



City of Cambridge Conservation Commission

147 Hampshire Street
Cambridge, MA 02139
Ph. 617.349.4680

Jennifer Letourneau, Director

jletourneau@cambridgema.gov

Public Meeting – Monday, March 28, 2022 at 7:00 PM Zoom MEETING MINUTES

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

Present Commission Members: Jennifer Letourneau (Director), Purvi Patel (Chair), David Lyons (Vice Chair), Elysse Magnotto-Cleary, Kathryn Hess, Michelle Lane, Kaki Martin, Erum Sattar

Absent Commission Members: n/a

Attendees: Tracy Dwyer, DPW; Jim Wilcox, DPW; Edward Milch, Harvard University; Jason Forney, Bruner/Cott Architects; Danielle Spicer, Green International; John Gwozdz, Shadley Associates; Charlie Roberts, Childs Engineering Corp.; EJ Winslow, Boston University; Paul Rinaldi, Boston University; Jim Curley, Boston University; Jamie Fay, Fort Point Associates; Lily Sylvester, Fort Point Associates; Todd Turcotte, Coastal Engineering; Charlie Argo, Coastal Engineering; Mark Verkennis

David Lyons opened the meeting.

7:00 - Notice of Intent

DEP File # 123-314

Harvard Weld Boathouse Maintenance & Upgrades
Charles River

Commission members Michelle Lane and Purvi Patel were recused from this hearing.

For the record Commission member Kaki Martin joined at 7:01 pm and did not miss the hearing.

Ed Milch, Senior Project Engineer for Harvard University with the Facility Administration Group opened up the hearing. Ed stated this is a very important project for the Athletics Department, the women's program rows out of this facility. Jason Forney from Bruner/Cott Architects gave an overview of the project. Jason stated that this a large historic building that is in the Charles River national registered district and is a registered building. Jason pointed out that they have been working with not only the Mass Historic Commission but also the Cambridge Historic Commission. This building was designed in 1905 by Peabody and Sterns Architect and has terracotta roof, stucco masonry walls with brick details and big oversized

windows. Jason stated that they are trying to upgrade the building to make it more modern and contemporary in terms of the type of equipment and training opportunities that are available. This building mostly serves the varsity teams but also a recreational component where the Harvard community can learn to row. They are also working with Harvard's landlord Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) on their overall master plan goals for the area which this building sits. Jason stated that their goal is to keep the building looking as it always has, they will be replacing the roof, reconstruction the windows, repairing the masonry and stucco as well as some of the detailed terracotta work. They will be completely replacing the docks in a similar or identical configuration to what is there now. Jason stated that the structure and piles are at the end of their lives. Jason described what was inside the building, on the ground floor is primarily used for storing crew and skilling boats, on the upper floor there is a large gallery and team rooms for storing trophies and for trainings.

John Gwozdz from Shadley Associates the landscape architects on the project stated that most of the site improvements are hardscape changes and are located at the entry of the building. They will be working on the entry stairs, cleaning up and re-pointing the walls. Some other improvements would be concrete replacement of the landing as well as replacement of walkway on the public sidewalk and on the west side of the landing they are proposing increasing the concrete to provide better function and organization to some the site elements which include ten (10) bike racks and a better recycling and trash storage area. John stated that the grading in this area is graded to the west and flows into a catch basin. Some other site improvements are on the east side of the building which are softscape which is to construct a bioretention basin to handle the roof water runoff. The water then flows through a vegetated swale and out to the river. Jennifer Letourneau asked John to talk about the wetland resource area as it was shown on the map that was being presented. On the top of the plan is the 100' buffer zone, twenty-five-foot (25') river foot area under the boathouse and the mean high-water line. Jason stated that the other main components to this project are the existing trees. Jason stated that in the entry area there is a large London Plane tree it is in the 30-inch size. Around the bio basin area there are four Linden trees and an Austrian Pine tree, and they are taken care of them during regrading to maintain the trees and not impact the roots. The last tree worth noting John stated is an Oak tree that sits at the mean high-water mark, they are trying to maintain that tree and free up canopy space by removing an existing Ash tree (twenty-two) 22-inch caliper but in tough shape and over mature and showing signs of emerald ash bore. There is also an existing Elm tree and it's overhanging the boathouse at its immature age. The idea is to cut those trees flush and not stump grind them to cause little to no disturbance as possible. John also stated that they had a Mass certified arborist (Bartlett) provide a report of their inspection. The arborist recommended removal of the Ash tree as well as another tree that was removed already from the corner near Memorial Drive. Bartlett also provided recommendations for pruning, root collar excavation and fertilization to help the trees out after construction.

