



City of Cambridge Conservation Commission

147 Hampshire Street
Cambridge, MA 02139
Ph. 617.349.4680

Jennifer Letourneau, Director

jletourneau@cambridgema.gov

Public Meeting – Monday, February 12, 2024 at 7:00 PM Zoom MEETING MINUTES

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

Present Commission Members: Purvi Patel (Chair); David Lyons (Vice Chair); Jennifer Letourneau (Director); Elysse Magnotto-Cleary; Erum Sattar; Michelle Lane; Tricia Carney; John Leo

Absent Commission Members: Kathryn Hess

Attendees: Tracy Dwyer, DPW; Kara Falise, DPW; Jon Burke, Boston Duck Boat Tours; Charlie Roberts, Childs Engineering; Lena Frappier, DPW; Jennifer Sweet, Haley & Aldrich; Anthony Galluccio, Galluccio & Watson; Chrissy Gabriel, IQHQ; Danielle Desilets, KDLA; Greg Avenia, Kleinfelder; Howard Moshier, VHB; Danny Frias, IQHQ; Ellie Muter; Emilia Wisniewski; Lewis Weitzman; Lisa Birk; Philip Warburg; Eric Grunebaum; Eppa Rixey; Hannah Mahoney; Deborah Gevalt; Kyle Zick; Marc Levy; McNamara Buck; Sarah Adkins; Taylor Donovan; Renee Kasinsky; Ann McDonald; James Williamson; Joel Nogie; Kelly Matthews; A Mcd; David Bass; 6178725193; Amy Oliver; Renata Pomponi; Mike Nakagawa; Gwen Speeth; Helen Walker; Bonnie Kwan; Daniel Pasquale; Magery Davies; Vicki Paret; Rachel Wyon

Purvi Patel opened the meeting.

7:00 – Notice of Intent **Boston Duck Tours Boat Ramp Repairs** Childs Engineering

Purvi Patel stated that DEP has not issued a file number so the commission can not vote on the project this evening.

Jon Burke, the General Manager for the Boston Duck Tours was present to speak with the commission. Jon explained to the commission that they have a small emergency repair to the ramp where they drive the duck boats into the river. Jon explained although it's not a large project it is deteriorating quickly even since December. Jon stated since this is the only access into the Charles River, they were looking for a quick turn around on the order of conditions but

now understands without the DEP file number the commission cannot vote on this tonight. Jon explained to the commission that they would like to complete the repairs ahead of their thirtieth (30th) season which opens on March 29th.

Charlie Roberts from Childs Engineering was present to review the technical side of the project. Charlie reviewed with the commission the location of the project. Charlie stated that the ramp is in North Point Park which is owned by DCR but leased by Boston Duck Tours and that this is the only access point into the Charles River for the boats. Charlie explained that there had been some crushed stone underneath that had been washed out. When the boats are entering and exiting the ramp there is a bit of a wake that happens which washed out the stone. Charlie stated that over time the planks have weakened and have cracked over time. Charlie showed the plans of how the ramp looks from the side with the concrete planks on top with the washed-out stone underneath which has created something like a "pothole". Charlie stated the plan to repair the ramp is to remove four planks, place two back and replace the two broken ones. The two planks that are not broken will be removed to replace the crushed stone that is underneath them. He stated that the crushed stone that is going back is a larger sized and denser stone than what is currently there. Charlie stated that the hope is that all the work will get done from the top of the boat ramp with a crane or any type of machine that can extend out to remove the concrete planks. Charlie stated that the work to regrade and replace the gravel will be done at low tide and once the gravel is in place then they can put the new planks in place and connect them back together. Charlie stated that there would be a minimal stockpile because the duration of the project will be quick, and it will be a very temporary laydown area. Charlie showed the commission where the silt curtain will be placed but the goal is to have all the work completed in the dry, low tide time frame although he stated that the work can be done in the wet too. Charlie stated that the goal is to work the tides and does not anticipate the work taking any longer than a week to do. Charlie said that C. White Marine will be completing the work as they are experienced at this kind of work in the river.

Jon stated that C. White stated that the work will take one to two days to complete with stockpiling materials the day before to help the project move quickly and minimize any impacts. Charlie apologized that there is no tide in the river. Charlie stated that they are not changing the use, just making small repairs quickly with little disturbance.

Purvi Patel stated she used to work for MassDOT and is very familiar with this area, especially underneath all the ramps. She stated that she was a little confused about the comments with the tides but thanked Charlie for clarifying. She stated the commission has their next meeting on February 26th and this could be moved along quickly.

David Lyons asked Jennifer Letourneau if the commission had an NOI on this ramp before or was it a different ramp entry into the Charles.

Jennifer stated that yes, they did have an NOI for this ramp several years ago for a repair. They were resetting a lot of the blocks on the walls along the ramp.

David asked how many years, like five years.

Jennifer stated that was correct.

David asked how many years ago repairs to the actual ramp were there.

Charlie stated it was a few years, the walls were repaired and that was 2016. At that time an inspection was done but work was done around 2010.

Elysse Magnotto-Cleary stated she had the same question as David and did a quick search of her Conservation records and the commission had an NOI in 2018 for the Boston Duck Boats which was for repairs to the granite block retaining wall.

Erum Sattar asked how frequent the inspections are and the other part of the question is the point after which you realize that work must be completed.

Charlie stated that it depends on the nature of the work, it was clear that the ramp needed repair because the boats were feeling something, so they went out and did an inspection. Charlie stated that it often times depends on the structure but they do inspections every five to six years depending on the clients and from that it depends on the different types of deterioration as the structure gets older it can decrease down or if it is a newer structure you can have longer spans in between. The ramp is a little different from year to year because it goes from land to water with a tight turn. Charlie stated that this might have lasted a lot longer had the gravel not been washed out but that is the nature of this type of set-up. Charlie stated that by putting in heavier gravel they are hoping it lasts longer this time but unfortunately with any structure in a marine environment there is always going to be challenges with freezing and thawing and wet and dry environments.

Jon stated that Charlie's team did do a complete inspection of the structure while looking at this ramp. Jon stated that the last repair that was done held up perfectly.

Jennifer stated that there was a repair to the wall and before that there was an extension done here and a repair to the prop wash.

Jennifer asked Charlie if there were any issues with the prop wash.

Charlie stated that was working.

7:18 – Public Comment Open

James Williamson stated he was not going to say anything but thought that this was an interesting little project. He stated he couldn't help but be reminded of the whole issue of the scouring of the levies in New Orleans that led to the catastrophe we call Katrina and maybe I thought what the insights might be from how they rebuilt those levy walls to avoid the scouring of the gravel. James thought that might be similar to on a much larger scale than what the applicant is proposing but just a thought he wanted to share.

Purvi stated that Jennifer can work with the proponent to get on the schedule for the next hearing if that makes sense. She stated that they will need to wait for the DEP file number and possible comments from the DEP. Purvi asked the commission if there was anything that they would like to see as of any subsequent submittal as part of the Notice of Intent application.

David stated he didn't have anything else.

7:19 – The commission agreed to continue to the next hearing.

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

7:19 - Notice of Intent (Continued from January 22, 2024)
MADEP File #123-322
Jerry's Pond Circulation and Access
IQHQ and VHB

Purvi Patel stated that this hearing is continued from the January 22nd hearing. She stated that on Thursday, February 8th with a large turnout five commission members attended a site walk and a lot of people from the public. Purvi thanked everyone for the great public participation. Purvi stated that they received a file number from Mass DEP and there were no technical comments received for this Notice of Intent.

