



City of Cambridge

32.

IN CITY COUNCIL

April 22, 1996

COUNCILLOR DUEHAY
VICE MAYOR BORN
COUNCILLOR DAVIS
COUNCILLOR GALLUCCIO
COUNCILLOR SULLIVAN
COUNCILLOR TRIANTAFILLOU

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to respond in writing to the City Council with regard to the attached communication received from Paul Feloney and John Moot, regarding the new water treatment plant.

In City Council April 22, 1996

Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

Attest:- D. Margaret Drury, City Clerk.

A true copy;

ATTEST:- *D. Margaret Drury*

D. Margaret Drury
City Clerk

April 10, 1996

To: Mayor Russell, Vice Mayor Born, Councillors Davis, Duehay, Galluccio, Reeves, Sullivan, Toomey and Triantafillou.

From: Paul Feloney, 105 Fresh Pond Parkway
John Moot, 44 Coolidge Hill Road

Subject: The New Cambridge Water Treatment Plant.

This project, we believe, is the largest and most expensive project to be undertaken by Cambridge in its entire history. The project, it is estimated, will cost the people of Cambridge \$58 million dollars, plus the interest costs on the bonds.

We must be sure that we are right when we settle on the location and design of this new treatment plant. It must serve the residents of Cambridge for 50 years at least.

The present plan is to demolish the existing plant and go on MWRA water for about 2 years while a new facility is built on the same site.

Before proceeding further the City should, we believe, consider an alternative site that has been given only cursory consideration: the possibility of building the treatment plant in the area around the Stony Brook and Hobbs Brook Reservoirs. The advantages of locating the treatment plant in that area are:

- 1.- Electric power savings for every year of the life of the new plant. The treated water would flow by gravity into the Cambridge distribution system. There would no longer be the need to pump the water up to Payson Park, a very significant expense. (Payson Park Reservoirs could be kept full of water for use in emergencies including a major fire.) Savings on electricity would be realized every year.

- 2.- A saving of the \$15 million cost of purchasing MWRA water during construction. This cost is figured at \$7.5 million per year and assumes that the plant will be completed on schedule.

- 3.- The City would gain a large addition of park land, most of the area now occupied by the water treatment plant.

The one-time saving of \$15 million plus the long-term benefits of reduced electric costs and additional parkland around Fresh Pond are so significant that this site by the Stony Brook and Hobbs Brook

Reservoirs should be carefully considered. We should try very hard to find a way to site the treatment plant there.

Even if it should cost more to build at that location, the \$15 million possible saving could instead be invested in the treatment plant. Even after spending that \$15 million or some part of it, the residents of Cambridge would have lower water rates, thanks to lower annual electrical costs, and would be able to enjoy more park land around the reservoir. Kingsley Park, Lusitania Field and all the land to Neville Manor would be joined into one large park!

The possibility of siting the treatment plant at Hobbs and Stony Brook has not been carefully considered. In the report of Camp Dresser & McKee all sites in this area were discarded with this short comment.

"Areas considered but eliminated from further consideration included: Areas around Stony Brook and Hobbs Brook Reservoirs - The sites around the upland reservoirs would eliminate the storage capacity and mixing capability provided by Fresh Pond Reservoir."

The reasons given appear inadequate. No further consideration was given to the site.

If the treatment plant could be built in the Hobbs and Stony Brook Reservoirs area, it is clearly worth doing. If it takes extra time to evaluate the possibilities, to design the plant, or to secure permits, the potential benefits are so great that delaying the project is warranted. At the moment we do not know whether or not it is possible. With so much at stake, we urge the City administration to take a time out now to get the answer to this fifty-eight million dollar question.

As you know, one of us, Paul Feloney, initiated the discussion of alternate sites with his letter supporting a different site along Concord Avenue. This upland reservoir proposal combines the neighborhood benefits pointed out in that earlier letter with some substantial economic advantages.

cc: Robert Healy, City Manager
Michael Nicoloro, Managing Director of Water Department
Joseph J. Harrington, Chairman of the Water Board
Ann C. Roosevelt, Member of the Water Board
Kevin Rogers, Member of the Water Board
Jonathan L. Yeo, Member of the Water Board
The Cambridge Chronicle, Amy Miller
The Cambridge Tab, Bill Premo

Duehay

ad #2 add his name to Ord #2 please

That the Cambridge City Council takes great pleasure in congratulating Boston **Globe** writer Robert Campbell of Cambridge who has received the 1996 Pulitzer Prize for Architecture.