David Lyons asked if the Elm was not recommended for removal from Bartlett and asked if there could be pruning done instead of removal. John said that was correct they did not recommend that tree for removal meaning it was healthy, but the removal was more program based because it was overhanging the boathouse. Jennifer stated that according to the plans that the Elm tree is located right where the vegetated outfall will be for the bioretention basin will be. Kaki Martin stated it seemed it would be hard to keep the tree. Jennifer also reminded the commission that the DCR is exempt from Cambridge's tree ordinance, and this was DCR property. Kaki Martin offered a suggestion that maybe the tree could be relocated depending on the timing of the construction.

John stated that with their coordination with DCR all the plants that they have selected are locally native to the county. John said they used the vascular plants of Massachusetts a county checklist as well as Landscape Restoration plant list that was generated as part of the Charles River Basin riverbank vegetation management plan and both lists were given to them by DCR. John listed the plants that would be used in the bioretention basin, raised planter and the vegetate swale.

Danielle Spicer from Green International explained the drainage. Danielle explained that these upgrades are minor, the upgrades would include a new waterline for fire protection and that will come out of the building and will connect to the twelve (12) inch watermain in JFK Street in coordination with the Cambridge Water Department. There will also be a new electrical duct bank that will run from the boathouse to Elliot House. The rest of the improvements will be onsite to improve stormwater. Danielle stated that right now runoff sheet flows to the river with little to no treatment and wanted to make improvements to that. Danielle stated that in the area where there is an increased impervious area where the bike racks and trash receptacles are located, they are replacing the catch basin with a drywell which already has an overflow connection into existing drainage system. They will also be collecting some roof runoff as well for water quality before it goes into the river. The bio basin will infiltrate the roof runoff or if there is a larger storm it would sheet flow over the spillway where there is a vegetated swale down to the river. Danielle stated on the west side of the building they will be capturing the roof runoff and using a proprietary water quality unit which will treat the runoff. Danielle also wanted to point out the 100-foot flood elevation and there is a small amount of work in the flood zone but there is no fill, just a small cut for the swale.

Charlie Roberts from Childs Engineering Corp explained how the docks were set-up. Charlie stated that there are two fixed piers that go down to two ramps that sit on top of the floating dock. Charlie stated that it is their goal is replaced in kind and replicate what is existing. Charlie stated they did explore the options of jacketing the existing piles but felt there be a bigger impact and not much longevity as replacing them. Charlie showed the plans for the replacement of the floats and docks with a slight reconfiguration. Charlie stated there is some minor concrete deterioration which will be repaired. The existing piles will be cut off at the mudline and new piles driven.

Jennifer wanted to just mention that they do have a DEP number 123-314 and that there was one technical comment that reads “plans should include design of bio retention basin and dry well”.