Chrissy Gabriel from IQHQ was present and stated that she is overseeing the Jerry's Pond Project along with her colleague Danny Frias since 2021. Chrissy wanted to express their appreciation for the turnout at the site walk on Thursday. Chrissy stated that she thought it was valuable to understand the existing conditions at Jerry's Pond while also showcasing where they have proposed improvements with the plan. Chrissy stated that she thought the walkthrough really helped show and explain where they have identified a lot of these programmatic elements that live in their proposal. Chrissy stated that one of the perfect spots that they brought everyone on the walkthrough was where the eco-center will be built was a perfect spot to get everybody to see where it was located at the waters edge and understand the natural surroundings that you are experiencing from what they call Jerry's deck. Chrissy explained that from the walkthrough you really get to experience why they chose this location because you are removed from the noise and busy that Rindge Avenue provides. Chrissy stated that also during their walk they were able to see and understand the southwest corner of the site where there have been a lot of talks about removing the asphalt but you were able to understand historically where those locations used to stand and why there is so much pavement there because of the parking lots for the retail locations and this is why they chose this natural location for them to use as compensatory flood storage and not have visitors congregate in that area because of the loud traffic along Alewife Brook Parkway which they all experienced during the walkthrough. Chrissy turned the presentation over to Howard Moshier from VHB to go through the technical details as well as responses to the client as well as some of the public comments that were received.

Howard stated that they received two comment letters from Kleinfelder on behalf of the city and have addressed them and provided two formal response letters with a lot of detailed content. Howard stated that they will also be addressing two comment letters that they received from interested community members. Howard stated that the Kleinfelder memo from the city asked a lot of questions about construction logistics phasing in mitigation, so the supplemental materials described the detailed phases, the construction approach, the type of equipment that would be used as well as mitigation. Also, in reviewing the mats and the erosion controls they made some adjustments to temporary impacts that have been reflected in the updated in Wetlands Protection Act form 3. Howard stated in terms of operation and maintenance they have added a lot of detail with stormwater infrastructure monitoring and maintenance, floating wetland monitoring, maintenance addressing the plantings and the trees as well as monitoring to make sure invasives do not come back after removal as well as leaf and snow removal in the right seasons. Howard said they also provided a post construction monitoring plan with details on who will be conducting that and for how long. Howard said that they addressed a number of comments

regarding the stormwater management components and that our basis of design, which is addressing the applicability of maximum extent practical, given the previous development on the site that many people saw during the site walk. Howard said in response to some feedback they increased the wetlands replication area to 58 square feet, and they moved it slightly so now its attached to land underwater and sits basically in the same area as before. Howard stated that they also provided the required and requested additional grading and planting details. Howard stated that they were asked several questions about the floating wetlands that are being proposed, including the benefits, how they will be constructed and how to be planted and these were recommended by the city based on a successful pilot in the lower Charles. They have provided information on what floating wetlands are meant to provide wildlife habitat as well as removal nutrients from the water. Howard said that the supplemental packages that they provided discussed the installation methods and how they will be monitoring and maintaining these floating wetlands. Howard said that in terms of the boardwalk, vegetation management and replating details they have outlined how the areas will be vegetated after the mat installation and the proposed plan is to include ferns and sedges and shade tolerance seed mixes on construction sequences and he said he mentioned that they provided detail on construction sequencing. Howard said just to clarify that they provided and noted that the boardwalk decking will have gaps but will be accessible the gaps won't be too large. He said they clarified how banks will be stabilized with erosion mats or other measures. He said they provided the details requested on permeable pavements that are proposed in the meandering pathway and have depicted the construction staging areas on the plans as well as outlined where the resource areas are and where the work is going to be located. Howard said that they did receive a formal email from Ingeborg Hegeman, so they did clarify that the bank that they are proposing is a permanent impact that is along Rindge Avenue, but the mitigation is the planting right along the same bank in the same location. He said they also received several questions concerning their detailed wildlife habitat assessment and that they wanted to note that they provided responses to each of those comments and there were no further comments on that. Howard stated that Ms. Hegeman also requested further details on the BVW replication grading which he noted that they already provided. Howard stated that they also received several comments from the Alewife Study Group (ASG) and there were a few and he wanted to go through them all. He stated that ASG requested that street trees be planted on the north side of Rindge Avenue under the power lines and IQHQ has agreed to add these street trees and has submitted that to the Conservation Director and DPW for review and approval to make sure it does not conflict with any infrastructure. He wanted to note that this is a request that was made recently that IQHQ has agreed to, but they are currently showing on the plans and tree species selection will have to be based on city feedback given the power lines. They also provided the requested snow and leave removal details, which they did. Howard stated that ASG has requested that IQHQ remove the amphitheater seating or complementing it with another ADA accessible ramp and IQHQ has agreed to that but that the current considered options are probably going to have small impacts on the tree planting plans. Howard said that the team has also been asked to re-examine the proposed removal of two Ash trees along Rindge Avenue that are existing and based on detailed analysis IQHQ has agreed to save the most easterly Ash tree but that they wanted to note that the root zone will be impacted by the demolition of the existing sidewalk and installation of the path and wanted to note that loosing roots in the area could impact the stabilization of the tree. Howard said that they will also be reducing the proposed tree planting count by one tree but they are saving the Ash tree and also wanted to note that they won't be providing new planting soil under the canopy because they do not want to provide further compaction of the existing root system and they will not be proposing to plant ground coverage or shrubs in that area for the

same impact on the roots. Howard presented the updated tree table and wanted to note that they are providing excess mitigation in caliper inches and number of trees. Howard stated another concern was the depaving around the compensatory storage area and for those who were on the site walk noted the compensatory storage was marked out and a lot of it is going to cause the removal of a lot of the relic paving that is in that area but in accordance with the recommendation by the Audubon Society, IQHQ has agreed to additional depaving, particularly around existing significant trees and will do that as long as it is allowed under the existing Activity and Use Limitation (AUL) and doesn't require any tenting that could cause further harm to the existing trees and the removal of that extra pavement. Howard said lastly, they were asked to provide further detail concerning invasive management and the original response to comments indicated one growing season monitoring period by the contractor, but IQHQ agreed to extend that monitoring period to five (5) years. Howard turned over the presentation to Danielle Desilets from Kyle Zick Landscape Architects.

