



**Norton Conservation Commission**

70 East Main Street

Norton MA 02766

508-285-0275

Email: [conservation@nortonmaus.com](mailto:conservation@nortonmaus.com)

<https://www.nortonma.org/conservation-commission>

RECEIVED  
NORTON TOWN CLERK

2021 MAR -4 AM 9:26

**Monday, January 25, 2021**

**6:30 pm**

**Remote Participation Only**

**The Public Remote Participation Procedure is found at the end of this Agenda**

**REVISED 2**

**Chairperson to read about Public Meetings:**

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting of the **Norton Conservation Commission** will be conducted via remote participation to the greatest extent possible. Specific information and the general guidelines for remote participation by members of the public and/or parties with a right and/or requirement to attend this meeting can be found at the end of this agenda.

**No in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted**, but every effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings in real time, via technological means. In the event that we are unable to do so, despite best efforts, we will post on the **Norton Cable website** (<https://www.nortonmediacenter.org/>) an audio or video recording, transcript, or other comprehensive record of proceedings as soon as possible after the meeting.

**Minutes**

6:30pm Open meeting

*The meeting was called to order at 6:30pm.*

*Attendance: Julian Kadish, Ron O'Reilly, Gene Blood, Dan Pearson, Kerry Malloy Snyder, Conservation Secretary Melissa Quirk, Conservation Director Jennifer Carlino*

*Absent: Lisa Carrozza, Daniel Doyle, Jr.*

**WETLAND HEARINGS AND POSSIBLE COMMISSION DELIBERATIONS**

Wetland hearings will be taken in order.

**Chairperson to read about Public Hearings:**

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §20, and the Governor's March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, this public hearing of the Norton Conservation Commission is being conducted via remote participation. No in-person attendance of members of the public will be permitted, but the public can listen to/view this public hearing/meeting while in progress by logging into

the Zoom conference meeting listed at the END of this agenda. Members of the public attending this public hearing/meeting virtually will be allowed to make comments if they wish to do so, during the portion of the hearing designated for public comment, by raising their hand virtually or pressing \*9 if participating by phone.

- A. Request for Determination of Applicability (DET #1107) Lisa Foley, 20 Talbot Drive, (Map 17, Parcel 167).** The proposed project involves plans to remove one tree within 200-foot of Riverfront Area. Files can be viewed here <https://tinyurl.com/DET1107-20Talbot>

*Document List – 20 Talbot Drive*

- 1. WPA Form 1- Request for determination of applicability received 1/12/2021*

*Carlino showed a plan of the project.*

*Motion was made to close the public hearing for DET #1107 by Pearson, seconded by Blood. Motion passes.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

<i>Blood– Aye</i>	<i>Pearson – Aye</i>
<i>O'Reilly – Aye</i>	<i>Snyder - Aye</i>
<i>Kadish– Aye</i>	

*Motion was made to issue a Negative 3 Determination for DET #1107 by Pearson, seconded by O'Reilly. Motion passes.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

<i>Blood– Aye</i>	<i>Pearson – Aye</i>
<i>O'Reilly – Aye</i>	<i>Snyder - Aye</i>
<i>Kadish– Aye</i>	

- B. Notice of Intent (#250-1070) Widak/Sher Corp. LTD, 0 Rear Eddy Street (Map 32, Parcel 31).** The proposed project is to construct a common driveway with associated stormwater management, septic system, utilities, retaining walls and grading for 4 duplex units within 100 feet of bordering vegetated wetland. Files can be viewed here <https://tinyurl.com/rearEDDYSherCorp>

*Tim McGuire of Goddard Consulting, Craig Cygawnoski of RIM Engineering and Margaret Bacon of Civil Site Engineering attended the hearing on behalf of the applicant.*

*McGuire stated green cards were mailed today. He explained the project and wetland resources on the plan provided. One of the duplexes is in the buffer zone in its entirety. There is also a potential septic tank, guardrail, a couple retaining walls, several stormwater management features, some grading and a rain garden. However, the work in the buffer zone is in a very small area of the parcel. All work is outside of the 25-foot buffer zone. Chessia is reviewing the Stormwater Report. The project has also been put through the special permit process. They have provided positive comments but have not issued the final permit yet while awaiting the ConCom's comments.*

*Carlino asked how the floodplain was determined and are there calculations for the elevation. Cygawnoski stated it is a large site. They were in the process with Goddard and did not finalize the elevation. It is a Zone A, no elevation. Carlino will look through the regulations with them.*

