



## City of Cambridge Conservation Commission

147 Hampshire Street  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
Ph. 617.349.4680

*Jennifer Letourneau, Director*

*[jletourneau@cambridgema.gov](mailto:jletourneau@cambridgema.gov)*

---

### Public Meeting – Monday, March 12, 2018 at 7:00PM 147 Hampshire Street, Main Conference Room MEETING MINUTES

The following meeting minutes were taken by Tracy Dwyer and are respectfully submitted.

Present Commission Members: Purvi Patel (Chair), Dorothy Altman, Elyse Magnotto-Cleary, Michael McDonough, Ted Pickering, and Jennifer Letourneau (Director)

Absent Commission Members: Lauren McPherson-Siegrist and Kaki Martin

Attendees: Tracy Dwyer (DPW), David Biancavilla (BSC Group), Brian Paula (BSC Group), Richard McKinnon (McKinnon Co.), Jerry Friedman (DPW), Roch Larochelle (HDR), Amy Ball (Horsley-Witten Group), Richard Claytor (Horsley-Witten Group), Cynthia Smith (Halvorson Design Partnership), Anthony Zerilli (Weston & Sampson), Joe Wahler (Stephen Stimson Assoc.), David Nielsen (Stephen Stimson Assoc.), Meredith Chamberlin (Eck McNeely Architects), Maureen Nunez (Shady Hill School), Mike Nakagawa, Peggy Barnes Lenart, James Williamson

Purvi Patel opened the hearing.

#### **7:00 PM - Informational Presentation: Horsley Witten Group**

This informational presentation was for the Willard Street stormwater outfall project. Jerry Friedman gave a brief overview of the project stating that they would be restoring the outfall, reducing the stormwater flooding during large rainfall events. Also, in conjunction with this project Willard Street would be reconstructed with new drainage, sidewalks and newly paved street.

Amy Ball explained that 25 feet of this project is on the riverfront area and the filled tide lands. They would need to apply for a Chapter 91 permit and there was no BVW.

Roch stated that they were subject to the Wetlands Protection Act and they would be constructing tree trenches and infiltration trenches. Catch basins would be deep sump for infiltration.

Purvi asked if these would be six (6) foot hoods. Jennifer answered that the general standard in the City is that catch basins be hooded.

Ted asked if Berkeley Place also will drain to the outfall. The answer is yes.

Richard discussed the design for the outfall and what the winter time construction would look like at the river. He stated that the construction would look similar to the construction for the Western Ave project which was a project that was previously constructed and now complete.

Cynthia explained which trees would be impacted during construction, she stated that everything that was disturbed would be reseeded, they also were proposing a design for a natural overlook for pedestrians to stop, sit and enjoy the view of the river. There would also be flexi-pave installed along the pedestrian/bike path on the river. She also brought to the commission what trees they were proposing to plant in place of the disturbed trees, they would be Alders and London Plane trees as well as more vegetation enhancements.

Amy Ball discussed permitting and water quality for the project. There would be an 80% TSS removal for treated areas. The permits that would be needed: MWRA 8(m) permit, DCR Access Permit, ConCom permit, MassDEP – Chapter 91 permit and US Army Corps of Engineers – general permit for work below Ordinary High Water.

Jennifer asked the commission if anyone else in the commission identifies BVW. There is BVW near the river bank. Purvi and Jennifer agreed that they would need to do some hand borings.

Ted asked what a 8(m) permit was. Jerry explained that permit is required by MWRA for anytime there is construction near any of their facilities. Ted also asked what would be the TSS removal. The infiltration trenches.

Jennifer reminded the team that the trees that you are replacing need to be inch by inch in comparison and Jennifer stated that can be cumulative.

Michael asked what is the spilled containment for. Roch answered it is for full restriction Jennifer said that they could use stop logs for O&M. The team would evaluate that design and take that into consideration.

Ted asked if they would review the overlook design. The commission did not have a strong preference but they did like the idea of the overlook. The team would bring that forward and would work with MWRA to make sure they don't have. Purvi asked if they would propose both designs in case DCR or MWRA have concerns.