Danielle stated that they did receive some requests for clarification on the compensatory flood storage that is calculated for Rindge Avenue. Danielle stated that on the plans presented to the commission they highlighted the location of the core logs and the fill soil and the additional soil that they are planting that they are adding to Ringe Avenue so that can have good healthy trees and ground covers and have more beneficial planting along that edge and Danielle stated that was reflected in the chart in the written response. Danielle stated that they updated the temporary and permanent impacts to the BVW to the bank and the land underwater bodies and waterways and the actual calculations for that is in the text response. Danielle stated that the next slide was a supplement to clarify where the boardwalk is in relation to the wetland resource areas. Danielle went through the diagram in the presentation and stated that the areas in green are bordering lands subject to flooding (BLSF), the blue to the northeast is the bordering vegetated wetland (BVW) and the purple line is the bank, and the turquoise color is the land under waterbodies and waterways (LUW). Danielle stated that the orange depicts the replication of the bank along Rindge Avenue and being done in situ in place where the back is being impacted. Danielle pointed out that the yellow area in the corner is the fifty-eight (58) square feet of replicated BVW that is connected to land underwater bodies and waterways. On the next slide Danielle wanted to highlight a couple of changes that were the revisions that are included on the plans that were submitted on the second of February, and she stated as Howard mentioned these do not reflect the most recent commitments from IQHQ. Number one on the plan was one of the clarifications of the laydown areas and there are four of those. Danielle stated that there is one along Alewife Brook Parkway where the current access point is now, there is another at the southeast corner near Comeau Fields parking area and will have the main entry way there, one is at the Jerry's deck foundation area on the east side and the last one will be north where they will have communal garden area. Danielle stated that number two is the BVW replication area which she noted on the last slide which was highlighted in yellow, and number three was added planting under the boardwalk at the BVW and number four was for the updated Rindge Avenue bank section. Danielle stated that number five and six aren't on the plan because it is a detail five being updating the chain link fence and she said there was a question at the last hearing about the fence locations and wanted to note that they made sure they brought the bottom rail of the chain link fence up so they have at least six inches clear for wildlife to pass underneath it and then they also updated the structural details which is number six, one was to include the gaps in the boardwalk but also to reflect a change in from helical piles with batter piles in lieu of the helical piles with cross bracing. Danielle stated they felt that the battered piles provide much more structure for the boardwalk itself and it will only be in select areas not everywhere, she stated it's a more straightforward construction process and less impacts to the flood zone but they did not

update the numbers and kept the numbers where they had them originally. Danielle stated in relation to the fencing question that they had at the last hearing they put together a diagram showing that fencing was only being added to IQHQ property and not to city property, so depicted in yellow was the replacing or adjusting fence locations. Also, around the communal garden area there will be a split rail fence. Danielle stated that the orange depicts areas where they will be repairing existing chain link fencing.

Danny Frias, the Project Manager from IQHQ stated that he wanted to share an experience he had at the pond that gives us a sense of what we want to accomplish by protecting Jerry's Pond. He stated while walking Jerry's Pond last Wednesday morning he noticed several Great Blue Herons hanging out on the northwest side of the pond across from Comeau Field parking lot. Danny stated as he got closer to the fence, he counted about sixteen (16) Great Blue herons enjoying the pond. Danny stated that members of the community who he shared the video with at the time can tell you how excited he was. Danny stated he hopes that we can stay mindful of disturbing this habitat and offer protection that Jerry's Pond needs whether that be by fencing or conservation efforts. Furthermore, given that we plan on having an eco-center on the boardwalk for youth he thinks this provides an educational opportunity for the community to learn about wildlife conservation.

Purvi Patel thanked everyone and stated that she thought the site walk was super helpful in helping them understand the three-dimensional quality of some of the proposed improvements along Jerry's Pond.

Kara Falise from DPW was present and stated that Greg from Kleinfelder was also on the Zoom if anyone had questions for him. Kara stated that Greg and his team reviewed the submitted materials in depth. Kara stated that they received two packages, one in early February which was forwarded on to Kleinfelder which resulted in the February 9th memo from Kleinfelder and that is referring to their initial review memo and the responses to those comments. Kara stated that there was a lot of information in there and to summarize it they needed more information on some of the calculations specific to the compensatory flood storage. Kara also stated that the information about temporary versus permanent impacts still was unclear and what exactly was being mitigated. Kara said that there were also some comments that she would group as administrative, like one about the staging areas extended outside of the limit of work, but the two outstanding items were the compensatory flood storage and how it was calculated and some of the impacted areas, permanent versus temporary and how they were mitigated and what was being reported on the DEP form, that was as of Friday afternoon. Kara stated as everyone knows they got a flurry of information from both the public and the proponent team and she appreciated everyone's efforts to respond to these comments. Kara stated that Kleinfelder did a very quick review of the information that was submitted, and they think that its starting to answering the questions that they had about the commitments and Howard's slides grouped them together and some of them are new to them today and some of them are what they reviewed as part of the February 9th package. Kara stated that some of the commitments to the Alewife Study Group's requests were not reflected in any plans that the commission has seen formally. Kara stated items like trees maintained and trees to be planted that DPW has not reviewed those specific locations, but stated they are always happy to accommodate more street trees but there's subsurface utilities they must look at, accessibility guidelines, site lines from driveways. Kara said there are a lot of things that come into play before a street tree location is given the green light. Kara stated that she appreciates the discussions that are happening between ASG and IQHQ and we support this

communication and everyone working towards getting project out that people are happy with, but we have not formally seen a lot of these items for formal comment but generally they are trending in the right direction.

Purvi stated that she wanted to understand how any kind of permit that could be issued could reflect any further future DPW review, so would that be a special condition. Purvi stated it's clear that they would need updated plans to be submitted to the commission and for the public to review. Purvi stated that as far as these outstanding review elements is what is the approach that we would recommend.

Kara stated that in instance of the street trees everyone agreed that needed city review, so if it's something in the right of way that is something that they would be happy to negotiate outside of the commission. Kara said plan changes and updates to information required for their Notice of Intent filing she would look to Jen to understand how much can be conditioned and how much needs to be on plans.

Jennifer stated that new commitments that have been presented tonight in bulleted form in the presentation she was looking for the project team to let the commission know if in any of these bulleted remarks have a wetland resource area impact that needs to be mitigated or calculated that has not already been calculated in the new form that was sent over to her.

Howard stated that with the street trees he agrees with everything that was said these are in the buffer zone and they would have no impacts to the tables he would offer that the team put these on the revised plans annotate them for review and if anything is deemed significant, they would come back for a review. Howard stated on the removal of the amphitheater seating they think that any plan modification might have a neutral impact on the wetland resource and would be the burden of proof when they provide the updated plans and to note that and make sure there is no greater impact or any changes but we think that the ramping could happen in the same area just a replacement of the decking with other types of decking. Howard said they would suggest for the potential modification, removal of seating that they would give the plans an update following any vote to the director and if any impacts increased, they would come up with a process for that. Howard stated with the removal of the Ash tree they have noted the impacts here and they would just need to provide the updated plans that show that but wouldn't be changing the bank and would just be changing the proposed planting arrangement and maybe a small benefit of the impact on the flood plan. Howard stated that they think this is something positive to the existing plans and they propose giving them stamped drawings that they submit as a condition to the order of conditions. Howard stated with the depaving they would like to take that question back and some of it is outside the jurisdiction of the Wetlands Protection Act but there might be areas that are in and they would like to study this carefully to make sure they are not running a foul of any previous approvals with the Conservation Commission or Planning Board, and would come back with a commitment to present this in the right fashion under the guidance of city staff but parts of it are in the jurisdiction whether it be in buffer zone or otherwise. Howard stated with the invasives that has already been addressed and thinks a lot of these could be handled through the file drawings.

Jennifer asked Howard if he is saying that a little more work needs to get done to check calculations and potentially update the plans.

Howard stated that with the compensatory storage and the additional depaving that they would want to look at that make sure they are not creating impacts, but the rest of it he feels they are running within the overall construct of the project.

Jennifer asked if he would like the commission to continue the hearing, so they are able to make the necessary changes and updates.