Jim Wilcox went through his technical comments of the project. Jim stated that on the Notice of Intent that they would be looking for the registry of deeds book and page reference it was left blank. Jim also stated that there looked to be some exposed soils in the front of the building as if some trucks had pulled into the area and wanted to confirm that area will be part of the project. Jim also reviewed the stormwater report, and it meets all Mass DEP standards. Jim stated that in the O & M plan he didn't not see maintenance for the proprietary BMP and will need to be training personnel. Also, Jim stated that the bio retention maintenance should be supervised by someone familiar with invasive species identification and removal. Jim stated that on the plan sheets there some differences where the resource lines and buffer zones were shown and recommend lines be shown on all sheets. Also, on sheet C101 there was reference of some wetland flags and was assuming that was for bank delineation but would like confirmation. Jim stated that there is a MWRA water line on Memorial Drive and as a MWRA community the project would require an 8m permit from the MWRA. Jim also had a question about how

construction vehicles will access the site and a confirmation that soils won't be tracked out to the right of way. Jim asked on the landscape sheets some text be added to highlight what trees are being proposed for removal.

Danielle responded to some of the comments and said that they did leave out the maintenance of the proprietary BMP so they will include that. She also wanted to confirm that on sheet C101 that the wetland flags are the bank and represent the mean annual high water. They are aware of the 8m permit.

Charlie Roberts responded to the book and page number, and they were having difficulty locating the information, but will reach out to the city on the parcel. Charlie will also update plans with resource areas.

John can provide information on O & M for bio basins.

Ed responded about the vehicle access to the site. Ed said DCR was concerned about vehicles accessing the site near the corner. DCR has given them permission to remove the guard rail to provide access to the site and maintain 8-10 feet of sidewalk for bike and pedestrian traffic. Ed also said there will be a crush stone/mat to avoid trucks bringing soils into the right of way.

Jennifer stated that Division and Marine Fisheries (DMF) had provided a comment stating they had reviewed the NOI for the Harvard Weld boathouse and had no resource concerns. Jennifer was concerned that they did not fully understand the pile work associated with the Harvard Weld boathouse. Jennifer is recommending that they reach back out to DMF and get a formal letter from them stating they fully understand what the project is and if they had any concerns over the time of year restrictions for accessing the Charles River.

David asked how much they will be dredging. Charlie stated it is just pile driving and since it was a small number of piles it was not a significant issue. Charlie will double check and confirm.

Kaki Martin stated that all her questions were answered but would like to see the final planting list. She wanted to clarify that what they saw for plantings was a sampling and still working through the final planting.

John stated that if this the list is approved by the commission that this will be the final list. He pointed out that the list is located on the top right of the rendering. He said the only thing that was not included in the list was the conservation seed mix.

Jennifer asked if they were considering planting any new trees since they will be removing two trees and Kaki agreed with Jennifer. John stated that there were no plans to plant new trees. Jennifer asked if there was any way they could plant new trees. John stated that within their limits of work it would be hard to plant some new trees but stated that there is room on site outside their limits of work and could work with Harvard and DCR. Jennifer asked what is the total dmh caliper inch that they are losing. John stated that it was about 28 inches between 2 trees. Kaki said that amount of loss is hard to accept with out replacement. Ed said that they could continue conversations with the DCR and make sure that they agree to planting more trees and finding locations. Ed stated that the black dotted line on the plans is their lease limits. Jennifer stated that Allie is on the Zoom Allie is an Ecologist from the DCR. Allie stated that they can work with Harvard to find areas. She stated that they have new parameters with their VMP to keep or maintain tree free from a maintenance perspective around buildings and closed to trail edges. She was hopeful they can work with Harvard to propose some planting locations within the leased area. Allie also mentioned that the Elm can't be relocated because that would potentially disintegrate the bank, taken anything out could loosen the bank.

Kathryn Hess wanted to state is that she understands the tree ordinance does not apply here but she would like to see Harvard honor the intent of that ordinance. Kathryn said she is more concerned about what is happening on the water side of the project, and she recalls a year or so ago that the MIT came to the commission with a boathouse project and spent lots of time talking about how they were going to protect the river and the type of systems they would have in place to make sure sediments weren't spreading. She is concerned about how there was no discussion tonight and would like to discuss more about what was going to happen. She would like to know how many pilings they are cutting and putting in and how that was going to happen.