*Bacon did the stormwater design and prepared the report and stated all stormwater standards were met. Carlino questioned the entrance road on Route 140. Does any stormwater from 140 come onto the site? Bacon calculated a little, but not much. She has it going into a stone swale which then goes into a water quality basin. She does account for any stormwater from that section. Carlino asked if the common driveway is pitched into the infiltration trench. Bacon stated everything from the proposed driveway will go into that trench. Carlino noted some steep areas on the slope that are disturbed may need to be stabilized.*

*Bacon reviewed the middle section. It is a fairly flat site. The roadway is pitched toward a long swale which drains to a settling basin. The basin then drains to an infiltration trench which goes under the roadway to another water quality basin. The rain gardens will take in the roof run-off. Since it is clean water, it is kept separate from the road drainage. Carlino asked if each duplex has its own drinking water well or are they shared. Cygawnoski stated there will be separate wells and septs. Telephone poles and electricity will be brought in and will be added to the plans. Carlino asked if there will be a condo or homeowner association, and who will be responsible for the dam on Lot 3. Cygawnoski stated it is a requirement of the special permit to have a homeowner's association. McGuire stated the dam will be the shared responsibility of the HOA.*

*Kadish asked what type of railroad is there and does it have a barrier to prevent people from walking out there. Cygawnoski stated it is an active railroad. He is not sure of the purpose or to what extent it is used. They are leaving a 30-foot no touch buffer up to the MBTA property. There is a fence along the existing MBTA property line.*

*Pearson and Snyder stated they would like to see the site.*

*Resident Debra White stated four generations of the White family have lived on the other side of Meadowbrook Pond. This is the saddest day of her life to see that this is happening for so many reasons. She asked what is the buffer zone from the highest point of water where the proposed duplexes are going? How big is the buffer zone from the land edge up to the lots? Cygawnoski replied Lots 1, 2 and 3 are mostly outside the 100-foot buffer. Lot 4 is closer to the right-hand side.*

*The building is within the 100-foot buffer, but the limit of work would be about 50 feet if they moved the rain gardens. Carlino stated it now shows 26 feet. Cygawnoski sated they could possibly move the rain gardens and rearrange the wells, but they do have to keep a certain distance from the septic. They will look at options and be as least intrusive as possible. McGuire reiterated they are preserving as much as possible of the 48 acre parcel as green space and wetlands. They are only altering a small portion.*

*The applicant requested a continuance to 2/8/2021 Motion was made to continue the public hearing for DEP #250-1070 to February 8, 2021 by Pearson, seconded by O'Reilly. Motion passes.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

*Blood- Aye  
O'Reilly - Aye  
Kadish- Aye*

*Pearson - Aye  
Snyder - Aye*

**C. Notice of Intent (#250-1071) Mansfield Municipal Airport Commission, 265 Fruit Street, (Map 3, Parcel 428 and Map 4, Parcels 133, 139-02, 140, 142 and 191).** The proposed project is to remove obstructive vegetation within wetland, a certified vernal pool and within 100 feet of wetland. Files can be viewed here <https://tinyurl.com/MansAirportVEG>

*Bree Sullivan, Matthew Caron and Jackie Marks of Gale Associates, Inc. attended the hearing on behalf of the applicant. Also, Joel Brandwine, Chair of the Mansfield Airport Commission and Steven Riberdy of GZA GeoEnvironmental attended the hearing.*

*Sullivan gave a summary of the project. She explained the Mansfield Municipal Airport is partially in Norton and partially in Mansfield. The Airport is required by federal regulations to keep certain areas of the air space over and around the airport clear for safety reasons. These are federally mandated surfaces under 14CFR, Part 77 of the FAA regulations. They stipulate that in order for aircraft to operate safely, those areas must be kept clear of penetrations (trees, telephone poles). The proposed project is for the management of vegetation that penetrates into those areas. They did a survey of the airport and determined what areas require vegetation management. They typically remove penetrations (an object that penetrates the air space) and also near penetrations (objects within 10 feet of the air space). This is done since vegetation will grow into the space. It is an ongoing process. The FAA ties all grants to the airport with them signing off that this work is done. These surfaces have been in place for years. It is not a change. It is strictly to comply with existing areas.*