Howard stated no, he would propose that it be a condition that the project team evaluate this and come back if its within the existing limits of all of the bullets and if there's an process that is required related to this that they would handle that separately upon the condition, but he thinks its IQHQ intent to pursue all of these they just don't want to run afoul of the current process. Jennifer stated that they either revised the calculated numbers and give those to the commission for review and they permit that, but the commission can not permit this unless they know what the numbers are, and they know what the impacts are and what the mitigation is. Jennifer stated unless it's on the plans right now that are before the commission then they would not be allowed to remove anymore pavement. Jennifer stated that this was not something that the commission can condition, they need to see it, quantify it and they must mitigate it and the commission will need to see those numbers and calculations. Jennifer stated they are not going to do anymore depaving, and the commission is voting on the plans as previously submitted or they can ask for a continuance and go to the next hearing and get the commission revised numbers and that it is up to the project team which one they would like to do.

Chrissy asked for some clarity, would this be just for the depaving in those areas or for additional work.

Jennifer stated Howard brought up tonight this would be the only bullet that has not been studied to know whether there are additional impacts in the wetland resource areas.

Chrissy stated that yes that would be for the additional depaving, and she agrees with Howard that they still would want to achieve approval tonight and asked to table that.

Purvi stated that she's sorry if she was not clearer, but she had stated that there needs to be additional information like new plans submitted to the commission. She stated they can not have different plans than those that were submitted to DEP and those submitted to the commission for the public to view. Purvi stated that they cannot talk about changes that are being proposed without seeing those articulated on updated plans. Purvi said it's not only having plans from x date but it's also having a narrative as well. Purvi said it's pretty clear that the commission needs the information, and she apologized if that was not conveyed clearly but that is the expectation.

Chrissy thanked Purvi for the clarity.

Purvi stated that this would be for any project that has any kind of revision, even if it is remotely substantive it should be depicted.

Howard stated that in the spirit they just don't want to say yes without understanding the implications. Howard stated that much of the site walk was outside of the jurisdiction, but they just don't want to misrepresent anything in the hearing and sometimes there are additional mitigation items to consider things are part of a course of action that comes up as part of the discussion and it becomes within a special condition. Howard stated that he thinks they are in a bit of a grey area right now trying to do the right thing here and trying to proceed with this important mitigation project at the same time while knowing the commitment to the community continues and it might not be within the Jerry's Pond project but as part of the larger Alewife Park Project, so that's why they are trying to suggest that it might become a condition and they just want to make sure they are doing the right thing on this commitment.

Purvi stated she appreciated what Howard said and somethings like keeping the Ash tree and what trees you are removing; those are the things that the commission would need to see and also

where the street trees that are being proposed need to go to the city for further review that would be something that is noted in a special condition.

Howard stated that would be something that IQHQ would need to answer but if there were any other questions, we can proceed with those and regroup.

David Lyons stated he endorses Purvi's thinking about continuing this where there are significant changes to the plans and sometimes there is some room with special conditions, but he has concern with the intense interests of the community in this project with all of the comments and responses. David said that with all of the public comments and comments from ASG and Friends of Jerry's Pond and what had occurred to him at the site walk is that this is a big site the whole property from Comeau Field all the way across the pond to Alewife Brook Parkway and was looking for some discussion and that could be commentary from a lot of different directions from the applicant, from the city staff what the overall vision is for the entirety of this property. David stated that they have talked a lot about the boardwalks, the viewing areas and the compensatory storage in the southwest corner which was a big part of the prior approval for the lab building itself but there is a lot of space and a lot of land between the compensatory storage and the northern portion of the site up near the access route near the MBTA headhouse which seems to be mostly the old Lehigh property which seems to be mostly paved, there is an old basement, some wetlands, vegetation and flooding and there seems to be a lot of depaving happening in the southwest corner near the compensatory flood storage which is good but what is the overall vision for that larger area to the north and he can see it going in a lot of different directions but it seems to be left out in this process. David stated he did see a heron in that area when they were on the site walk and did appreciate Danny's comments about the whole family of herons he saw and he said this could just be fenced and be left for wildlife reserve but thinks that leaving it paved for another twenty to thirty years is not really a great use of that area.

Chrissy said she appreciated Davids' question and his participation on the site walk to really understand how big the site really is and acknowledge that comment and she thinks its to the benefit of the project that it is that large. Chrissy stated that one of the design elements that came out early in the design principles that they had from the Ocean Institute survey and also talking with other community members was to maintain contiguous habitat where possible and with that was the heron rookery that is still active and what it showed them was when you do fence off particular areas you let the habitat flourish on its own it will attract animals and different plants. Chrissy said on January 13th they had a site walk with an arborist from Mass Audubon and he was very helpful identifying different species of plants and providing them with some context as how historically some of the trees had gotten there and one of the main points of the conservation was whether or not we believed that there was an existing structure, an existing concrete foundation in that particular area and he said based on his findings and what he is seeing, the tree species, the amount of them, the size and how condensed they are he did not believe that there was any concrete foundation left in its place, so all of that was positive feedback.

Elysse Magnotto-Cleary stated she was glad also to go on the site walk with so many people and recognize it was really an invaluable opportunity to see the site in the way they did. Elysse stated she was in favor of keeping the conversation going and that this would be consistent with past practices and wanted to voice that.

Erum Sattar wanted to second what everyone was saying especially David but couldn't be there at the site walk. She said that the amount of comments from people has been sort of unprecedented even getting some of them up to fifteen minutes before the meeting and she said she doesn't think anyone has had time to digest what those are and what therefore the onboard process of how IQHQ decides to move forward with this and what the onward process and community engagement with the people who are reaching out to the commission and will get the commission to a point where they say they have looked at everybody and what they are saying. Erum stated that they need to have a more holistic understanding of what is before them and what is still possible and what may still be at play. Erum would like to see this continued, so it would give them time to digest all of it.

Jennifer stated that after the January 22nd meeting she took all the comments that had been submitted and saved them in a single location and shared it with anyone who had asked including the proponents and then the public comments had stopped and then they picked up last night, with a comment that was received on Thursday evening by James Williamson. Jennifer said she will combine all of the comments that she received and share those and knows that not everyone would have had a chance to read all of comments before the meeting this evening. Jennifer said she will share all the comments that she received this evening with anyone who wants them as well as the commission and the proponents. She said that the comments that were received this evening were comments that they have already seen and were a reiteration of the comments that have already been made, so there is nothing new or something that they have not considered.

Purvi stated to Jennifer that in the MEPA office they are used to getting comments coming in and they generally ask for responses to the comments or iteratively so she was assuming that they would get further responses to comments as well based on the fact that some of these did come in today but it was her expectation and wanted to confirm if that was something that they might expect.

Jennifer stated that she prompted the proponents to only respond to the comments relevant to the Wetlands Protection Act and to keep it to Wetland Protection Act specific.

Purvi stated now there needs some kind of revision she would like the revisions brought in by the comments, like in terms of the proposed street trees, so that response would be that they are planting trees in accordance with whatever DPW decided is appropriate.

Erum stated she appreciates Jennifer sharing all the comments and since this project has been going on for two to three years, she expected people knew what was going on but reading through some of the comments it sounded like some people just learning of somethings that were being proposed. She stated she would like someone to go through the comments and make sure that it has been looked at and what can be accommodated.

