



## City of Cambridge Conservation Commission

147 Hampshire Street  
Cambridge, MA 02139  
Ph. 617.349.4680

*Jennifer Letourneau, Director*

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

---

### **Public Meeting – Monday, December 14 at 7:00 PM 147 Hampshire Street, Main Conference Room MEETING MINUTES**

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

Present Commission Members: Jennifer Letourneau (Director), David Lyons (Vice Chair), Erum Sattar, Kathryn Hess, Elysse Magnotto-Cleary

Absent Commission Members: Ted Pickering, Kaki Martin, Purvi Patel (Chair)

Attendees: Marissa Valentino, BSC Group; Jacob Vance, Cabot Cabot and Forbes; Betsy Frederick, Kleinfelder; Rob Kenneally, Kleinfelder, Tracy Dwyer; Cambridge Department of Public Works, Michael Brandon; 27 Seven Pines Avenue, Larry Childs

David Lyons opened the meeting.

#### **7:00 – Notice of Intent – Continued from November 16, 2020**

Mooney Street Redevelopment  
DEP File# 123-304

Marissa Valentino from BSC Group opened the discussed the changes that they did to the plans, per the comments from Kleinfelder's review, the commission and members of the public. Marissa discussed the grading plan and the concerns about the TSS removal and the additional water quality units in Mooney Street to have the 80% removal rating in Mooney Street and Fawcett Street. Marissa also reviewed the construction phasing options that they put together. Phase one option would be to demo buildings 61, 67 and 45 and construction of buildings A and C during this phase the permanent flood storage will be built as the first phase of this project. The flood storage would be the first to be constructed before anything on Mooney Street is constructed. before construction would be begin as well as new utilities in Mooney Street, the existing buildings would be tied into the new system and stubs placed for future buildings. 13 Mooney Street and 121 Smith Place would require a temporary street stub and to maintain the sidewalk and later allow for parallel parking later in the project. Marissa pointed out that on the flood table, flood storage in buildings A and C would have a net increase at each elevation.

Option two would be to demo 61 Mooney Street and provide temporary flood storage with loom, seeding and gravel. With the demo of 61 Mooney Street they would construct that building first

and flood storage would be maintained. This location would have impervious surfaces removed to provide surface flood storage. Building B would be constructed along with Mooney Street and Fawcett Street construction. All building utilities would be tied into Mooney Street. All flood storage would be maintained at each elevation.

Phase option three, 61 Mooney Street would be demolished all impervious surfaces would be removed and regrading would happen on-site. Only the eastern half of Mooney Street would be constructed and tie-in to the existing Mooney Street, the only difference is the western half drainage would keep going to the combined sewer until the rest was building. Also, vehicular access would need to be built for access to Building F. Flood storage would be similar to option two, able to storage it at each elevation. When building A and C were built flood storage would be built in each of those buildings. Detention systems will be maintained for each building when constructed.

Kathryn Hess asked about meeting with Jennifer Letourneau to discuss construction phasing options. Marissa said she met with Jennifer and Kleinfelder they discussed all the phasing options and Jennifer and Kleinfelder emphasized the importance of maintaining flood storage throughout all phases of the project. Marissa said they agreed to provide any compensatory flood storage prior to any site work being done. Jennifer added that they would condition it that the proponents would need to come back at each phase to review with the commission what phase is being built.

Erum Sattar wanted to confirm that whatever option is chosen the commission would get a promise of retention during the construction. Also, would the rooftops be maintained at construction. Marissa explained that was they would be back to review with the commission at each phase of the project and that the rooftops would be maintained at each building; the runoff is collect and then let out into the system slowly. Erum asked what phase they thought they would start with? Marissa answered for Jacob Vance and stated they are still working on permitting with the City and once that is complete, they would have a better understanding how to phase this project. David added that they are still in permitting phase and that the Planning Board might have advice to offer on what phase is best. He said there are several ways to phase this to maintain flood storage throughout. Marissa agreed that that was correct.

Betsy Frederick from Kleinfelder had no questions, she stated she was part of the meeting with Marissa and Jennifer and that they discussed that with permitting there is room to condition this so the commission can see the phasing details. Erosion and Sediment controls would also be more defined as the project gets permitted. Betsy reviewed the memo that they wrote up to review the project with the changes that were made. Betsy Frederick and Rob Kenneally stated that the comments that were provided were more of a reference for the City. Rob stated that the information he listed would be provided at some put during the permitting process. Jennifer stated that all of this needed a construction permit and also a stormwater control permit from the City. The order of conditions will be worded that if anything in the design changes they would need to come back to the commission. Also, some of the design elements like to stormceptors that were listed are not DEP approved, so they would need to come back for approval.

David Lyons stated that everything in the commissions preview has been addressed and there are other matters but those will be addressed with permitting and conditions.