*Riberdy explained they delineated the wetlands. Much of the work on the plan is maintenance cutting/mowing that was done about 5 years ago. He explained the new areas of cutting are for off-airport parcels. They needed to be cut but are new because the Airport just recently acquired*

*the rights to clear those areas. He reviewed the resource areas on the plan. Riberdy stated there is minimal cutting in the buffer zone.*

*Sullivan explained the Notice of Intent was filed for two different things. It is for new vegetative selective removal. They are not clearing. It is only removal of penetrations and near penetrations. The work proposed off property are newly acquired aviation/navigation easements. Those easements were required on the parcels that were identified as needing vegetative removal. As far as the easements are concerned, they have the rights to do the work. The other part of the Notice of Intent is to cover the maintenance work that will be done on Parcel 428 which is Airport property. The maintenance work is part of the Yearly Operational Plan update that was submitted to the ConCom in the last month. That plan was not prepared by them. It was done by Mass DOT Aeronautics Commission through their consultant. The work in that plan needs to be covered because it is work within resource areas and within the buffer. All of those areas have been previously managed under a previous OOC issued by the Norton ConCom and in conformance with the 2013 Vegetation Management Plan. All airports are required to have a Vegetation Management Plan approved by the Mass DOT Aeronautics Commission and local Conservation Commission. It is very specific in how this will be done in a manner that will affect the resource areas as little as possible. Kadish clarified this involves a limited number of trees. He assumes the work will be done in a time of low water and there will be no heavy equipment. What is needed will be hand carried on and off site. Sullivan agreed. She also stated they are requesting a 5-year term on the OOC which is consistent with the aerial operational plan time period so they will line up.*

*Carlino requested a book and page for the permit to be recorded.*

*Carlino asked if with the penetration and near penetration, are these with trees that are 80 feet and taller? Sullivan replied it depends where they are. The closer you get to the primary surface which is the airport, the penetrations are much shorter. On page 74 of the PDF, there is an image that shows the measurement of the work and removals that will be done in that area. Carlino asked if the trees to be removed would be marked. Sullivan stated they could do that. Carlino requested the trees not be dropped on the existing path on the Land Preservation Society property. Sullivan agreed.*

*Resident Fred Briggs lives at parcel 142. He stated the Airport may have easement access now, but that could change because it is being challenged in the Court now. He asked if trees in the purple that would be taken would be marked prior. Carlino responded that would be something required in the OOC. Briggs stated the trees in the green areas are not marked. Prior to the easement taking by the Airport, Gale Associate refused to provide any information as to what trees would be taken prior to the taking. Briggs asked if there is a height drawing of the penetration the trees need to be at and what trees exceed that, why is that not being provided to the residents? Sullivan responded there is a plan available on the town's website on page 74 of the PDF of their application package that shows those measurements. Kadish clarified the green section is not in a jurisdictional area. It is outside the buffer zone and does not need a permit to be removed. Sullivan*

*stated that is correct. Since the trees in the green section are not in the buffer, they were not marked. Briggs said his major concern is that these trees act as a natural buffer for noise abatement. There is no noise abatement procedure for residents of Norton through the Town of Mansfield for the Mansfield Airport. Their noise abatement procedures only highlight Mansfield residents, but Norton residents are severely impacted. He wants to know what the Mansfield Municipal Airport plans to do for noise abatement when they start taking down these trees. Kadish believes that is outside of what we can do under our purview with the Wetland Protection Act. Briggs believes the effect on wildlife with noise and pollution would have some impact with the Norton ConCom. Kadish responded that much of what has been discussed are regulations at the federal level for safety with use of the Airport. Briggs questions the safety issue because Gale Associates has not been forthcoming with information and has given false information. According to the 2019 project plan, this is more about getting federal grant money through improvements by opening up the space, not flight safety. We have no representation in the Town of Mansfield, so he would hope the Town of Norton would represent the residents here. Carlino stated possibly the Airport Commission could address this before the next meeting.*

*Caron responded that the FAA did pay for an aeronautical study in 2018. This is not uncommon for airports to do tree clearing, particularly the approach surfaces. They do everything in their power to limit the impact to private properties. The Airport Commission does meet monthly. Since this discussion is out of the Norton ConCom's jurisdiction, The Mansfield Airport Commission could probably address these questions. Their next meeting is this Thursday. Carlino clarified residents could find the meeting information on the Town of Mansfield's website.*