**7:30 PM – Notice of Intent: Weston & Sampson**  
Shady Hill School, 178 Coolidge Hill  
Building 512 Renovation Project  
DEP File# 123-281

Meredith went through the improvement with the building on the campus, she stated that they will not be changing the footprint of the building. They are within the 100-foot buffer of the wetland and they have a letter of support from the direct abutter. She stated they will also be making landscape improvements.

Joe went through the landscape improvements; garden rooms, stormwater retention improvements and pervious pavement improvements.

Anthony explained that there would be no impacts to the resource area and improve the stormwater. Jennifer stated after her review that there is more information needed. She stated that it's been three (3) years since the wetland area was delineated and that the flags are gone. Also, the construction fence is on the BVW line.

Questions and comments were provided to the proponents.

The Notice of Intent is continued until information is given to the board and public comment will remain open.

Ted asked what was the destination of the stormwater. There is run-off on Coolidge Hill and the Cemetery. Jennifer stated that the wetland is ever changing and it is a phragmite marsh.

Purvi asked if Jennifer could make sure that all suggests to the team are complete before they come back to the board. Jennifer stated she will make sure they are all complete.

Ted asked if the wetland be impaired. Jennifer states that the run off is from professional manicured lawns and cemetery run-off which is all clean water, the water is sampled by DPW. Dorothy stated that the school is built on a peat marsh. Jennifer stated that this project will be added to the March 26 meeting.

Public Comment open – no public comment.

Commission has voted to continue to the next meeting.

**7:45 PM – Notice of Intent: BSC Group**

The Residences at 50 Cambridgepark Drive  
Redevelopment of 32, 34 & 36 Cambridgepark Drive  
DEP File#123-282

Present for this meeting was David Biancavilla, Brian Paula and Rich McKinnon  
David explained that this land that 50 Cambridgepark Drive is on land that is subject to flooding and within the flood plain. They were constructing 300 apartments for this residence and just as they did for 88, 160 and 180 Cambridgepark Drive there would be flood storage. In this project the flood storage would be under the parking garage. The apartments would be starting on the second floor and there would be retail on the bottom floor. They would be adding in shade trees along the sidewalk adjacent to the building and they are in the process of gaining access to New

Street for the entrance and make it a 2-way street. They have proposed to construct this building meeting the 2070 flood elevations.

Elysse asked how many retail spaces are you proposing. David stated that they are proposing to have a small grocery store for the area.

Purvi asked if 88 Cambridgepark Drive was constructed 2 ½ years, Jennifer answered yes it was and they are already seeing the benefits of the stormwater management that was constructed. Purvi then asked if this was the same design as the other buildings that were built. David stated there were some differences to the buildings so they don't have the same look but they all have similar flood storage. Rich stated that DPW is also above the climate change regulations and all 1<sup>st</sup> floor units start on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the building as well as the parking garage will be equipped with flood gates. David stated there is also roof infiltration.

Ted asked will there be sedimentation. David stated there is infiltration in the garage and storage under the parking, there are flood access grates in the garage and bio-retention. They will be taking out the wall along the building per DPW's suggestion. Jennifer stated this will allow for construction mitigation and O&M. All of these will be recorded on the deed and any minor changes that are needed will be addressed when they apply for DPW permits.

Public Comment was opened.

Mike Nakagawa:

Mike Nakagawa was referencing page 10 of the presentation – the underground retention is unrestricted and can they channel water under the concrete and infiltrate. David stated flood storage have a hydraulics connection water can freely come in and out. Mike stated if rocks can be placed under the concrete can make it more pervious of an area. David stated that DPW requires hard surface area to clean and the area is limited to five feet. Mike referenced page 13 of the presentation the “Peak Flow Table” – the City is 25 to 2 that is for everything but the driveway David stated. DPW has a 2-year existing run off but the driveway doesn't meet that but it is approved. The peak flows will be 2 years 5.75 for the site and 25 years 5.45 will be the reduction to the site.

Mike also stated that the parking area in the old building has a pervious parking area and would have potentially more green area. The newer proposed building has smaller shade trees and less green space and that green roofs weren't part of the project. He stated a conversation that he had with Owen O'Riordan the Commissioner that none of these projects have green infrastructure and Mike feels that the commission is limited to what they can do. He recalls projects getting superseded order of conditions from the state.