Tricia Carney stated that across the street from Jerry's Pond is the largest environmental justice community in Cambridge, is it possible to get more feedback from the residents of Rindge Towers and the neighborhood across the street in person.

Anthony Galluccio stated that he will repeat back what he said at the first hearing, he stated that the whole plan was based on a survey that was handed to them from the Ocean Institute which was a survey of the Rindge Towers and Jefferson Park residents. Anthony said that everything

was based on the representation that there was a survey done and the only disconnect was around whether the pond would be reshaped and he would argue folks who filled out the survey have never operated on that level and that these people have real economic challenges and real world problems that would like to see an improved Jerry's Pond and be able to access it for enjoyment and escape. He believes that the representation that folks have pinned on at that level of detail are just insensitive to the real world economic and real-life challenges those folks have. Anthony stated he would argue at this point based on three mailings to every individual with pictures of the plan, countless meetings, their interns, and folks going door to door showing the plan that there is no lack of engagement or input and thinks whoever is deeply interested in this are deeply interested for whatever reason and have the time and energy to put in that level of interest and thinks that piece is exhausted but what he would say is that the commitments that IQHQ made over the last three years to various people they are expecting the developer to deliver. Anthony stated that if this continues to get delayed, we are going to look like the same old institution that makes promises and flashes things up in the air and doesn't deliver and that is the biggest concern on the table is the delay and not actually delivering what was promised because if he was one of those folks that's what he would expect. Anthony said he as been a permitting attorney for many years and has never seen this level of public engagement and at some point you have to presume that folks generally like the plan or they have other major concerns like paying their kids tuition and hopefully moving out of subsidized housing and owning a home, getting a better job, childcare and this may not be the top issue in their life. Anthony stated he is sorry to be so direct, but he has represented the neighborhood for a long time and coached in the neighborhood and knows a lot of families and that is exactly how he feels at this point. He said to the commission that he has never seen a public meeting more noticed than that site walk. He said you couldn't turn on TV or open a publication without seeing that.

Tricia said that one idea she had since now they have plans to place the plans on an 8 foot table in front of Rindge Towers and people could write their comments on post it notes, it can be close to where they live and it could be an opportunity to show if what was said in the survey is true about what people want then their would be less comment letters about things not being the way they want them.

Tricia said she had a question about the soil test and looking at contaminates and asbestos for the area where the deck will be placed over the ground to the right of the pond and making sure that all the right actions are taking place during construction. She said she also has a question about the 4500 square feet of shading that will happen with the boardwalk being placed over the water, it seems like a lot of shading will be happening and you will be going into the water by building this boardwalk. Tricia is curious about what the current testing is for the water and the soil sediment in this area because it will be disturbed during construction.

Jennifer Sweet stated she has heard this question a few times and will try to answer that and the additional comment. Jennifer stated she is a Licensed Site Professional (LSP) and an Environmental Consultant with Haley and Aldrich. She wanted to remind everyone as a LSP she is licensed by the state of Massachusetts to advise owners of sites that have been impacted by contamination on the response actions that are required under the state of Massachusetts' contingency plan regulations, which are overseen by Mass DEP. She stated that her role in this project is to advise IQHQ how to safely allow limited access to the area while taking all the necessary precautions during construction. The Jerry's Pond and the surrounding areas are located within portions of the former sites that are regulated under the MCP due to historic impacts by various contaminations related to historic use and also from historic filling and those sites were previously assessed and response actions taken under the MCP and under the current

conditions there is no risk to human health or the environment. She stated that they did do some additional testing in 2021 of the surface water and sediment in Jerry's Pond due to some public comment and that data did confirm that there is no risk to people or wildlife in the pond itself from the former WR Grace site, but since previous response actions included implementation of an activity and use limitation (AUL) there are additional precautions that are needed during construction, when handling soil, managing soil and groundwater during construction, as what was done with the development site, the development project and MCP work plan, which is actually called a Release of Abatement Measure (RAM) will also be developed prior to construction of Jerry's Pond and submitted to Mass DEP and that document will include an updated risk assessment for the proposed uses for this plan, like specific soil management and health and safety procedures that must be taken during construction and it will include requirements for clean cover placement to comply with the AUL to mitigate risk. Jennifer said that the 2021 pond sampling and other sampling that they have recently done will direct the proper management of soil generated during construction and all of that data will be included in the RAM plan that they are currently working on and additional sampling data that was collected recently in the southwest corner that was collected because there will be excess soil generated to create the compensatory flood storage area and all of that data is in the process of being compiled. Jennifer stated that the results for the sampling that they did in the southwest corner indicate the presence of constituents that are very typical of urban fill soil that they see all over Cambridge and Boston, there were no surprises in the data that they collected and there is nothing in the data set that indicates there was any specific release on the Lehigh Babos parcel other than what's commonly found in urban fill.

Tricia stated that for invasive plants they do need to have ongoing maintenance it can't be limited because its an ongoing situation so she thinks that should be considered in the plans. She stated that she just went to a presentation, and they say it just doesn't go away and it must be something that you consider beyond five years.

Howard stated that would be the contractor's obligation to maintain it for five years and then IQHQ will take it over as the property owner.

8:19 – Public Comment

Hannah Mahoney, Rindge Avenue resident and a member of Cambridge Mothers Out Front. She stated that they have been supporting and advocating for the project for a long time and in response to the January 22nd meeting and the recent site walk they wanted to take the opportunity to urge the commission again to consider some meaningful improvements along specifically the public facing Rindge Avenue an Alewife Brook Parkway portions of Jerry's Pond project. She stated that IQHQ has not made a persuasive case that they saw or received systematic or thorough input from the abutters on the Rindge Avenue side of the project and give the fact that this neighborhood is a priority environmental justice community bearing disproportionate, heat island effects, air pollution, climate risks as well as lack of green space it strikes as being incumbent upon a commission to take these neighbors needs into account in assessing the projects plan. Specifically, as they mentioned previously, they support a restored shoreline along Rindge Avenue side of the project the modification would support the flora, fauna and ecology of the pond and would enable more tree canopy and would help integrate the project more accessibly into the neighborhood. Second, along Alewife Brook Parkway side as they mentioned previously, they support significantly more depaving of the part of the parcel to allow for increased tree canopy and a healthier more robust and diverse ecosystem in that area, depaving

there could also provide an opportunity for a pathway set farther away from the heavily trafficked roadway than the one on the current plan, which closely parallels the parkway. They hope that these comments are taken in account as they assess the Jerry's Pond project. The city can and should take advantage of this historic opportunity to complete the plan in a way that takes the environmental justice community that abuts it into account and that optimally supports the ecology of the plants as an important city resource.