Charlie stated that the existing dock could be taken from the top down and they would have a debris boom around while that was going on to catch debris. The piles will be cut at the mudline like a tree they don't want to cause any destabilization and then they would drive in new piles and construct everything back.

Kathryn asked if there was a time of year that they would be trying to do the work and when DMF would allow work. Charlie stated that he needs to reach back out to DMF to make sure there are no restrictions and would communicate that back to Jennifer.

Erum wanted to ask Danielle Spicer about the roof top catchment and the treatment of that. Danielle stated that the building now has multiple roof drains that drain right into the river. Danielle stated that they are trying to capture as much upstream as they can. Danielle stated that they are proposing to take the roof drains from the front of the building which will go into a bypass and then into the proprietary separator which will provide some filtering then go back into the system and discharges to the river. Danielle stated on the east side, and they will capture the roof runoff and let it naturally spill into the river.

Kaki stated didn't they always have time constraints with in-water work. Jennifer stated that they did, and she believes that with the NOI front loaded with building renovation work she believes it was missed by DMF.

David agrees with Kaki to be consistent with the in-water work and restrictions.

7:56 - Public Comment Opened.

7:58 – The commission unanimously approves to continue the hearing till April 11, 2022.

In Favor – 5, Absent – 2, Opposed – 0, Abstained – 0

8:00 – **Notice of Intent**

DEP File # 123-315

BU Boathouse Maintenance & Upgrades

Charles River

Purvi Patel and Michelle Lane commission members joined for this hearing.

Lily Sylvester an Environmental Planner from Fort Point Associates opened their presentation on behalf of Boston University and their boathouse renovation project. Lily stated that the project is for renovations to the dock associated with the Boston University DeWolfe Boathouse on the Charles River. Lily introduced the team that was present, Paul Rinaldi, Assistant Vice President

for Planning from BU, EJ Winslow, Senior Project Manager from BU and Jim Curly Director of Satellite Relations in the Office of Government and Community Affairs from BU. She introduced the team from Coastal Engineering Todd Turcotte, Engineering Manager and Charlie Agro, Project Engineer.

Jim Curly from BU talked about the boathouse and history. Jim stated that the BU Boathouse is located just east of the BU Bridge at 619 Memorial Drive in Cambridge. Jim stated that this boathouse was constructed in 1913 by the BAA and was leased by MIT for fifty years. In 1966 MIT moved and BU began at twenty-five (25) year lease with the commonwealth which began in 1998. In 1999 BU constructed the DeWolfe boathouse which now consists of five (5) boat bays, a main dock, a floating dock, and some interior features. Jim stated that BU offers summer rowing programs to the public through their fitness and recreation center (FitRec). This has also been used by “WeCanRow”, women recovering from breast cancer and in the winter, months use their rowing equipment since 2010.

Jennifer asked if that was correct that that they only had one year left of their lease. Jim stated that was correct their lease is up in October of 2023 and they are in discussions with DCR for renewing it.

Lily stated that on the call Jamie Fay from Fort Point was in attendance. Lily went through some pictures for reference. Lily went through the parts of the dock they would be talking about. The first section was the pile-supported deck which is a fixed deck above the water and that is mostly used for storing boats. Next would be the aluminum transition plate/ramp and then the floating dock, where rowers load and unload from boats. The problem which leads them to this project is that the floating dock is no longer floating on the east side because there is a build-up of sediment and debris where the water is shallow. Lily stated that the float is now resting on the riverbed and causing the dock to be uneven which is causing some safety concerns for the rowers. The project is mostly to resolve this build-up issue. Lily stated that the purpose of the project is to improve safety conditions and enhance the utility of the floating dock. The proposed project will include dredging, disposal of materials upland, replacing decking as needed, add a fifty (50) foot by seven (7) foot finger dock to the west and replace decking on existing fixed deck as needed. Lily stated that the timeline for the project work will be early June to mid-July, which would help with their rowing schedule. Lily stated that the resource impacts for the project would include riverbank about fourteen (14) linear feet of temporary impacts, one thousand two hundred and forty-seven (1,247) square feet of temporary impacts to land underwater and forty (40) cubic yards of dredging in a fish run.