*Resident Julie Warren stated she received a vague letter asking them to attend the Zoom meeting and talk about whether or not it is appropriate to clear land. The answer is no. The noise from the Airport has gone up substantially in the last 10 years. Her neighbor, Karen, sold them the triangular piece of land so that trees could be cleared. She investigated this whole subject. The answer from Gale Associates was that maybe they should not have bought a house near the Airport. She asked the ConCom not to make any Determination tonight so the Norton residents can come to a decent agreement with the Airport. They are terrible neighbors. The noise shakes their homes in the middle of the night. Now they are talking about taking down more trees? She does not think this appropriate and would love to be invited to the Mansfield meetings and have representation for the people this affects. The flight path comes from Norton. Kadish reminded her our jurisdictional area does not cover all of these areas where there is a request to remove trees. It is only in the buffer zones where there is tree removal proposed. Warren believes this is an exception process. We can either grant the exception or not grant the exception. This is conservation land. We have laws in place. More research needs to be done. Carlino reviewed on the plan the areas that are within wetland jurisdiction.*

*Resident Adam Warren believes the talk of leaving stumps for the environment is fancy talk for not paying for anything more than they have to. Nobody would leave long stumps in their yard. They would remove the tree and the stump and replant something nice to help with the buffer of the sound. The Mansfield Airport Commission should support the natural wildlife with new trees and*

*sound barriers. He thinks the stumps should also be removed on the walking path and plant new vegetation there. It looks like a war zone on Fruit Street where they cut trees and left all the stumps. Something better needs to be proposed. He would ask Mansfield to pause approving anything until the residents of the Town of Norton, who do not have representation, are able to get in front of the committee. Kadish responded that for those things within the jurisdiction of the ConCom, we can't direct them to remove stumps. It is actually very disruptive to remove and drag logs from the vernal pools and wetland areas. Warren replied it is mostly not wetland. Kadish agreed. But if it's out of our jurisdiction, he is assuming the Airport Commission will be as conservative as they can be. Warren stated it is not enough. He asked why the residents are the ones being made to sacrifice? Why can't the runway be shifted further into Mansfield and cut off earlier into Norton? Why aren't we thinking about things like this? It may cost Mansfield more money, but do something else that doesn't disrupt Norton sound barriers and vegetation. Pearson noted there is still time to get articles on the warrant for the Town meeting. He is not sure if that is something that Town meeting deals with.*

*Brandwine stated this is a safety project. That's all it is. They are not trying to grab federal dollars or anything else. That's not how it works. The FAA is mandating them to only do safety projects. The entire reason for this is to clear the runway approach so the planes have a safe pathway into the Airport. He welcomed anyone to attend their next meeting on January 28<sup>th</sup> at 7:30PM. If there are noise issues, he implored the residents to call the Airport Manager because he reports them to the Airport Commission at the meetings. Normally, they don't get many, if any. It's something they take seriously. They want to come up with a solution that works for all.*

*Resident Mollie O'Keefe lives on Cobb Street and agrees with what her neighbors said. She is opposed to this, but it doesn't seem like this is the right place to discuss it. She did want to discuss the specific method of tree removal that will be used by the vernal pool area. As a best practice for the rest of the environment, why isn't that method being used across the board? Sullivan responded that landscape removal from someone's yard typically involves removing the tree because that is what's preferred. You want to leave areas in a manner consistent with how it is used. The vernal pool method is that way to do the least amount of damage. Other areas dictate different methods. If we're removing something that is visible, we don't want to leave the log in place if that's possible. Another reason for the different methods is because of the different height zones that are required to clear. You may not have to remove a tree in its entirety. Tree topping is a method, but it's not the healthiest thing for the tree. It's all about disruption in the resource and buffer areas. To O'Keefe, it seems it should be done because it's the least disruptive to the natural environment. O'Keefe asked who monitors the compliance? With respect to following the permit. Sullivan responded the enforcing authority in Norton would be the Norton ConCom. They will do site inspections and meet with the contractor. Certain standards will be set in the OOC.*

*The applicant requested a continuance to 2/8/2021 Motion was made to continue the public hearing for DEP #250-1071 to February 8, 2021 by Pearson, seconded by O'Reilly. Motion passes.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

