine future pond management by imposing restrictions that will prevent us from managing our pond and its future health.

Miguel Echavarri

Homeowner - 255 Commonwealth Ave

5/25/2025 9:51:47 AM

Dear WPTF members, (2 of 3 comments)

I want to address statements made by the dam removal (DR) contingent regarding the (supposed) victimization of Town staff. Please consider the following, all of which is supported by MMN videos.

* Town staff specifically told the public that pond sediment isn't sand, but as you well know, it's ~80% sand. Who's the victim here? The public or town staff who misled the public?

* Town staff told MCI the sediment was compost but again, it's sand. This allowed staff to obtain MCI permission to place a sediment disposal site on restricted prison property. This made the plan unworkable, and it failed as a result. Who's the victim here? Town staff? Or MCI officials who were misled by town staff? Or taxpayers who lost \$154K in this wasted effort?

* Town staff told the public, NRC and CPC that MCI would accept the sediment as "compost" but again, the sediment is sand meaning town committees, and the public were misled. Respectfully, the real victim is the public trust.

* Town staff claimed they didn't know about security restrictions related to the disposal site. But MCI warned town staff (as early as 2017) of said restrictions. Further, EA engineers seeking to inspect the site were subjected to rigorous security measures. So, if the DR people truly believe town staff weren't aware of said restrictions, then I've got a bridge to sell them.

The DR contingent is asking for a vote to support town staff but please understand, such a vote would mean the WPTF approves of the misrepresentations town staff made (above) to our community, state agencies and town committees. And that would be wrong.

Miguel Echavarri

Homeowner - 255 Commonwealth Ave

5/25/2025 9:55:04 AM

Dear WPTF members, (3 of 3 comments)

At the last WPTF meeting, a member of the dam removal (DR) contingent asked another member to step outside. It's unlikely this request was made so they could share a cup of tea and discuss their differences in a civil manner. More likely it was a threat and should be treated as such.

Perhaps the issuance of threats and intimidation are part of CBI's consensus building process and that's why they allowed it. To be clear, CBI could've (properly) addressed the threat and diffused the situation but they didn't, thus setting a precedent that such behavior is acceptable and can be repeated.

Let me be absolutely clear – There should be a zero-tolerance policy regarding threats. I don't believe they should be made in a public meeting, and I firmly believe that all task force members and the public should feel SAFE attending meetings. CBI, as professional facilitators, should've understood this and addressed it in the moment, but they didn't.

* For clarification, when I say address, I mean CBI should've specifically told the member that such language was inappropriate and that it wouldn't be tolerated. That did not happen.

To avoid setting a precedent that threats are permissible, and to avoid future threats from being issued, I believe this member should be admonished and not allowed to participate in the upcoming meeting of the WPTF. Anything less means the task force condones such behavior.

Miguel Echavarri

Homeowner - 255 Commonwealth Ave

5/26/2025 12:38:42 PM

I wanted to thank the WPTF members for all the hours and work that went into this effort. As a member of FOWP, I am pleased with the result, and grateful that most of the TF members came to believe that there were very reasonable ways to preserve the pond for the community, add fish passage when it becomes relevant, and work on incremental improvements in water quality over time. FOWP was formed because many in the community felt that the people apparently deciding the fate of the pond did not fully appreciate the tremendous human and cultural value of the pond to the residents of West Concord, particularly when the population density of the town is about to increase exponentially. It is a cherished natural resource -- even in its degraded state and with inadequate public access, as the community meetings repeatedly demonstrated.

We are excited to get started on a proactive management plan and improve public access at Gerow and the other points. We anticipate that the stewardship committee will consist entirely of individuals who want to preserve and improve the pond, working with an experienced pond management company. We also believe it is important that the stewardship committee can function somewhat independently with the NRC as an oversight body, rather than having the NRD serve as a sole middleman through which all interactions with the pond management company and other consultants must pass. We fully anticipate that the stewardship committee will also be a major and ongoing time commitment, and we have seen that town employees do not have adequate time to devote to even baseline pond/dam maintenance, let alone a more dynamic and exploratory process. Lastly, we would advocate for including a liaison from the Recreation department, as the development of Gerow and the restoration of the pond need to be effectively coordinated.

Again, we thank you for all the mental and physical energy expended by the entire group. We are optimistic that this process will lead to the Gerow Recreation Area and Warner's Pond becoming a gem in the heart of West Concord for years to come.

