

## Charles River Dam Advisory Committee | Meeting #5

October 14, 2021 (Virtual)

### Meeting Summary

---

*This meeting summary was prepared by the Consensus Building Institute (CBI), a nonprofit entity contracted by the Town of Natick to facilitate the Charles River Dam Advisory Committee process. This summary is not intended to be a meeting transcript. Rather, it focuses on the main points covered during the meeting.*

#### MEETING IN BRIEF

The Charles River Dam Advisory Committee (AC) convened for the fifth time virtually on Thursday, October 14, 2021, to review and discuss ecological considerations for the decision facing the Town about the future of the Charles River Dam. Sixty people attended this meeting: 19 AC members, 2 invited presenters, 2 CBI project staff, and, in listening mode, 35 interested members of the public. **The agenda, presentation slides and the recording of this meeting are available on the project's webpage: <http://natickma.gov/crdam>.**

#### NEXT STEPS

- Upcoming AC meetings include the next virtual meeting on November 9, focused on cultural and historical considerations.
- AC members will continue to review the draft work plan and share suggested experts and speakers for future meetings topics.
- The Planning Team will share further details about proposed field trips to dam maintenance sites.
- The Planning Team will follow up with Mr. Wildman to address a question raised about dam removal processes with similar developmental characteristics as Natick's dam.
- The Planning Team will plan meetings with abutters upstream and downstream of the dam.
- The Planning Team will post the AC Meeting #5 recording and slides on the project webpage.
- The Planning Team will present a write-up of the criteria, values, and principles the AC identified.

#### WELCOME & COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Ona Ferguson, CBI Facilitation Team, welcomed participants. AC members approved the meeting summaries from their third meeting on September 22 and the site visit to Andover dam removal sites on October 2 with one clarifying question raised and discussed. Ms. Ferguson also presented a new public comment process, extending the typical length of Advisory Committee meetings to accommodate a live public comment period, in addition to written public comment opportunities. James Errickson, Town Administrator, welcomed the Advisory Committee and shared some updates from the Town, including asking GZA to complete a regulatory review of proposed options, further exploring questions on design of a spillway removal option, and adding in an engagement period to hear from Natick community members about what they would like to see at the site of the dam.

Advisory Committee members shared reflections from the October 2 site visit to two dam removal sites in Andover, MA. They commented on the presence of native species and habitat at the sites, questions about navigability, importance of designing ways for the public to interact with the site through a park, and how removal did not impact flooding risk downstream.

#### ECOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Maggie Osthues, CBI Facilitation Team, briefly reviewed concerns and questions on ecological considerations shared during the community input period in May-June 2021, highlighting the public's desire to understand how either option could impact water temperatures, water quality, fish species, habitat in the impoundment area, and sediment flow. Members of the public also raised questions about climate implications and ecological impacts of construction. (The complete synthesis report of public input is available on the project's webpage, [here](#)).

Nick Wildman, C.E.R.P, MA Division of Ecological Restoration (DER) and Dr. Allison Roy, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Massachusetts Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, UMass Amherst, then presented on ecological considerations around dam repair and spillway removal, speaking to spillway removal in the state; what is known about construction impacts, invasives, and climate change impacts; how dams impact water quality; and how dams impact fish species. *The presentation slides and meeting recording are available to view on the project page [here](#).*

Below are key discussion threads from AC members following the presentation on ecological considerations. *Please note that both options (dam repair and spillway removal and river restoration) were discussed without an assumption of which outcome would be selected.*

- **Concerns about smell:** There is desire to better understand how dams and impoundment areas can negatively impact water quality and habitat, specifically if Natick can expect more events of a “stinky” river and fish kills. Dr. Roy noted that warmer water temperatures result in more growth of algae and plants, which then die causing low oxygen and leading to fish kills. Odor can also be impacted by low oxygen from cyanobacteria blooms dying and falling to the bottom of the river.
- **Questions about potential for fish movement:** Members asked multiple questions about how Natick could better help fish move throughout the Charles River system. Mr. Wildman noted that the restoration of fish runs for migratory fish species like herring, given the other dams in the system, is unlikely in the near term. Improvements to passage downstream could increase the numbers of those fish near Natick. He noted that ladder designs like fishways or rockramps would likely require a design tailored to the site and to particular species, which could involve data collection, and maintenance.
- **Increasing connectedness of river system:** Referencing Dr. Roy's presentation, one member highlighted that removing the spillway would increase the connectedness of the Charles River itself, as well as increasing connectedness between multiple tributaries to the Charles River, which can be helpful for fish species.
- **Concerns about mosquitos:** One member raised questions about the risk of increased mosquito presence in a spillway removal scenario; Mr. Wildman said he would not anticipate a large change to mosquito population due to the long, linear nature of the river.
- **Questions about accessing river banks:** One member raised questions about accessing the riverbanks in a spillway removal scenario to put in a kayak; Mr. Wildman noted that there might be some difficulty immediately after the removal given the terrain, but that it should get easier with time. How rocky the substrate is will impact ease of traversing.
- **Questions about gathering Natick-specific data:**
  - Multiple members raised questions about whether the Town needs to collect water temperature and dissolved oxygen data specific to its context, or whether Natick requires additional data to make a decision, given the existing body of research around dam impacts to water temperature and quality.
  - Dr. Roy advised that the significance of data is determined by what matters to the person considering it. She also noted that timing could be challenging for data collection, as the most robust water temperature data would be collected in summer.