*Blood– Aye  
O'Reilly – Aye  
Kadish– Aye*

*Pearson – Aye  
Snyder - Aye*

**D. Notice of Intent (#250-1057) Ruscito Brothers LLC, 253 Mansfield Avenue (Map 3, Parcel 722).** (continued from 7/27/2020, 9/14/2020, 10/19/2020, 11/23/2020) The proposed project is to convert a commercial building to a 40B multi-story, multi-unit residential apartment building, stormwater management, parking and utilities within 100 feet of bordering vegetated wetland. Files can be viewed here <https://tinyurl.com/253-mansfield>

*The applicant requested a continuance to 2/22/2021 Motion was made to continue the public hearing for DEP #250-1057 to February 22, 2021 by Pearson, seconded by Blood. Motion passes.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

*Blood– Aye  
O'Reilly – Aye  
Kadish– Aye*

*Pearson – Aye  
Snyder - Aye*

**E. Notice of Intent (#250-1040). Michael Trowbridge of Hutchins-Trowbridge Assoc. 306-308 East Main Street. (Map 5, parcel 38 and 252).** (continued from 4/29/19, 6/10/19, 7/8/19, 7/22/19, 8/12/19, 10/7/19, 11/18/19, 12/2/19, 12/16/19, 1/27/2020, 2/24/2020, 4/13/20, 11/23/2020) The proposed project is to construct an addition to warehouse, detention basin and grading within 100 feet of BVW. Files can be viewed here <https://tinyurl.com/250-1040BerniePhyl>

*The applicant requested a continuance to 3/22/2021 Motion was made to continue the public hearing for DEP #250-1040 to March 22, 2021 by Pearson, seconded by O'Reilly. Motion passes.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

*Blood– Aye  
O'Reilly – Aye  
Kadish– Aye*

*Pearson – Aye  
Snyder - Aye*

## **SIGN AND ISSUE ORDER OF CONDITIONS/ORDER OF RESOURCE AREA DELINEATION**

## **REQUEST FOR PARTIAL/FULL CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**



- **Certificate of Compliance DET #409 Deborah and John Poplawski 10 Plain Street (Map 23, Parcel 175) for installation of a septic system.**

*Motion was made to issue a Full Certificate of Compliance for DET #409 by Pearson, seconded by O'Reilly. Motion passes.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

<i>Blood– Aye</i>	<i>Pearson – Aye</i>
<i>O'Reilly – Aye</i>	<i>Snyder - Aye</i>
<i>Kadish– Aye</i>	

- **Certificate of Compliance DEP#250-388 Lisa Foley, 20 Talbot Dr (Map 17, Parcel 167) for construction of a house**

*Motion was made to issue a Full Certificate of Compliance for DEP #250-388 by Pearson, seconded by Snyder. Motion passes.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

<i>Blood– Aye</i>	<i>Pearson – Aye</i>
<i>O'Reilly – Aye</i>	<i>Snyder - Aye</i>
<i>Kadish– Aye</i>	

- **Certificate of Compliance DEP #250-395 Lisa Foley, 20 Talbot Dr (Map 17, Parcel 167) for installation of an above ground pool**

*Motion was made to issue a Full Certificate of Compliance for DEP #250-395 by Pearson, seconded by O'Reilly. Motion passes.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

<i>Blood– Aye</i>	<i>Pearson – Aye</i>
<i>O'Reilly – Aye</i>	<i>Snyder - Aye</i>
<i>Kadish– Aye</i>	

## **REVIEW DRAFT MINUTES**

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Lease of Conservation Land - Norton Kayak Company

*Motion was made to approve the annual contract by O'Reilly, seconded by Pearson. Motion passes.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

*Blood- Aye*

*Pearson - Aye*

*O'Reilly - Aye*

*Snyder - Aye*

*Kadish- Aye*

### **OLD BUSINESS**

Site Inspections – 0 Rear Eddy Street

*Carlino stated the ConCom may want to set up a site inspection. She will send out an email to schedule it.*

### **BILL SUMMARY**

#### **Summary list of bills signed – January 11, 2021 – January 24, 2021**

National Grid	\$10.00	001-171-570-5308 – Maintenance of Conservation
Areas	pool meter	
Infinity Construction	\$800.00	001-171-614-6087-20-08 – Capital Improvement
Fund	painting – Edith Read	
Chessia	\$1,260.00	243-171-100-5700 – Outside Consultant Fees
	Norton Crossing	
SRPDD	\$1,516.48	344-171-100-5700 – Taunton River Stewardship
Council	Norton Water Access Plan	
W.H. Riley & Son	\$669.18	001-171-570-5308 – Maintenance of Conservation
Areas	Edith Read – propane	
Adrain Name Plates	\$460.68	242-171-100-5700 – Wetland Protection Fund
	wetland buffer markers	
Comcast	\$118.44	001-171-570-5308 – Maintenance of Conservation
Areas	Edith Read	
W.B. Mason	\$82.66	001-171-570-5420 – Office Supplies
	office supplies	