Charlie Agro Senior Project Engineer from Coastal Engineering will describe the plans for the deck. Charlie stated that the dredging for this project would be completed by an excavator situated on a barge, thirty (30) foot by ninety (90) foot barge with an excavator and a temporary containment basin. The containment basin could be made from jersey barriers with filter fabric and would be used to store dredge material to dewater. Charlie stated that the sediment would be placed there by the excavator. Charlie explained that prior to any dredging there would be a double walled slit curtain placed around the site which would delineate the limit of work and contain increased levels of turbidity within the site. Charlie stated that there is a proposed floating dock extension and that would be brought in on the barge along with the materials for the project. Charlie stated that there would also be a pile driven into the seafloor support the dock extension. This location would also be for staging and storage of materials for the contractor. Charlie stated upon completion of the dredging and dewatering the material will

eventually be brought to a marine facility located off Jefferies Point which will be loaded off and then trucked to an offsite facility. They did do borings and from the analysis it was determined that the sediment is compatible for upland disposal. Charlie explained that the dredging would improve the area by preventing the build up of trash and allowing water to circulate. Charlie said that daily access to the site would be for personnel via personal vehicles that would park in designed parking areas and walk-through existing walkways. All activities will be via the barge or deck, except if additional materials are needed those deliveries would be accessed via the stairway and determined to be minimum. Charlie stated that the proposed float extension would require a Chapter 91 license, for the 2.5-foot requirement.

David Lyons asked Jim Wilcox to read through his comments for the project. Jim stated that in similar project to this there were odor complaints and would recommend odor control and wanted to make sure the applicant was looking into that. Jim also was wondering when materials are needed to be brought in would that be via the existing staircase. Jim stated that in the Notice of Intent there was mention of wetland flags but didn't see them in any of the drawings.

Charlie stated in response to Jim's comments that all old decking that is removed will be stored in the temporary storage area until the completion of work and moved to the barge and taken by barge off site. Charlie mentioned that there also might be support vessels a push boat/ skiff, small tug and can be used to move materials off site. Charlie stated that they wetland flags were turned off prior to the stamped plans, but since have been updated. Charlie stated that regarding odor they would have the contractor have lime onsite but said that it was a small amount and didn't anticipate a lot of odors. Todd stated that a lime treatment would be easy and be covered when dewatering and will be part of the contract.

David stated if that is a condition in the contract it could also be a condition in the permit. David also stated that these plans are a lot closer to what they have seen before for work in the river as far as the slit curtain and work on the barge.

Kathryn wanted to follow-up with Todd regarding the estimate time for the dredging. Todd stated that the excavation will take no longer than three (3) days and then the dewatering would occur.

Kathryn asked Charlie about the borings that were taken and asked if they were tested for contaminants and if he had concerns. Charlie stated that from the analysis the sediment was found to have less than ten percent (10%) finds and generally a sandy sediment there are less contaminants.

Kathryn also asked about the quantity of the debris, from the pictures that were shown it seemed like a lot of debris and is there a need for separation. Charlie said they could put a small dumpster on the barge for the debris.

Kathryn also asked if there were plans for BU to institute any type of maintenance program to stop this from happening in the future. Jamie Fay from Fort Point Associates stated that he asked the same question, but everything they could see from hydrographic surveys and the lay out of the land it does not appear that it will happen again. Jamie thought there was a culvert dumping in the area but there was not.

Kathryn asked about the finger dock, but she said they refer to it as a floating dock, but they are installing a piling. Charlie stated that it will be hinged to an existing dock and a hoop connection from the pile to the dock. Kathryn asked for clarity on installing this prior to dredging. Charlie stated it would be up to the contractor.