- Mr. Wildman recommended the AC consider, “What do you lose by removing the dam?”
- In thinking about the fact that removing this spillway would not clear the river of all dams, one member compared spillway removal along the Charles to constructing a sidewalk, which is often done piece-by-piece, building different pieces of a connected whole over time.
- Another member noted that, in a spillway removal scenario, having Natick-specific before and after data could help make the case for further removal along the Charles.
- One member raised questions about whether a study could determine if repairing the broken valve in the spillway could help mitigate water temperature in the impoundment area in a dam repair scenario.
- **Town’s projected budget:** One member asked if the Town could share its budget for supporting this decision in order for the Advisory Committee to better understand any financial constraints to additional research or technical work.

## PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Below are verbal public comments shared live in the meeting. Additional public comments submitted in writing are captured in Appendix B.

- Roger Scott, 40 Water St.: I appreciate having this opportunity to say something. My question is a new one, so I had a whole bunch of questions I submitted. Listening to Mr. Wildman earlier today, he said on the removal of the dam, the increased river flow would add a rapid-like effect to the River, which would be more challenging for canoeing. And being down river, with a lot of young families that live down here, and I know, in the past, there was a two- or three-year-old child drowned in the River further up. Would children be in danger in the neighborhoods downriver due to this potential of a rapidly moving river? Or if they had gone canoeing with a non-expert canoer, they could jeopardize their life by being in a rapidly flowing river? And also, I know that there was a big Labrador Retriever that drowned in the river, which should not have been off leash of course. And I also know that the fire department had to rescue a 19-year-old kid once with ladders to go across where the River was running high, and he decided to try to surf it and get caught in a big mess. He couldn't swim out of it, so they fought him out of it and rescued him by ladder. So just the fact that it's a calm river now and people enjoy canoeing on it, would it become dangerous for people to have to deal with the potential of having your children in the neighborhoods and a totally watchful eye. I just want the safety of the children to be considered as well as the enjoyment of the river. I did have another question: So you’re talking about fish going upstream to go to the other side of the dam, can’t you stock the other side of the dam and have fish there?
- Pat Polimeno, Dover Rd: I heard wonderful information tonight, and I'm very happy to hear about the fish and all the temperatures, but my only concern is with no matter what choice you make that you make sure that Pleasant Street is open from Route 16 south. It's our only access to Natick without going through other parts of Natick, which takes us all around or through Wellesley and Needham. It's very important.
- Joel Lewandowski, 72 Elliot St.: I have done research over the last year and looked online and not found any dam removal examples where they have a pond populated with homes around the high side. A lot of the examples I find are in industrial and secluded areas. Asking if you have any examples you can provide where they have a similar scenic view with the pond and the trees and the homes? For question #2, Mr. Blease had asked about walking to the river with a kayak and what the earth would be like. The answer from the specialist was discussing where the channel would be, and that it would maybe be on the Pleasant side. If they are removing the pond and

creating a channel, would they have the capability and would they consider moving the channel outside of the natural lay of the riverbed?

## CONCLUSION

Ona Ferguson, CBI Facilitation Team, reviewed a list of next steps and invited Advisory Committee members to share closing thoughts and reflections. Members shared excitement about convening abutters in future listening sessions to hear their thoughts, gratitude for Dr. Roy and Mr. Wildman's time and expertise, and the importance of viewing the Charles River holistically and long-term - not separating humans from ecological considerations.