Yours sincerely,

Anna Feldweg

Anna Feldweg

343 Commonwealth Ave

6/3/2025 1:51:23 PM

I am writing to share with the Task Force the content of a fairly lengthy conversation I had on May 21st with the two men who were collecting water depth and sediment depth measurements for the bathymetry survey of Warner's Pond. Their motor boat had a large wooden crate stamped GRE Survey on it and I have pictures of the men and the boat. They told me they were working for the town. When I asked what the data would be used for, they said they thought the Town was anticipating dredging the pond. They had seen all the Save the Pond signs and asked what that was about. I told them that there was a Task Force considering removing the dam. They were surprised to hear that because they had just taken measurements by the dam and said the dam was in great shape, unlike many other places where they've done measurements ahead of a dam coming down. They assumed that the Town was anticipating dredging the sediment to create a usable channel. I told them that my understanding was that the Town was considering removing the dam without doing any dredging first and would just let the channel form naturally. They said they didn't think that was the plan on this pond.

They said there is so much sediment in the Pond that it would be a "complete mess" that you couldn't use if the Town took the dam down without dredging first. They said that the sediment depth in the deep hole was about equal to the water depth in the deep hole and that there were many places in the pond where the sediment was 7 ft deep. They wanted me to know that lots of towns are dredging and that there are companies that specialize in dredging and selling the dredged material for more than half the cost of dredging. They said the sediment is so high in nutrients that places are willing to pay good money for the dredged sediment. They said that the deepest channel was through the deep hole all the way over to the fields and in front of Gerow. They told me about a company, Geosyntec, that specializes in dredging and selling the dredged material. They knew of a \$50M dredge project where Geosyntec sold the dredged material for \$35M bringing the cost of the project down to \$15M.

Since the NRC pivoted to dam removal as the "preferred alternative" after strongly advocating for dredging for many years, it seems that any information or options that could make made dredging more economically feasible have not been fully researched and explored and/or have been intentionally kept from the Task Force. The dam removal folks have recently conceded that their dam removal proposal could be more palatable if there was a dredging component to it. Several experts have said that dredging would solve the challenges associated with Warner's Pond. The unstated truth is that this all comes down to economics.

Given all of this, I ask the Task Force to strongly consider tasking the Pond Maintenance Committee or the Pond Stewardship committee with continued research into dredging, including ways to make dredging less expensive and more cost effective. Many towns are apparently undertaking and funding dredging projects, so there is much that Concord could learn about how to do that. It seems that most agree that dredging would be beneficial for Warner's Pond while it is being adaptively managed and would also be beneficial in the future if dam removal is ever considered again. Let's not walk away from dredging as a possibility while the pond is being adaptively managed.

I also request that the members of the Task Force read and discuss this public comment and other public comments that have raised important things to consider with regard to each of the alternatives. I do not see the Task Force discussing public comments. What I do see is the pro dam removal members citing comments out of context and overstating statements by experts as supporting dam removal, when many of the same experts said that dredging would be beneficial to the pond.

Allison Aley

47 Warner St.

6/11/2025 6:57:50 PM

Dear WPTF – Here’s an update and correction to my earlier email regarding CPC dredge estimates. Note, CY = cubic yard.

EA quoted \$45/CY to the CPC. It’s important to note that EA had this number confirmed by a third party, SUMCO. (Source: CPC cost estimates, emails between town staff and EA)

The outstanding question is – why wasn’t this information shared with the WPTF and later with the dredging subgroup? Taxpayers paid for these estimates, and they should’ve been passed along.

To continue – As part of the Alternative Analysis Report (AAR) EA quoted \$60/CY to the public for the AAR dredge option. (Source, footnotes under Table 4-3)

But it appears that EA actually used \$95/CY (not \$60/CY) to generate its \$2.9M AAR dredge quote to the public. (shown as Project Implementation in Table 4-3).

For example, on EA’s detailed cost breakdown on dredging, found in Section C of the AAR, EA estimated \$1.3M for “Dredging/sediment placement”. As noted above, this was based on \$60/CY to dredge 14K cubic yards. But the numbers don’t add up; when \$60/CY is applied to 14K cubic yards the amount is \$840K, not \$1.3M.

It appears that the actual cost used by EA to generate the AAR estimate was \$95/CY, not \$60/CY. (Calculation: \$1,325,000 cost/ 14,000 CY dredge area = \$95/CY)

Questions – why did EA tell the CPC that dredging would cost \$45/CY but then used \$95/CY to generate its AAR estimate, while telling the public it was \$60/CY? W.re to the CPC, the more attractive cost and large footprint of 55K cubic yards was attractive; the higher cost and reduced footprint presented by the AAR made the dredge option unviable to the public.

Three notes – [a] presenting this information is not disparaging of town staff as mentioned at the last meeting, [b] this updated comment is based on discovering Appendix C of the AAR which provided a detailed cost estimate for the dredge option and allowed me to do an apples-to-apples comparison between AAR and CPC estimates and [c] I mistakenly expressed per cubic yard costs in my last email in thousands, for example \$60/CY was described as \$60K/CY. I have no idea how I did that, and I apologize for that mistake.

Miguel Echavarri

Homeowner - 255 Commonwealth Ave