Lewis Weitzman, resident of Montgomery Street and Co-Founder of the Friends of Jerry's Pond and has spent a large portion of his life and energy during the last eight years working on this site restoration. He is excited about the pending opening and has nothing but glowing words for IQHQ that they are trying to make good plans and really make them the best they can be. He stated Commissioner's please take note of the two words that he uses restoration and reopening we can't allow one without the other and they believe that the current plans for the site are going to give the community access to Jerry's Pond but they have to keep in mind it's a very limited opening and it will include man-made boardwalks and decks and almost nothing is planned to improve the ecology of the vital resource and that's their main gripe, they are not ungrateful for IQHQ for opening it but it's not enough to just day open it. He stated the place is very blighted and this would be the right venue here at the Conservation Commission to really take a bite out of the last remaining problem here, which is not addressing the ecological issues and couldn't imagine anything that could be more important to the commissioners than the restoration of what is likely to be the last major undeveloped site within their jurisdiction. Where else in the city are we going to have a place like Jerry's Pond with an urban wetland, a body of water immediately adjacent to as Hannah said the thickly populated neighborhoods that include the largest environmental justice community across the street, there is nothing like this and nothing will be considered for quite some time. Lewis stated that this is a unique opportunity, there is a very significant disturbance going on and thinks this is a good opportunity for the commission to ask for ecological restoration not just adding boardwalks. He thinks that the commission should carefully look at the work at the southwest corner because that is for the development to the north and has nothing to do with Jerry's Pond and urges the commission to make recommendations in their special conditions for IQHQ to add a significant amount of trees not just a few trees.

McNamara Buck of the Friends of Jerry's Pond leadership team stated that he agrees with Lewis that IQHQ has been a great organization and stated his perspective is with the earth itself although all perspectives are important in this and would like to talk about this place sometimes called a wetland and sometimes called a basement and that its at the Lehigh site. A little bit of history about that site is that twenty years ago aerial photographs which he believes the commission has seen show that there were no trees in that basement that would indicate that it was a basement or still is concrete it is likely that over the forty years that this site was walled off enough soil formed that a number of red maple trees have been able to grow and the person from the Audubon seemed to think they could be about twenty years old and is a tree that is comfortable having a lot of water around them and are a tree that could become mature and likely will not be able to survive if they are growing on concrete we don't know the answer to that and no one knows the answer to that and the request to the Conservation Commission is that you help IQHQ to determine if there a basement there, there certainly are walls there and what is the right thing to do ecologically for this area that appears to be a wetland, he does not know and only has been back there one time to see it in January. One last comment about the rookery, he thanked Danny for the video and it was beautiful and really nice to see but it hasn't been a

rookery for a number of years he thinks there were maybe three to four years when the herons were actually raising their babies there and oddly the year that IQHQ bought it that was the year that they stopped raising their babies and had nothing to do with what IQHQ did at that point and it's just what herons do, they move around so he thinks they can't still call it a rookery but does think that they can look at the land and see that we have to release the land from all of the concrete and all the black top because there is no soil formation. Please have IQHQ pursue if this is a basement or not and what to do about it.

James Williamson stated he was here to elaborate on his written comments and hopes the commission had time to read them. He stated he agrees with what Danielle Desilets had to say. He said it's not like there hasn't been good faith on the efforts of ASG, Friend of Jerry's Pond and IQHQ to engage with the people who are primarily effected by this which is the people in the towers, Brick Works which is a mixed income and Jefferson Park, he stated he lived in Jefferson Park for sixteen (16) years and was president of tenant council and will be moving back to Jefferson Park. James stated that he doesn't think the efforts that were made although in good faith are sufficient and said he does not remember getting a survey although he did live there at the time but did confirm he did get some mailings. He said before he accepts characterization of what the results where he would like to see the response rate for example. James said instead of going forward to carve out the section that is most controversial which is the section along Rindge Avenue as well as the southwest corner working together he said he would volunteer to help out the steering committee of the Friends of Jerry's Pond and residents who live right on Rindge Avenue and planning out a good systematic way of surveying all the people that live along Rindge Avenue. He stated the problem is and the echoing comments made by IQHQ in the presentation why have an eco-center that looks out at nature when three sides of the pond have boardwalk, your not looking at nature you are looking at boardwalks and there is no need for a boardwalk on the Rindge Avenue side. James said there are alternatives which make sense but widening the paved surface but not enough to have separation for pedestrians doesn't make sense at all and has a potential negative impact on the wetlands in ways others could technically speak better then he could. He just thinks a boardwalk on the Rindge Avenue side is a terrible idea and thinks postponing this to engage with people who live along Rindge Avenue is important for a successful project.

Renata Pomponi with Mass Audubon operating in Cambridge out of 668 Memorial Drive, stated that she would like to make a couple of comments but had provided a letter at the last meeting where they expressed their support for the project but that they were hoping for more depaving and more trees. Renata stated that they are very happy that IQHQ has taken those comments to heart and provided more depaving around mature trees so they can retain the trees that are there but also add additional ones and excited about the fence to let the wildlife pass through. She also stated that in terms of the Lehigh site it is true that one of the science folks did come out and look at the trees from a far, but they have not done a detailed study, but their initial findings was that there are fairly large trees that are doing well right now and should continue to do well. Renata stated that there have been a lot of talk about the herons, and you can argue whether they are roosting or nesting, but they are using the property right now along with other types of wildlife and they are excited about where the project is heading and the additional work that is going to be coming on locating those trees and the depaving efforts. Renata said they are really excited for the project to be moving ahead and getting kids into the eco-center and to be able to learn in this kind of environment and was really excited that IQHQ was willing to take on an education partner for this project and had extensive conversations with them about how to do

education with other types of properties where there is similar conditions to the AUL and they were happy that they were willing to work with them and listen to their experiences around how to get kids connected to nature even when there are constraints like boardwalks and not being able to touch the water and really want the project to be able to provide those services to the community as soon as possible.

Eppa Rixey is a resident of 126 Harvey Street and has been involved in the project since 2021 through ASG and has been involved in numerous community group meetings throughout the past few years. Eppa wanted to mention that even with IQHQ's significant efforts ASG has also reached out to the Rindge Avenue community and surveyed over 250 in the neighborhood including over 85 from Rindge and said that it is quite difficult to connect with folks in Rindge in terms of schedules lining up and getting time for one-on-one conversations with them. Eppa agreed with Anthony that they are busy, and they just want to move on to whatever they need to do next but through their surveys they have been able to have some one-on-one conversations and they do have a wide range of concerns about the area. Eppa stated when they have asked them questions with a budget constraint saying if they had ten million dollars how you would spend it to improve the area the number one concern was getting better access to Danehy Park and the Fresh Pond Mall and would allocate twice as much to that as improving the shoreline of Rindge Avenue which gets an average allocation of less than two million dollars. Eppa stated that he doesn't think there are opportunities to improve the area around Rindge Avenue and Jerry's Pond and he thinks the IQHQ plan largely does that but it's a very space constrained area and when you take into account the contaminated nature of the site and extend that area significantly and add roughly three quarters of an acre park which is the most recent proposal from the Friends of Jerry's Pond you have to create that compensatory storage somewhere else and it's not clear where you can do that without removing mature trees and trees on the west side of the pond serves a really important function in providing tree canopy over there which can help trap some of the pollutants from one of the most congested roadways in the entirety of Massachusetts when you look at the prevailing wind blowing from west to east you have playgrounds, a tot lot, a deck, an eco-center, a pool and a baseball field all downwind of that and thinks there is an opportunity to put as many trees as they can and restore the habitat on the west side and the first step in doing that is fencing it off so it can be a nature reserve and is largely why we see herons there now. Eppa stated he does fully support IQHQ's expanded commitments around depaving and if the details need to be hammered out through a continuation of this process than that should happen, but he thinks they have made a huge commitment in expanding and being willing to look at how to do that safely. He thinks one of the major challenges is that they don't know the full extent of paving on the site and the site conditions that may enable it to be removed easily or difficultly and whether certain trees that may have grown up into the tree itself and would harm the tree. Eppa said that IQHQ's commitment around depaving reflects respecting the AUL, the asbestos protection ordinance and protecting existing trees, which are three things that he thinks are imperative for that to be successful. Eppa wanted to briefly address the comment from James Williamson that the eco-center won't look out onto nature and wholeheartedly disagrees and thinks that is exactly what it is going look out at, it's going to look out at one of the most natural places of the pond where there are not boardwalks it's the fenced of area that they have been talking about with the Lehigh metals potential basement where its not clear what exactly is over there and he thinks there could be a longer-term efforts to increase the habitat value of that but it doesn't seem relevant to the particular scope of this project there is not proposed work in that area and thinks it's of the remit of this organization and evaluating the project thats being proposed.