## APPENDIX A: ATTENDANCE

### Advisory Committee Members

Mike Balcom, Community Member  
David Blease, Community Member  
Dirk Coburn, Finance Committee Representative  
James Errickson, Town Administrator  
Terri Evans, Planning Board Representative  
Jeannine Furrer, Historic District Commission Representative  
Martin Kessel, Community Member  
Seth Levine, Recreation and Parks Commission Representative  
David Lodding, Open Space Advisory Committee Representative  
Jeremy Marsette, Director, Public Works  
William McDowell, Town Engineer  
Karen Partanen, Director, Recreation and Parks  
Claire Rundelli, Conservation Agent  
Mary Kate Schneeweis, Conservation Commission Representative  
Aaron Spelker, Commission on Disability Representative  
Rebekah Stendahl, Community Member  
Jillian Wilson Martin, Sustainability Coordinator  
Kristen Wyman, Indigenous Representative: Natick Nipmuc Indian Council  
David Yancey, Indigenous Representative: Natick Nipmuc

### Project Staff

Ona Ferguson, CBI Facilitator  
Maggie Osthues, CBI Facilitator

### Invited Presenters

Dr. Allison Roy, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Massachusetts Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, UMass Amherst  
Nick Wildman, C.E.R.P, MA Division of Ecological Restoration (DER)

**35 interested members of the public** also attended the meeting.

## APPENDIX B: WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

**Brad Peterson**

October 3 and October 8

Also, I have attached my comments on the meeting held 9/22, and a link to an opinion piece I wrote in the Metro West Daily News. If you are able to distribute to the Advisory Board, it would be much appreciated.

<https://www.metrowestdailynews.com/story/opinion/2021/10/05/brad-peterson-south-natick-dam-de-serves-better-than-riprap/6001998001/>

Thank you and have a good weekend,

Brad

Dear Committee Members,

Thank you for your time and effort in this process. It is much appreciated.

Since no public comments were solicited during your September 22nd public meeting, please see my comments below:

During the presentation from GZA Associates, the past tense was used when describing the earthen dam repair option, such as “we would have..” and the future tense was used when describing spillway removal, such as “we will..” This is most likely an innocent mistake, and reflective of the fact dam repair was commissioned by the town as a first option, before spillway removal was commissioned as a second. It may, however, lead an outside observer to believe the process is biased toward spillway removal. In the same vein, it appears that the photo renderings of spillway removal are of a higher quality than those of earthen dam repair.

During the presentation by GZA Associates, statements were made that i) the upstream catchment area was too small to provide any flood storage, AND ii) the small patch wetland down stream of the earthen dam (a small fraction of the size) would provide a flood storage.

The Town Engineer closed his comments by noting that backfilling the earthen dam was not an alternative considered or studied as “our Conservation Commission would not allow it”. While the Town Engineer may have an opinion as to what the Conservation Commission may allow, he does not actually know until a Notice of Intent is filed with a proposed plan. According to MassDEP and Town of Natick Conservation Commission by law (<https://www.natickma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/587/Natick-Wetland-By-Laws>), wetlands can be altered where the Commission finds it necessary, and would require “replication” in a nearby area.

Any alteration to the dam, either through earthen dam repair or spillway removal is will likely require permits from the DEP, MASSDEP and Army Corps. As part of permit process, the Town would be legally required to conduct an Alternatives Analysis. Backfilling the earthen dam could be one such alternative.

It also appears that South Natick dam is a named feature within the John Eliot Historic District (<https://www.natickma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/629/Natick-Historic-Districts-PDF>). This district is registered both the Massachusetts Historic Register, and the National Historic Register. It may be that redevelopment, or removal of the spillway is restricted by law.

Thank you again for your time and effort in this process,

Brad Peterson  
7 Dover Road, Natick

---

**Kyle Ondricek**

October 11

I have summarized my earlier email questions below.

Has there been a quantified liability and risk assessment of a failure of our dam?

Has there been a quantified liability and risk assessment of a failure of our dam?

I ask...

1. What volume of water is held by the dam "containment basin/reservoir"?
2. In a 100 year flood what volume of water per minute would go over the spillway?
3. What would the downstream flood plain area and height be if the dam failed and its reservoir volume was added to the 100 year flood volume per minute over a time span of 1 minute, 10 minutes, 100 minutes?
4. How many dams in the "fair or poor" condition category have failed in the last 50 or 100 years?

Here is what prompted these questions.

This question arose in my mind when Bill McDowell said that if we drained all of the reservoir behind the dam before a flood it would fill up in minutes. Therefore, trying to use the Reservoir as flood control was not going to be effective. I agree.