Erum asked about the core samples, whether the dewatering is safe and what is in the water that shouldn't go back into the water.

Jamie Fay stated that this a very common technique for dewatering. Jamie said that part of the dredging process there will be spill over from the bucket and that is why they have the slit curtain in place to contain sediment. Jamie said it depends on the contractors means and methods, but they do usually pump out the water and it is discharged back into the river where you have the silt curtain. Charlie agreed with Jamie's response but wanted to reiterate that the dewatering and dredging and the location of the barge is within the silt curtain.

Jennifer asked about the barge after dewatering, loading and off-loading materials and this barge leaves Cambridge and off site. Jennifer wanted to know if there is any responsibility back to this project on making sure that this is done cleanly and neatly. Jamie said there is no responsibility of this project. Jamie did say that the Boston shipyard is one of his clients and they know how to operate, and they have supported a lot of reconstruction over the years. They do have procedures in place to make sure that the transfer from barge to truck doesn't create any issues.

Purvi wanted to clarify one of Jim Wilcox's comments that the work is not incurring with BLSF, riverfront and BBW the work does include six resource areas but just not those three, it's within bank, river, and fish run. Purvi asked why the fifty-foot river finger dock is eligible to be treated as a limited project.

Jamie asked a limited project under the wetland protection act. Purvi stated that is what it stated in their narrative. Jamie said the impact would be the one piling for the float. Purvi stated this might fit the construction of 310 CMR 10.5, 3L but wanted to know if there was certain area. Jennifer stated that her understanding is that it is same footprint not an increase.

Purvi asked if they were looking for a Chapter 91 license and permit. Jamie said they are seeking a dredge permit; they cannot get a license in the time frame and will go back for the license but not for the dredging.

Purvi asked if they are looking to get a waiver from DMF. Jaime stated he reached out to Tay at DMF in December and they discussed that the herring would move up the river in the spring to spawn and then return in the fall and there is a small break between spring and fall which is when they are trying to schedule construction but doesn't fit perfectly with her schedule. Jaime stated that Tay wrote to him and stated depending on where and how the work will be done and what minimizing factors were in place the time of year could possibly be adjusted. They will go back to Tay once they know when construction will happen and install the silt curtain and start the dredging with a week or two-week time of year waiver. Jaime stated that this area is not used for spawning.

Jennifer stated she received a letter from Tay that stated no in water, silt producing work from February 15th to July 15th will be permitted, which was received on March 15th. Jennifer said that if Jaime is receipt of a letter dated after March 15th from Tay, this will go into the order of conditions.

Purvi asked about Jim's review comments, would they need a supplemental to provide more information in order issue an order of conditions. Jennifer agreed that they need to respond to the comments, if not they might not get the information, if the commission approved an order of conditions with out it.

Kathryn said she is confused about what DMF is saying and what Purvi is saying regarding the time of year restriction. Purvi stated that DMF issues time of year restrictions based on species.

This work falls right at the time when there is a restriction. Purvi said in some cases the applicant will go and get a waiver. Purvi is wondering if they issued an order of conditions and DMF did not agree, the commissions order of conditions might be moot. Jennifer clarified that most projects there has been waivers however the protection has been able to be installed outside the time of year restriction and then the work can happen. Jennifer explained that with this project they are installing during the time of year restriction which has never been allowed.

David asked if they have enough information about how they are controlling the debris and dredge materials on the barge and work area.

Jennifer has concerns about the one laydown area. She feels like there is a lot going on in one area to have room for personnel to have safe egress and adequate space for the materials.

Jamie said he would reach out to Tay Evans with the time of year restriction and will address DPW's comments and discuss the methodology regarding the dredging.

Todd commented on the debris and limited work area. Todd wanted to clarify that the existing float would be relocated at the time of dredging. Todd stated that they would be moving the curtain and moving the barge. Jennifer said they would need to see the multiple set ups. Todd said he would expand on the narrative but to depict every scenario that would be hard.

