



Town of Stow Conservation Commission

380 Great Road
Stow, Massachusetts 01775
(978) 897-8615
FAX (978) 897-4534
conservation@stow-ma.gov

TO: Nathanial Cataldo, Stamski & McNary
FROM: Kathy Sferra, Stow Conservation Coordinator
RE: Athens Lane Area Wetland Delineation – PRELIMINARY Comments
DATE: January 25, 2021

Below is a summary of the wetland flagging questions and modifications from our field work associated with the Athens Lane ANRAD to date. The field work has been done by Ingeborg Hegemann Clark and myself on three separate dates this past month. We have one remaining day of field work to do to review the delineation for Maple Street, scheduled for this Thursday. All new flagging was done with red and white striped flagging.

Please review, and if needed we are happy to schedule time in the field to review any remaining questions. Members of the Commission may have other comments at the public hearing.

Sheet 1

- a) Flag GC110 was relocated 8-10' upgradient, please correct missing GC109 on the plans
- b) Flag GC 112 was missing in the field. Observations suggest it should be higher than shown on the plan. Please check.
- c) Please recheck the delineation in the areas of GC131 to GC 139. Field observation suggests that this line should be 1-10' higher across this pocket
- d) WF D14 should be relocated approximately 3' higher
- e) There is a wetland line off the property between WF D14 and WF E5. Please approximate the boundary and note the location of buffer zones in this area.
- f) There are two WF GC100 on the plan. One of these should be 101. Why was this line not carried to the property line?

Sheet 2

- a) The MAHW line at the main access culvert crossing is confusing. The MAHW line should go through the culverts and then downstream perpendicular with the road and not parallel to it.
- b) We added a flag A14A near the stone building and slightly upgradient of the proposed line
- c) We also added a flag 23A replacing flag 24 and to encompass a low lying wetland area at the base of the slope.
- d) We have a number of questions/comments regarding the small IVW located near the stone building:
 - i. Flag #2 is missing in the field and should be replaced
 - ii. We dug a test hole just off the old roadbed and found 10 YR 2/1 soils at 16" with numerous inclusions. We would ask that this area be revisited with an eye to whether

- there is a channel or BVW crossing the roadway and flowing toward the A series wetland. It appears that there is about a 50' long area here with standing/flowing water.
- iii. There are also numerous pockets of standing water likely caused by breakout in poor soils in the area. This is an area that will require attention during construction.
 - e) A number of flags are missing from the sheet in the area of flags GC 5-13 but were found in the field. They encompass a small pocket of wetland that is not shown on the plans. The surveyors will need to pick these up and add them. It also appears that there may be some mis-numbering here (e.g. there are two flags GC6, then a GS7, and then WF 15 and G16.)
 - f) Similarly, Flags GC 31-36 are missing from the plan, and upgradient of the existing line. They should be added.
 - g) Flag GC 50 was relocated approximately 5' upgradient
 - h) Flags C-15 through C-17 are missing on the plan, but were in the field.
 - i) Of interest, there was standing water in two small pockets at the far southern extent of the C-53 to C-64 inlet. This is not a stream, but a small finger like depression.

Sheet 3 – No changes

Sheet 4

- a) We may need a bit more information on the wetland boundaries on the south side of Athens Lane – at least in terms of the stream channel and wetland edges near the roadway. Please add these to the plan.
- b) A prior wetland replication area in the vicinity is not shown. We realize that road materials may have been pushed into it but given that this was a replication area required as part of a settlement of a violation, we may want to see this area flagged and the area re-established. We have a plan showing this area which we can provide you.
- c) Wetland Flags 2 through 8 are not shown on the plan. Additionally, in some circumstances there are both flags on vegetation and stakes in the ground. It was not clear which flags were the wetland delineation flags. Please clarify.
- d) Wetland Flag 12 was replaced with Flag 12R. Please measure and show 12 R on the plan.
- e) We noted a small alternate channel along Sandy Brook in the approximate area of MAHW 16 to 19. It is not clear whether the Brook would flow through this channel at high water but we thought it should be noted and possibly evaluated at high water.
- f) Flags C-3 through C-7 were missing in the field, as were the corresponding MAHW flags. I saw some remnants that had been placed on grasses, but they had fallen and I wasn't sure where they were to be. Also, this area is somewhat transitional, so I suggest they replace the flags with pin flags or stakes and also do an upland and wetland data plot in this location.
- g) MAHW flags 31 and 32 are located in an odd location in the field that doesn't seem to correspond to the river bank. These should be checked in the field and corrected, as necessary. This area also has a small "esker-like upland island" between the river and what must have been a borrow pit, which has now developed into a wetland marsh.

Sheet 5 – No changes

Sheet 6 – Still to be reviewed. But it appears that MAHW and Riverfront Area are missing from the Brook in this area.

Overall

- a) There is no delineation of BLSF. This will be excluded from the Commission's decision unless it is shown.
- b) Once the flags are all set, it would be very helpful to have a single overview sheet that shows all resource areas.