Joel Nogie from Clifton Street and a member of the Alewife Study Group for 28 years. Joel stated that ecological restoration is important to this site which is a highly degraded site from the prior industrial use, including brick making many years ago that's why there is a pond or a pit here and at this site these issues have been studied extensively over the last few years related to this project. Joel stated that Alewife Neighbors Incorporated a 501c hired Matt Weissberg who attended a site visit with other wetland scientist hired by IQHQ a couple of years ago to examine the site closely and he's a highly respected wetland scientist and one of the things he said is that ecological restoration really depends on the site restoring itself naturally because it hasn't been disturbed and what most needs to happen is allow that to continue and that is a big part of the reason for that undisturbed area in the northwest section of Jerry's Pond being fenced off and not having paths through it it's an important ecosystem and habitat and IQHQ is taking the right approach to having that protected. Also, Mass Audubon's comments previously and the city's review of the two different plans from IQHQ and Friends of Jerry's Pond earlier this year all pointed to minimizing disturbance is important part of ecological restoration. Joel stated in terms of the IQHQ plans with the addition of the streets trees proposed by ASG now includes approximately thirty (30) new trees along Rindge Avenue, but should look at what is a good number of trees because the Rindge Avenue residents do not want the view of the pond blocked so they are connected to nature but also for safety reasons so when people are on the boardwalk or the overlook they can be seen from Rindge Avenue.

Eric Grunebaum from Friends of Jerry's Pond stated he lives about five blocks from the pond. Eric stated he's been working on this since 2015 with neighbors, colleagues, and other environmental community groups to restore the pond to make it accessible again. He said it was nice meeting some of the people on the site walk last week and thanked the commission for the opportunity to speak tonight on behalf of the Friends of Jerry's Pond and others. Eric stated that they also surveyed people in the towers tabling about four times over the last few years and about 97% of the over 100 people they talked to wanted more green space and more canopy. Eric said that the primary issues that they see with the current plan even with tonight's adjustments are the very significant impacts this design makes along the banks and over the water of one of Cambridge's last unaddressed large wetlands as Ingeborg noted in her comments sent to the director this afternoon, the Wetlands Protection Act includes language stating that work should be evaluated to avoid, minimize, and then mitigate impacts the proponents design has not really followed the first strategy avoiding impacts what we see instead is the construction of large boardwalks and decks along both the south and east sides of the pond which cause significant impacts to the resources, as listed in exhibit A which the commission saw tonight, their decks and boardwalks of more than 200 linear feet over banks, 1900 square feet over bordering vegetated wetlands, 4500 square feet over water and 5100 square feet over bordering land subject to flooding and some of these impacts can be avoided and some can be minimized. Further, Ingeborg and the Kleinfelder January 17th peer review have questioned whether the mitigation itself is adequate, Kleinfelder notes this in four statements in their peer review. First they write given the helical piles will be located below the boardwalk it is unlikely that vegetation would naturally re-establish itself and they also say that changes to bordering vegetated wetland, vegetation and ground surface below the boardwalk should be accounted for in the impact numbers where clarification is needed for how there is no impact also they said regarding the gaps between the boards in the decking they write if there's a gap provide explanation of the ground cover below the decking and if vegetated clarify how vegetation will establish in highly shaded locations and lastly they say some of the exiting slopes beneath the

proposed boardwalk decking are steep and unlikely to vegetate due to shading. Eric stated that the mitigation itself is flawed due to shading and or steepness. Cambridge itself noted in the cover letter to the peer review that the proponents shall provide more clarification of the impacts to the resource areas and temporary permanent impacts to be calculated and mitigated. So, we agree with DPW that the current plans are not fully mitigated and should not be approved. Eric stated that this is our one opportunity to get it right and as he noted in his remarks at the last meeting, I hope we can look back in twenty or thirty years and feel like we did the right thing.

Mike Nakagawa who has been involved in Conservation Commission issues for over a quarter of a century now and lives in the area. He states that one of the things that has not been mentioned was the Lehigh area and asbestos was found in that area in the soil and would be an area where he would want people to be careful in, but IQHQ has no plans for that area. Mike's question is if I live in a special flood hazard area and I want to depave my driveway are you telling me that I need to tear down my garage because it would be nice for the resource area even if I had no plans to touch my garage, so he doesn't even know how the Lehigh area is even in play right now. He stated that IQHQ is volunteering to make so many improvements to the area now everyone's questioning after two plus years of discussion of whether this is a good idea after it's been submitted for approval, he doesn't understand. He said that IQHQ is offering to lift some of the pavement, we don't know how much and you're saying you have to quantify that, but they won't know how much until it's unburied, and they can't dig it out until you've approved the digging out because its in a resource area. Mike stated he thought it would be more appropriate to say that it will be monitored by the Conservation Commission through an order of conditions so you make sure they are not doing something wrong as they are doing it, but the idea is to pull it out thoughtfully and you can't tell because it's underneath buried soil. He said there are comments being made by people who don't live in the area and don't understand how many trade offs there are that we have been discussing for years, the pathway that's proposed along Rindge Avenue over soil will be paved because the city wants accessibility and there is going to be hardscape there then you need soil on either side pavement so that means you have to dig out some other area around the pond in order to make up for that so it's nice to say we are going to plants trees here and we are going to plants trees in some other area where they are depaving on the west side but that's the area that was planned to provide flood compensation and the idea of the boardwalk is to minimize your overall impacts and in fact the land underwater total area is less than the standards that the threshold then reporting it its just where the posts are and has very little impact, you don't have to fill in and you don't have to dig someplace else out. He said there has been a lot that has been discussed over and over again the boardwalks limit people trampling over habitat and they thought that was a good idea and now people are saying the boardwalks are a bad thing, then we would have no access because trampling on the ground directly is not going to be better than walking over a boardwalk that preserves habitat underneath and access to another area and prevents people from walking in other areas. Mike stated lastly to the surveys that were done, they went out to two of the Fresh Pond's apartment summer parties, they attended a resource party and also gone out with their surveys whenever CDD was having some event in the area. Mike explained that these are one-on-one surveys for several minutes and asked questions not just would you like more trees and if that was your question of course people are going to say yes, but ask how many do you want and what are the tradeoffs for more trees but they talked to the people and showed them pictures of the IQHQ plans and they liked the plans because they thought the alternative was that the pond would get paved over and built on so that was the alternative that was in their minds when they were saying would you like improvements. There are other ways of improvement like clearing out the chain link fence and getting a clearer

view of the pond and getting people away from the pollution and noise with a nice view to get to the better areas of the pond.