Paul Rinaldi stated they would do what is necessary and understand what the commission is looking for and how they will deliver the information that they need to review this application. Charlie wanted to point out that between the edge of the barge and the silt curtain there is still about 12-13 feet for support vessels to get around. Charlie said they can depict how the barge will move around the double wall silt curtain.

8:55 – The commission unanimously agrees to continue this hearing to the April 11, 2022, meeting.

In Favor – 7, Absent –0, Opposed – 0, Abstained – 0

8:56 – Administrative Topics

Meeting Minutes from March 14, 2022 – approved

In Favor – 6, Absent –0, Opposed – 0, Abstained – 1

9:05 – Meeting Adjourned

In Favor – 7, Absent –0, Opposed – 0, Abstained – 0



City of Cambridge
Conservation Commission
 147 Hampshire Street
 Cambridge, MA 02139
 Ph. 617.349.4680

Jennifer Letourneau, Director

jletourneau@cambridgema.gov

CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO G.L.c.39, SECTION 23D, THE "MULLIN RULE," OF PARTICIPATION IN A SESSION OF AN ADJUDICATORY HEARING WHERE THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBER MISSED A SINGLE HEARING SESSION

I, ___Purvi Patel_ (name), hereby certify under the pains and penalties of perjury as follows:

1. I am a member of the following adjudicatory body, board or commission

___Cambridge Conservation Commission_____.

2. I missed a hearing session on the matter of ConCom business

which was held on ___March 14, 2022_____.

3. I reviewed all the evidence introduced at the hearing session that I missed which included a review of (initial which one(s) applicable):

4. _____ audio recording of the missed hearing session; or

5. _____ video recording of the missed hearing session; or

6. ___PPP_____ official transcript of the missed hearing session.

4. I reviewed the evidence on ___March 28, 2022_____.

This certification has been executed prior to my participation in the vote on the above matter. This certification shall become a part of the record of the proceedings in the above matter.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury this _28_ day of _March_, 2022 _____.

**Signature date must be prior to the date the Board votes on the matter.*

 Signature of Member

Received as part of the record of the above matter:

Date: 3/28/2022

By: Jennifer Letourneau

Position: Director of Conservation Commission



City of Cambridge
Conservation Commission
 147 Hampshire Street
 Cambridge, MA 02139
 Ph. 617.349.4680

Jennifer Letourneau, Director

jletourneau@cambridgema.gov

CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO G.L.c.39, SECTION 23D, THE "MULLIN RULE," OF PARTICIPATION IN A SESSION OF AN ADJUDICATORY HEARING WHERE THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBER MISSED A SINGLE HEARING SESSION

I, Erum Sattar (name), hereby certify under the pains and penalties of perjury as follows:

1. I am a member of the following adjudicatory body, board or commission

Cambridge Conservation Commission

2. I missed a hearing session on the matter of

DEP File # 123-312
 VHB; Request of Determination of Applicability
 MWRA Siphon/Junction structure Maintenance
 Alewife Reservation; Notice of Intent
 DEP File # To Be Determined
 Harvard Weld Boathouse Maintenance & Upgrades
 Charles River

which was held on Monday March 14, 2022.

3. I reviewed all the evidence introduced at the hearing session that I missed which included a review of (initial which one(s) applicable):

- a. _____ audio recording of the missed hearing session; or
- b. _____ video recording of the missed hearing session; or
- c. Yes official transcript of the missed hearing session.

4. I reviewed the evidence on Monday March 28, 2022.

This certification has been executed prior to my participation in the vote on the above matter. This certification shall become a part of the record of the proceedings in the above matter.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury this 28 day of March, 2022.

**Signature date must be prior to the date the Board votes on the matter.*

Erum K. Sattar

Signature of Member

Received as part of the record of the above matter:

Date: 3/28/2022

By: Jennifer Letourneau

Position: Director of Conservation Commission