**RATIFY LAST MEETING'S OPEN SESSION (TOPICS NOT REASONABLY ANTICIPATED 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE)**

- Full Certificate of Compliance (DEP #250-0587) Vernon and Sally Ferrini, 241 Old Taunton Avenue (Map 29, Parcel 108).

*Motion was made to ratify a Full Certificate of Compliance for DEP #250-0587 by O'Reilly, seconded by Blood. Motion passes.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

<i>Blood– Aye</i>	<i>Pearson – Aye</i>
<i>O'Reilly – Aye</i>	<i>Snyder - Aye</i>
<i>Kadish– Aye</i>	

**OPEN SESSION (TOPICS NOT REASONABLY ANTICIPATED 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE)**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Executive Session. Discuss strategy in executive session with respect to **Island Brook**, East Main Street request for an Adjudicatory hearing related to a Superseding Order issued by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP File No. 250-983), pursuant to G.L. c. 30A, §21(a)(3), if discussing the matter in open session will have a detrimental effect on the Town's litigating position and the chair so declares; votes may be taken.

**\*\*The commission will not be going back into the regular meeting after Executive Session.**

*Motion was made to enter into Executive Session by O'Reilly, seconded by Blood. Motion passes.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

<i>Blood– Aye</i>	<i>Pearson – Aye</i>
<i>O'Reilly – Aye</i>	<i>Snyder - Aye</i>
<i>Kadish– Aye</i>	

*Motion to close the public meeting by Pearson, seconded by O'Reilly. Motion passes and the public meeting closes at 8:23PM.*

*A roll call vote was taken:*

*Blood- Aye  
O'Reilly - Aye  
Kadish- Aye*

*Pearson - Aye  
Snyder - Aye*

*Respectfully submitted by: Melissa Quirk* *Melissa Quirk*


*Minutes approved by the Commission on 2/8/2021.*

*Conservation Commission Signature:*  
*Julian Kadish*  
*Julian Kadish, Conservation Commission Chairman*

*3/3/21*  
*Date*

## **PUBLIC REMOTE PARTICIPATION PROCEDURE**

For this meeting, members of the public who wish to participate in the meeting may do so in the following manner:

1. To participate in the meeting, we recommend downloading the zoom app  before the meeting. (This may not be necessary because you can click the link below but we have found that this makes logging in to the meeting easier.)
2. Join the Zoom Meeting at 6:30pm.
  - Using your computer or smart phone go the Zoom app and click “join a meeting” or click on: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87301063835?pwd=OEIJbUpVaTJ4Mkgybm9TVDFWRTJZZz09>  
When prompted, enter the **Meeting ID: 873 0106 3835, Password: 115155.**
    - The site can be a little tricky so if it doesn’t work the first time, try again. Try copying and pasting the link into a google chrome browser if internet explorer or another browser doesn’t work for you.
    - Using “connecting to video and audio through the computer” has been the easiest method. So make sure your computer’s video/audio is on.
    - If you cannot hear, you may need to phone in by calling 1-646-558-8656, same meeting ID and password as above. If it asks for a participant id you can just hit #. Please put your phone on mute until the Chairman asks for your comments.
    - Everyone will be placed on mute at the beginning of the meeting as you sign in but you should be able to hear. We will unmute you when we reach the public question and answer portion of our meeting.
3. If, for some reason, neither option is working for you, you can email the Conservation Commission at [conservation@nortonmaus.com](mailto:conservation@nortonmaus.com) to ask your questions. We will read your email address, name and comments into the public record.
4. The standard procedure for a public hearing is a presentation by the applicant’s representative, questions and comments by the Conservation Commission and Director, then opening questions and comments to the abutters. Please be patient and wait for your turn to participate.
5. If there are no additional questions by the Conservation Commission or Director, the hearing would typically close; however, to ensure adequate opportunity for public participation, those specific hearings will be continued until the next meeting. This will be announced. You will have until the next

meeting to provide your comments and questions before the Commission closes the hearing and makes a decision.