Jennifer stated that there has never been a superceding order of conditions from the state in the last 15 years for Cambridgepark Drive projects.

Mike also stated the 20.7 zoning ordinance and that the city should be reviewing the plans and also brought up 20.75 part 3 screening projects that are within the flood plain environment. In conclusion Mike would like larger shade trees at this project.

Peggy Barnes Lenart:

Peggy Barnes Lenart would like to see more vegetation and green space blanketing the buildings. We need to really need to prepare for the 2070-100 year storm and the predictions that they have. Will the buildings be functional and she would also like the traffic problems to be solved, but also noted that with the access on New Street this might give the neighborhood some movement. Purvi stated that traffic issues are not in the commissions jurisdiction and asked if anyone had comments pertaining to the wetland protection act? David explained that the McKinnon Company is working with abutters on Preparedness plan and options for solar. They are using the Alewife Preparedness plan as a guideline.

James Williamson:

James Williamson stated he lived in Jefferson Park that is subject to routine flooding and Cambridgepark Drive is in an area where flooding is a concern. David reiterated that all the 1<sup>st</sup> floor apartments are on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.

Public Comment Closed.

The Commission unanimously agreed to approve with special conditions.

#### **8:40 PM – Administrative Topics**

Jennifer would like Kaki Martin do her presentation in front of the commission at a meeting regarding the Fresh Pond project.

Elysse was introduced to the commission and gave a brief overview of her work history and the reason for her interest in the board.

Dorothy brought up the Harvard Sailing Pavilion sinking into the Charles River and if they were aware that they would need to come to the commission for permits. Jennifer stated and her and Jim Wilcox from DPW reached out to them and will be meeting with them in to discuss their construction and permitting needs. They will either have to remove, rebuild pier and reset the building or they will demo the building and rebuild. Cambridge Fire Department has been monitoring the building from a public safety perspective.

Purvi stated that she has a Fresh Pond Advisory Board meeting coming up. Jennifer told the commission that Jim Wilcox from DPW and herself will be attending the next meeting because they were interested in swell designs, so Jim and Jennifer will be presenting to the board.

Meeting Minutes – February 12, 2018: Unanimously approved.

#### **8:50 PM – Other Business**

Mike wanted to speak toward the flood plain overlay district – he stated that the Planning Board looks towards the Conservation Commission to make suggests towards different projects. The Wetland Protection Act is limited and suggests that the commission gives recommendations to the Planning Board. Purvi explained again that the project at 50 Cambridgepark Drive is

meeting the 100 year storm recommendations and that the first floor apartments are really located on the second floor.

Dorothy also stated that the parking garage as storage for the flood waters and asked if are taking it for granted that we believe that these developers actually know that that is enough storage.

Mike discussed that plans to have boats staged in the area to help residents get out of the area when there is flooding and what would people do if they didn't own a vehicle. Ted reminded them that they are speaking towards safety issues that are out of the commission's jurisdiction.

Dorothy brought up the point how we could require builders to install green roofs. Mike suggested for this particular project that they require bigger shade trees.

Jennifer stated that the Planning Board does get comments from the commission, the meeting notes. Although the interaction with the Planning Board and various departments are not a public meeting that they City departments all engage with one another one various projects.

Purvi stated that the flooding on this property is very limited. Mike stated that there might be underground flooding that they are not accounting for. Ted stated that the developers are making connections to the utilities to make it part of the flood plain and stated if why should we make the building a small footprint to accommodate for shade trees.

James stated that it is within the jurisdiction of the commission to bring comments to the Planning Board for the perimeter for this project. He stated that he believes there is too much development going on for the Alewife area. He has concerns with transportation and said it is not sustainable development. How do people get out of the area without a car? Purvi reminded the public we are concerned with the flooding on this project and that we are here to bring forward the concerns toward the Wetland Protection Act, again some of these concerns from the public are safety issues.

Peggy stated in regards to the Wetland Protect Act what are the regulations are they giving to other boards. She also stated that Cambridgepark Drive doesn't have much green space.

**9:20 PM – Meeting Adjourned**