This led me to think " OK if the damn failed in a 100 year flood and we sent all of the upstream Reservoir water down the stream in a few minutes would it really make a lot of difference?

For example, If it raised the floodplain water by half an inch it would be much less of a liability and damage downstream than if it raised it by a foot. Or stated another way If failure raised the floodplain water by 1% it would be much less of a liability than if it raised it by 30%.

I think we all would feel much more comfortable repairing the dam and living with possible liability if consequences were small instead of catastrophic.

Since the consultants have already modeled the effect of the flood with and without the dam I think they could give us an estimate.

Finally, I suspect the probability of a repaired dam failure is really small. How many dams in the "fair or poor" condition category have failed in the last 50 or 100 years?

I am concerned that we may be on a path to destroy a beautiful and iconic landmark that provides great pleasure to many based on a legal and catastrophic view that does not seem to have been quantified and may be smaller than we think.

---

**Mass Audubon, Elissa M. Landre**

October 12

Attached is a letter for your consideration in advising on the future of the Charles River dam in Natick. We hope it will be helpful in your discussions.

Best regards,

Elissa

Elissa M. Landre  
Community Advocacy and Engagement Manager Metro West  
Mass Audubon's Broadmoor Wildlife Sanctuary  
280 Eliot Street  
Natick, MA 01760  
508 655-2210  
[elandre@massaudubon.org](mailto:elandre@massaudubon.org)  
FAX 508 647-0429  
[www.massaudubon.org/broadmoor](http://www.massaudubon.org/broadmoor)



October 11, 2021

Charles River Dam Advisory Committee  
c/o James Errickson, Town Administrator  
Natick Town Hall, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
13 East Central Street  
Natick, MA

Via Email: [jerrickson@natickma.org](mailto:jerrickson@natickma.org)  
[mosthues@cbi.org](mailto:mosthues@cbi.org)

**Re: Letter Regarding the Future of the Charles River Dam in South Natick**

Dear Committee Members:

Mass Audubon is pleased to provide this letter as part of Natick's public outreach program with residents and stakeholders regarding the future of the Charles River Dam in South Natick.

Mass Audubon is supportive of nature-based solutions, including the removal of obsolete dams to restore natural riverine flows, structural features, and processes; reduce flood hazards; improve water quality and habitat for fish and other aquatic life; and to restore floodplains and riparian corridors. Mass Audubon has supported many other dam removal and riparian restoration projects. Examples on Mass Audubon's properties include the restoration of former cranberry bogs at Tidmarsh Wildlife Sanctuary in Plymouth – the largest freshwater restoration project in the Northeast, and removal of a dam on Sackett Brook in Pittsfield, MA in 2014. Our experiences with these projects have highlighted the importance of effective public outreach in addition to the technical planning and permitting that is needed to achieve success. Through our statewide network of wildlife sanctuaries and nature centers we are engaged in many educational programs and stakeholder engagement processes related to nature-based solutions.

As the largest riverfront property owner upstream of the Charles River Dam in South Natick – including land that is part of the Natural Valley Storage Area, Mass Audubon has a strong interest in the restoration opportunity offered by this project. Mass Audubon has participated in several public meetings regarding the future of the dam and has been impressed with the thoroughness of the process. Given our statewide experiences, we are eager to see dam removal explored with further detailed planning, and are hopeful this will lead to the River being returned to its natural flow with habitats for native species.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Elissa M. Landre in black ink.

Elissa M. Landre  
Community Advocacy and Engagement Manager

Handwritten signature of Heidi Ricci in black ink.

Heidi Ricci  
Director of Policy and Advocacy

cc: Jillian Wilson-Martin, Natick Director of Sustainability

---

**Ed Doherty**

October 12

Please note that I was concerned when a supporter of the Dam Repair was sending photos of a fisherman at the existing dam. I am quite certain that the falls were a great fishing spot for the native americans before the dam and mills were built. The Charles River restoration group would be glad to speak to this issue.

Let me know if I need to have a fisherman speak at town meeting to express a true picture of the fishing history at the South Natick Falls...

Regards,

Ed Doherty

Town Meeting Member, Precinct 10

---

**Connie Dinning**

October 13

We live a couple blocks from the spillway and visit the site frequently, and have done this for over 35 years. We love its iconic beauty.

My husband and I have been attending all of your meetings regarding the dam and would like clarification on a couple of things.