Erum wanted clarification of the Kleinfelder memo regarding the discharge to the west. She wanted to know if this will be looked at some point, whether with Jim Wilcox or during other permitting. Rob agreed there was no updates on that comment and would need to be addressed at some point. Marissa said she would be happy to provide more information with the model at the time of the stormwater permitting.

Erum also asked about the power failure with the pump systems. This was a previous comment that did seem to be addressed. Marissa stated that the systems would have back up power and be able to retain water. She said that they are also working with landscape architect to construct bio-retention or tree wells throughout Mooney Street to provide additional storage for stormwater runoff. Erum asked if the commission would get more information on the retainage. Marissa stated that in the hydro CAD there was more information on retainage and how much. They would have more information on the pumps in the future.

David had a comment that this is probably the largest project that he's ever seen come to the commission while he's been on the board. He wanted to make sure that all opportunities are being looked at. He agrees that flood storage seems to be being met, with pervious paving, bio-retention wells, tree wells. He wanted to make sure that all opportunities are being taken here. Jennifer stated that comments that they get are the stresses that would be put on Fresh Pond Reservation with the only public area for people to go to. She stated there was a general lack of green space, like a park in the development. Marissa said that the intent was areas around the buildings are going to be pervious pavers areas, but there would be large plaza areas as large public open space. The residential areas would have some green space and courtyards for the residents. Jennifer stated there is still no park, and it's a large parcel that could have a park on it.

Michael Brandon of 27 Seven Pines Avenue, clerk for the North Cambridge Stabilization Committee. He would ask that the Zoom meeting that is being recorded be posted online. He also asked the commission to post memos, comments and any materials online ahead of the meeting so the public can read through prior to the meeting. Jennifer stated that she shared the link to the materials that was shared with all the commission members prior to the meeting.

Larry Childs asked for broader awareness of the meeting. He was in a Green Cambridge meeting and they were reviewing this project.

David Lyons stated that this was the third hearing of this project and that there were many members of the public in prior meetings.

**7:40** - Public Comment was closed.

Kathryn was looking clarification on what they were voting for, would they be voting for the Notice of Intent with the conditions of coming back at each phase? Jennifer stated that there would be an order of conditions with standard construction mitigation conditioning as well as additional condition that speaks to them coming back at each phase to demonstration to the commission that they are meeting flood plain mitigation at each phase of construction.

David stated the conditions that Jennifer laid out was important to include in the O of C.

**7:45** – Re-Open Public Comment

There were new members of the public that came into the Zoom meeting and the commission agreed to reopen public comment to hear additional comments.

Elizabeth, Normandy Avenue, she stated that she was part of the original Blair Pond Master Planning process, and a member of the Highland Neighborhood group that has been meeting Cabot Cabot Forbes and she stated that there are a lot of questions that have not been answered. She wants to make sure that flood mitigation, for the Highlands and the whole area and protecting Blair Pond. She would hope that this project brings an innovative and vibrant Neighborhood and not a “dead zone” of a bunch of big buildings.

Kathryn asked if there were any questions, they asked that were in the purview of the commission. David stated that would be anything that pertained to flood storage.

Elizabeth stated that they heard assurances but no concrete studies.

Larry Childs had a question about the property adjacent to Blair Pond was referred to as “Blair Pond Recreation Area” that should be corrected that it’s part of Alewife Brook Reservation. He asked the commission to push the developer for a stronger buffer between the property and Blair Pond. With stronger swell features and influence more City policy with stronger protective arrange of requirements with developers. He thought with this project it would be a great time to look at this. David stated that this project is within three hundred feet from the pond, so it’s out of the jurisdiction of the commission. He said that some of the broader comments of what more can be done here are well taken.

Kathryn commended the proponents for the flood storage that will be created after this project is complete. She did state its hard structure and not more natural ways, but she said that they do need to be commended for all of the additional storage. She stated that the phase one option they would build all the flood storage right up front, she said there is also no assurance that they will really build all of the buildings. She said she hopes Planning Board is looking at that with the changing economy there is no assurance. Marissa stated that the intent is always to maintain flood storage, so she said if buildings A and C are not constructed, the intent would be to demo 61 Mooney Street which would offer flood storage onsite. That way if Marissa also wanted clarification on condition on coming back to the commission. She wanted to confirm this would be an update and not a separate hearing and just an update. Jennifer stated agreed that was correct, she said it would be just an administrative update on what phase of construction and what the flood storage capacities are.

Larry Childs commented on the “green swath” in the area, that the swath would be acquired by the City. If the City has plans and talking to owners to acquire the land to maintain the “green swath”.

7:59 - Closed Public Comment

**8:00** – The commission unanimously approves the Order of Conditions with special conditions that the proponent will return to the commission for an administrative update on the next phase of the project as well as an updated flood mitigation table.

**8:00 – Administrative Topic**

Meeting Minutes from November 16, 2020 were approved.

The next meeting will be January 25, 2021.

**8:07 – Meeting Adjourned**