Lisa Birk lives four blocks from the site and the co-founder of the Alewife Study Group and has been studying this site for 28 ½ years. She stated like she said last time that balance here is tricky and agrees with every single thing Mike Nakagawa said, they worked for three years and have done tons of outreach and have met over one hundred times with four to six IQHQ staff, consultants, subcontractors to get the balance and the complexity right. She stated this is a really profound difficult site with great opportunities and my big fear here is that IQHQ has been doing the right thing, they have met with the public more than one hundred times, they have adjusted their plans even as of last week to respond to neighbors comments, they have expanded depaving, they have expanded their commitment to invasive removal they are doing the right thing. Lets send the message to Cambridge developers that we want you to do the right thing that we reward the right thing and she fully supports IQHQ's slightly modified plan with their improvements of additional trees going in writing and she fully supports the Conservation Commission signing off on this beautifully balanced delicate plan, studies and well outreached not perfect but well done, please pass this plan eventually at the next meeting.

David Bass of 23 Norris Street stated it seems to him that they don't know what the state of or even the existence of the Lehigh Metals foundation is but he's skeptical of taking down dozens of twenty-year-old trees to remove a relic foundation in the hopes that healthier trees one day may replace them. IQHQ at the urging of ASG and other neighborhood groups have really gone the extra mile to save trees throughout their 26-acre site and such an extensive tree removal at the Lehigh Metal site would seem inconsistent with all that they have strived to do and all that the tree advocates in Cambridge have been calling for. Also, with all of the filling along Rindge Avenue that amounts to digging up one area of the site to fill and flooding to fill in another area of the site and it's a zero sum game and doesn't really create anymore real estate that is available for a eventual forestation and nor would that affect public access or intimate views of the pond. He stated his perspective is that really a lot of what we are talking about between the two plans proposed by IQHQ and the Friends of Jerry's Pond are in the final analysis aesthetic and made a note about the boardwalks what's the alternative no responsible property owner would create a shoreline that would invite the public to enter the pond the proposed boardwalks allow people an intimate view of the pond around two-thirds of the perimeter the alternative would have to be a tall chain link fence like what is there now and that would be a real loss.

9:02 – Public Comment remains open

Purvi thanks everyone for all of the kind and thoughtful comments.

Jennifer Sweet stated she has a few words about the boardwalks and thinks Mike said it every well with all of the challenges related to the site one very important one is that as she said before this site is located within several historic impacted sites that are managed under the MCP and those sites were assessed as she mentioned before there is no risk under it's current use and the key reason why there's no risk for current use is the implementation of the AUL which restricts specific uses that have high impact and high frequency use and more importantly the maintenance of a protective cover. Again, she said that her job is to make sure what IQHQ is proposing is safe and meets all the requirements under the MCP regulations, the use of boardwalks allows us to do that it allows us to provide access while not degrading protective

cover and limiting use to uses consistent with the AUL. Jennifer stated that although IQHQ would probably prefer paths on the ground because it would be a lot cheaper, she says no because it doesn't comply with the AUL and the discussions of restoring the sites and natural conditions this whole area was filled historically so in order to do that to get unrestricted use with no AUL they would have to remove at minimum at least three feet of soil across the whole site which would require cutting down all of the trees, so she hears save the trees and then she hears restore the site and we can't have both given the site conditions and that is why they are using boardwalks so they can provide access that is safe.

Purvi stated that there is a revision to the plan that they are expecting. She said she didn't hear anything from any of the commission members that require further submission of the supplemental information and asked Jennifer if she noted anything that was outstanding beyond what Kleinfelder has submitted.

David wanted to respond to Jennifer Sweet's comments all well taken, and wanted to make sure they were not missing anything from clear cutting the site and clearing out soils and additional feasible removals that would be consistent with safe use of the site, safe conditions for the public while also having some ecological restoration benefit and storage benefits and stated he's not convinced of that and that they have reached that point yet not to say that he couldn't be but just not convinced that they are there yet.

Jennifer Sweet didn't really understand his question.

David asked if there was more assessment that they can do on the west side of the site for other areas that could be depaved, that would have ecological benefits and flood storage benefits. He stated he agrees with the boardwalks and understands the need to limit access through the use of the boardwalks, but it seems like the plan is to leave the whole west side, northwest side of the site untouched indefinitely and he's not sure that is necessary under the AUL or the best ecological outcome here.

Jennifer Sweet stated from the site walks they did she did not see a significant amount of pavement on the north side of the site, and she thinks someone else had said that too, she is not sure all of the areas where they saw visible pavement were on the southern side, IQHQ said as long as it's feasible and doesn't not violate the AUL.

David asked about the old basement area.

Jennifer Sweet said she didn't know anything else aside from what everyone else has said today about the basement.

Howard stated he would like to point out and not forget that the development area had extraordinary stormwater benefits as outlined in the Con Com and the compensatory storage that was being proposed originally for this corner was providing extra benefits to the entire flood plain and this project as currently proposed is providing additional benefits and most substantially at those elevations when the flooding would occur first, not at the highest elevations but at lower elevations. He said these are all good things and this alleged basement, that area as been delineated as a bordering vegetative wetland its meeting the standards that DEP has established to function or have the characteristics with the soils and the vegetation that make it a

wetland. In terms of water being retained there for periods of time that's probably because it's flat and it has an elevation very similar to the pond surface and that makes sense. He states that area is over 10,000 square feet that would be a mammoth undertaking to clear cut and remove to depave and would be a lot of work. Howard wanted to point out that the lens that you are casting the project team has always looked at these things and as they said at the site walk repeatedly the goal was to provide access in a safe manner to the pond where its been formally fenced off and everything that has been selected is to create the minimum amount of impacts the less soil that moves the less soil that gets disturbed. In terms of the depaving there are areas that they already committed to that were within the boardwalk swath and they have said they would remove that pavement it's been on the plans, and they are looking at some additional depaving. He said that the team at the direction of the client has been asked to look at the same things you are asking but just don't want the benefits that are already been gained through previous approvals as well as currently approved to be lost because in previous hearings people have alleged we are having stormwater impacts or floodplain we have created benefits at every proposal and wanted that to go on record because that didn't come up strongly enough last time because we thought that we were just listening.

Purvi said at this point what they are understanding and to be all on the same page is that here is an expectation that the comments from Kleinfelder and Kara are going to be addressed in a further responds to comments and there is going to be a submittal of a revised plan articulating some of the nuances that they are now proposing and there should be some clarity on the comment about shading Purvi thought that would be very helpful and also the temporary versus permanent and the mitigation.

9:12 – The commission approved to continue the hearing to the February 22nd meeting.
7 – In Favor, 0 – Absent, 0 Abstained

Purvi thanked everyone on behalf of the commission for all of the public's comments, it has given the commission a sense of all of the different trade offs and the way this project has attempted to address the competing interests.

Jennifer agreed to compile all the comments and send those out to the commission members as well as anyone else who requests them. Jennifer asked everyone who would like them to email her.

Erum asked if there was a time cut off on which people are allowed to send in their comments before the meeting, so they are sure that they can respond to everyone.

Jennifer stated that all the comments that were submitted over the last two meetings there have been no more unique comments and have heard all of people's comments. She thinks leaving it open for people to make comments is a good idea.

9:16 – Administrative Topics

Meeting minutes from January 22, 2024, were approved.

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

9:20 – Meeting Adjourned