At the most recent meeting, partial removal of the spillway was added to the potential plans. It was stated that the river would subsequently flow through an area of the spillway that was removed, not over a lower spillway. There was no visual presented to go along with this. Would there be exposed cement spillway to each side of the river? This would seem unsightly and would change a beautiful site into an eyesore.

What will the town do along the new lower riverbanks if the spillway is removed? Despite repeated requests from the public for some design plans regarding this, we have not seen or been told of any plan. If nothing is done, our concern is that the riverbanks will be overgrown and have muddy, impassable soil/ground as the water level changes with rains and dry weather. We live along the river, so can verify these soil changes with the weather.

Lastly, please add a request for a canoe/kayak path or ramp to this area if the spillway is removed.

It seems clear that a design plan must be part of the decision-making phase of this project.

Thank you,

Connie Dinning

---

**Robert Reeve**

October 13

Hello. This is Robert Reeve writing. I live at 8 Dover Road, Natick. While I am in favor of free flowing rivers with no impediments, I would like to see the committee urge the use of a landscape designer who is both informed on the free flowing rivers and preserving the town's most special park, so that it doesn't just turn into looking like a Department of Transportation cement project devoid of the specialness that does exist at the site. Thank you.

---

**Roger Scott**

October 13

On dam removal, theoretically, the town of Natick would have no liability for damage to the homes down river. If the advice from the dam removal company ends up as flawed and inaccurate, and serious changes happen to affect homes down river, will they inherit the legal obligations to make good on all claims filed against them for malpractice?

What would the cost be for reenforcing the Pleasant St. Bridge on removal of the spillway?

The town engineer states the cost of dam repair will be \$1.2 million and the cost of removal of the spillway \$500,000. The repair will be good for 90 years as stated by the town engineer. With the costs and consequences of the dam removal (bridge repair, environmental issues with invasive species, potential need for chemical treatment if not contained by the magic beetles), in the long run, wouldn't it be better to fix the known than to venture into the unknown?

If the town was responsible for the maintenance of the dam, why didn't they do it and thereby avoid the tree growth on the dam and the problems we now must deal with?

How can the town legitimize using the children from the middle school as part of the survey to say that they had a high level of agreement with removal of the spillway to bolster the case for that decision? (Teacher bias who are probably from out of town and do not pay taxes in Natick and therefore should not have any say in the decision)

Should National Shrines be treated with respect?

In a report written by Charlotte Diamant- Wellesley College Student,

A History of the Charles River Dam in South Natick and displayed by the Natick Historical Society on the web, she writes.

The goal of reconstruction was to beautify the riverside and nearby Old Town Park, create a new swimming spot, and put men to work during the Great Depression. Water-powered industry was no longer a consideration. Despite the \$35,000 estimated cost (about \$670,000 in 2020 dollars), 800 town meeting voters unanimously approved the project in March 1934, and town employees offered to give 7.5 percent of their annual wages to help pay for it. The new dam—135 feet long, 20 feet wide, and 12 feet high, sitting on solid rock—was largely finished by the end of the summer. Some federal aid was secured, and ultimately more than 200 men and women worked on the project that had a final cost of about \$50,000. Nearly 3,000 people gathered for the dedication and speakers praised the dam as a “national shrine.”

Roger Scott  
40 Water St.  
Natick, Ma. 01760

---

### **Charles River Watershed, Robert Kearns**

October 13

Please see the attached letter from CRWA to the Natick Charles River Dam Advisory Committee attached as well as a copy of an interesting document [Massachusetts Acts of 1795 Chap. 33](#) which we reference in a footnote of the letter which notes the authorization by the state legislature for the Town of Natick to regulate the harvest of Alewife and shad by the Town of Natick .

Best,  
Robert

--

**Robert Kearns**

Climate Resilience Specialist  
Charles River Watershed Association

41 West Street, Suite 800  
Boston, MA 02111  
t 617-540-5650 x1075  
*Pronouns He/Him/His*

October 12, 2021

Dear Members of the Natick Charles River Dam Advisory Committee,

We are writing on behalf of Charles River Watershed Association (CRWA) to offer our perspectives on the ecological impacts of the South Natick Dam, and the benefits of removing it. We regret that a conflicting event precludes us from joining your virtual meeting on this topic. In reviewing the meeting agenda, we note that you will be hearing from many dam removal experts, and as such we have kept our comments relatively brief and focused on the specifics of the South Natick Dam and the Charles River.

Removing the South Natick Dam would benefit the Charles River ecosystem in the following ways.