Duehay

32.

That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to respond in writing to the City Council with regard to the attached communication received from Paul Feloney and John Moot, *regarding* the new water treatment Plant.

April 10, 1996

To: Mayor Russell, Vice Mayor Born, Councillors Davis, Duehay, Galluccio, Reeves, Sullivan, Toomey and Triantafillou.

From: Paul Feloney, 105 Fresh Pond Parkway
John Moot, 44 Coolidge Hill Road

Subject: **The New Cambridge Water Treatment Plant.**

This project, we believe, is the largest and most expensive project to be undertaken by Cambridge in its entire history. The project, it is estimated, will cost the people of Cambridge \$58 million dollars, plus the interest costs on the bonds.

We must be sure that we are right when we settle on the location and design of this new treatment plant. It must serve the residents of Cambridge for 50 years at least.

The present plan is to demolish the existing plant and go on MWRA water for about 2 years while a new facility is built on the same site.

Before proceeding further the City should, we believe, consider an alternative site that has been given only cursory consideration: the possibility of building the treatment plant in the area around the Stony Brook and Hobbs Brook Reservoirs. The advantages of locating the treatment plant in that area are:

1.- Electric power savings for every year of the life of the new plant. The treated water would flow by gravity into the Cambridge distribution system. There would no longer be the need to pump the water up to Payson Park, a very significant expense. (Payson Park Reservoirs could be kept full of water for use in emergencies including a major fire.) Savings on electricity would be realized every year.

2.- A saving of the \$15 million cost of purchasing MWRA water during construction. This cost is figured at \$7.5 million per year and assumes that the plant will be completed on schedule.

3.- The City would gain a large addition of park land, most of the area now occupied by the water treatment plant.

The one-time saving of \$15 million plus the long-term benefits of reduced electric costs and additional parkland around Fresh Pond are so significant that this site by the Stony Brook and Hobbs Brook

Reservoirs should be carefully considered. We should try very hard to find a way to site the treatment plant there.

Even if it should cost more to build at that location, the \$15 million possible saving could instead be invested in the treatment plant. Even after spending that \$15 million or some part of it, the residents of Cambridge would have lower water rates, thanks to lower annual electrical costs, and would be able to enjoy more park land around the reservoir. Kingsley Park, Lusitania Field and all the land to Neville Manor would be joined into one large park!

The possibility of siting the treatment plant at Hobbs and Stony Brook has not been carefully considered. In the report of Camp Dresser & McKee all sites in this area were discarded with this short comment.

"Areas considered but eliminated from further consideration included: Areas around Stony Brook and Hobbs Brook Reservoirs - The sites around the upland reservoirs would eliminate the storage capacity and mixing capability provided by Fresh Pond Reservoir."

The reasons given appear inadequate. No further consideration was given to the site.

If the treatment plant could be built in the Hobbs and Stony Brook Reservoirs area, it is clearly worth doing. If it takes extra time to evaluate the possibilities, to design the plant, or to secure permits, the potential benefits are so great that delaying the project is warranted. At the moment we do not know whether or not it is possible. With so much at stake, we urge the City administration to take a time out now to get the answer to this fifty-eight million dollar question.

As you know, one of us, Paul Feloney, initiated the discussion of alternate sites with his letter supporting a different site along Concord Avenue. This upland reservoir proposal combines the neighborhood benefits pointed out in that earlier letter with some substantial economic advantages.

cc: Robert Healy, City Manager
Michael Nicoloro, Managing Director of Water Department
Joseph J. Harrington, Chairman of the Water Board
Ann C. Roosevelt, Member of the Water Board
Kevin Rogers, Member of the Water Board
Jonathan L. Yeo, Member of the Water Board
The Cambridge Chronicle, Amy Miller
The Cambridge Tab, Bill Premo



City of Cambridge

32.

IN CITY COUNCIL

April 22, 1996

COUNCILLOR DUEHAY

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to respond in writing to the City Council with regard to the attached communication received from Paul Feloney and John Moot, regarding the new water treatment plant.

Born, Davis, Galluccio, Sullivan
Consent Order #32 Triantafillon

Councillor Duehay re: Communication
received from Paul Feloney and John
Moot regarding the new water treatment
plant.

5-219

In City Council April 22, 1996

Order Adopted