*Improve Water Quality*

CRWA monitors water quality throughout the watershed, and sees the effects of dams on various water quality parameters and issues. While we do not have data specifically within the South Natick Dam impoundment, our data from the Lakes District and the Lower Basin of the Charles River show the negative impacts of dams on water quality. In these impoundments, we have recorded slower moving water, higher water temperatures, lower dissolved oxygen levels, more invasive plant species, more frequent and severe cyanobacteria blooms, and a lower biodiversity of benthic macroinvertebrates. Removing the dam would improve water quality by allowing the water to flow freely through this stretch, remaining cool and oxygenated.

*Reconnect a Large Section of the Charles River*

Removing the South Natick Dam's spillway would reconnect a total of 26.23 miles of the main stem of the Charles River, restoring connectivity between the Cochrane Dam on the Dover-Needham border and the Sanford Mill Dam in Medway. This would be a vast improvement for a relatively short river which currently has 19 dams along the 80 mile mainstem. Removing the dam would not only connect this section of the main river, but would also restore connectivity of the area downstream of the dam into six major tributaries in the watershed, including the Stop River, Bogastow Brook, and the Mill River. Connectivity is critical for resident fish to be able to pass into the river and tributaries providing additional spawning grounds and opening access to cool, free flowing sections of the river. As was observed this summer in a major fish kill in the river<sup>1</sup>, when fish are trapped in unhealthy sections of the river they can suffocate en masse due to high pollutants concentrations and low levels of dissolved oxygen. Improved water quality will further foster a more hospitable habitat for fish to thrive.

---

<sup>1</sup><https://www.wcvb.com/article/dead-something-heavy-rain-leaves-charles-river-reeking-of-death/37106706>



Charles River Watershed Association

### *Improve Fish Passage and Migration*

The Charles River is home to over twenty species of resident fish, including bass, pickerel, perch, bullhead, catfish and trout. Additionally, migratory fish including Alewife, blueback herring, American shad and American eel migrate up the Charles River to their spawning grounds each spring. Removing the South Natick Dam's spillway will be a significant step forward in achieving the ultimate goal of fully-restoring fish passage in the Charles River so migratory fish can one day complete their historic migration routes, including through Natick<sup>2</sup>. This will require additional dam removal and fish passage improvements downstream overtime.

### *Address Sediment Accumulation*

Removing the spillway would have the co-benefit of eliminating sediment collection behind the dam going forward. Accumulated sediment can further reduce dissolved oxygen levels and, depending on the rate of accumulation, can bury new plant growth as it occurs. The sediment currently accumulated behind the dam would be addressed as a part of the dam removal process. Removing the spillway will create additional healthy benthic (river bottom) habitat to support native plants and creatures that are an important part of a healthy river ecosystem.

### *Enhance Recreation*

Dam removal would reconnect a large section of river for boaters and paddlers who would otherwise need to avoid the drowning hazard from the spillway. Improved conditions for fish also mean that this portion of the river may be able to support more recreational fishing.

### *Trees*

If the Town chose to repair the dam and keep the spillway in place--rather than remove it-- that would require the removal of a large number of mature trees located on the earthen portion of the dam. These trees currently provide considerable ecological benefit in the form of habitat, cooling of water and air, and stormwater control, which would all be lost with the removal of the trees.

Thank you for considering these comments. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to reach out to us. We look forward to continuing to be involved in this important conversation.

Sincerely,

Lisa Kumpf  
River Science Program Manager

Emily Norton  
Executive Director

---

<sup>2</sup> In 1795 the Town of Natick passed a home rule petition which the Massachusetts General Court (State Legislature) approved to regulate the taking of Shad and Alewives within the Charles River in Natick. ([Massachusetts Acts of 1795 Chap. 33](#))

---

**Kristen Norman**

October 25

Good morning,

As the daughter ( forever In my heart Natickite ) of  
Long time old South Natick  
Resident “ Franny” Branagan,  
I’m saddened to see what’s happening to our beloved town.

If there’s a petition to sign to save; please allow me to e-sign <3& continue to share on FB.

When I come home,,,,,

It’s the Cove, Casey’s,

—grab a coffee

Head down to

Glenwood ( sad they built 🌳 behind her poor soul

A-Gain... & the ICONIC

falls where we go to remember...love & reflect with our angels 🙏 & so many things gone by.

Peace 🕊 love & SAVE STUFF!!!

Thank you for taking the time to read this; I stand with MANY in fight for what’s RIGHT & JUST.

Witch of Magnolia’s girl,

Kristen

Redmen is Respect.

---