Town of Lincoln, Massachusetts  
Community Preservation Committee  
Project Submission Form

For the FY09 funding submittals, the CPC has instituted a two-step process for submittal of applications. In order to be considered for recommendation at the March 2009 Town Meeting, preliminary “Letters of Interest” and this form must be submitted prior to September 15, 2008. Should your submittal be determined eligible for consideration, you shall be contacted regarding submittal of a detailed request information, which will be due prior to October 22, 2008.

Project Name: Pierce Park Pond Restoration

Submitted by: Thomas Gunbart  
Submission Date: 9/15/08

Address, Phone, E-mail: Conservation Dept., 259-2612, gunbart@lincolntown.org

Town Committee or Organization (if applicable): Pierce Property Committee

Brief description of the project:
Both ponds at the Pierce House need restoration to remain viable water bodies. The associated infrastructure also needs to be repaired or replaced and this includes four headwalls and two culverts.

Time frame for completion of the project:
Fall 2009

How does this project help preserve Lincoln’s character or further its mission?

Pierce Park is a town-owned resource that serves residents and visitors to Lincoln. The open water bodies are an integral component of the landscape and were designed to be part of the historic landscape. Lack of maintenance detracts from the park ambiance and is a safety hazard.

What are your funding requirements for this project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Implementation Costs</th>
<th>Maintenance Costs</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
<th>Other Funding Sources (and $ amount)</th>
<th>CPC Funds Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>AcreCom. $10,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For CPC Use:  
Received on: ___/__/___  
Received by: ____________  
Determination: ____________

Reviewed on: ___/__/___  
(see reverse side)
MEMO TO: Community Preservation Committee

FROM: Thomas Gumbart, Conservation Director

DATE: September 15, 2008

RE: Pierce Park Pond Restoration

This is a “Letter of Interest” to accompany the preliminary “Project Submission Form” for the current round of Community Preservation funding requests. There is a strong interest and need in doing restoration work on the ponds and associated infrastructure on the Pierce Park Property adjacent to the Pierce House. I am submitting this proposal on behalf of Richard Silver and the Pierce Property Committee as a placeholder. We still need to work on the scope of work and get quotes for the work; the dollar figures included on the form are a rough estimate of what it could cost.

Richard Silver and Max Mason from the Pierce House, Tim Higgins – Town Administrator, Chris Bibbo – DPW Superintendent, Peter von Mertens – Conservation Commission co-chair met this summer to discuss the need for this work. There is a consensus that the ponds and connecting culverts and headwalls need attention. Currently the pond within the driveway circle is filled in with plants and sediment, the main pond is getting shallower and murkier, the headwalls are collapsing, and the culvert connecting the ponds is no longer functional.

Restoration work will help preserve the historic integrity of the landscape at the Pierce Property, protect water quality, and eliminate the serious flooding problem that currently takes place during high water periods in the spring.
Hi John and All,

I have included Anita Scheipers on the response, the staff representative for the Capital Planning Committee. Also I have included Richard Silver for the Pierce House and Chris Bibbo, our DPW Superintendent. It needs to be noted that as the Conservation Director I am working to facilitate getting the work done over at the Pierce House ponds but it is not a Conservation Commission/Department project. It is a Pierce House/Pierce Park project on behalf of the entire Town of Lincoln. Richard Silver is the point person for the Pierce House but the field of wetlands permitting is not something he is familiar with and it makes sense for the Conservation Department to assist with this project.

1) The ponds do have conservation value independent of the Pierce House. The ponds and outlet stream are contributory surface water to Cambridge’s drinking water supply, they provide wildlife habitat and educational opportunities for local school programs, the main pond is used for the Recreation Department’s annual fishing derby, and the ponds and stream pick up a significant amount of stormwater runoff from the nearby roads and from behind the Town Offices.

2) This issue has been discussed at ConCom public meetings and there is a consensus that the drainage needs to be repaired and that the ponds do need restoration work. Specific details will need to be figured out during the permitting process.

3) I am not sure about the CPA rules but it seems to me that historic landscape restoration is an acceptable use of CPC funds.

4) The ConCom will not entertain a proposal for filling in the pond for any reason. It would be a very difficult permit to obtain, the replication in and of itself would be expensive and challenging, and it would set a bad precedent for wetlands protection locally and statewide.

5) Since it is really not a ConCom project the ConCom has not prioritized it and I am not sure about the Historical Commission, we have not been in direct communication with them about this issue. Certainly it is a serious issue for the Pierce House since there is annual flooding around the Pierce House and the threat of basement flooding (Richard will have more information about whether or not the building itself has been impacted by the flooding. Clearly the ability to hold functions has been adversely impacted by the flooding and deteriorating condition of the ponds, culverts, and headwalls.

6) I am meeting with a representative from Aquatic Control Technologies on Thursday to get some thoughts and pricing on pond restoration so hopefully by the next CPC meeting I can provide better numbers. Certainly a lot of the cost will depend on what we ultimately decide to do. I think the priority items are to remove accumulated sediments from the smaller pond within the driveway, remove the accumulated sediments from the drainage swale that drains into the main pond, and to replace the culvert and headwalls connecting the two ponds (which has totally failed). The outlet culvert and headwall work could probably be deferred but with the knowledge that it will need replacing at some point in the future. If work is not done on the main pond it will continue to get shallower and water quality will remain murky as it did this past season. Ideally everything could be done at once but I realize that may not be feasible.

7 & 8) Who will do the work still needs to be determined. Certainly the Conservation Department and Department of Public Works will assist to the extent feasible but we are constrained by the availability of staffing and the proper equipment and competing projects that also need to be accomplished. There is probably no way around the necessity of outside help. I imagine that the Conservation Department could work on cleaning out the drainage swale with our tractor and small backhoe, the DPW may be able to help with some of the cleanout within the small pond but they will likely be limited by the reach of their backhoe, and the culvert installation and headwall reconstruction should be done by independent contractors who have the skill and experience for this type of work. If it goes out to bid then it may ultimately be more cost-effective to have contractors take on the entire project.

Tom Gumbart
Tom:

The Community Preservation Committee has received your proposal for funds for the Pierce Park Pond Restoration. We would greatly appreciate it if you would provide additional information as follows:

1. Do the ponds have conservation value independent of their proximity to the Pierce House?
2. Does this proposal have support of the Conservation Commission?
3. Do you know if pond restoration, as an historic preservation, is covered by the CPA?
4. We understand that one proposal being contemplated by the Pierce House Study Committee is to fill in the second “pond” and install a permanent tent in that location. Has this proposal been vetted by the Pierce House Committee and the Pierce House Study Committee?
5. How do the Conservation Commission and the Historical Commission rate the priority of this project in the context of each Commission’s wish list, and in the context of town needs generally?
6. When do you think you will have better information on the scope of work and cost?
7. Who would perform this work?
8. Is this work that could be undertaken, in whole or in part, by the town DPW?

The next meeting of the Community Preservation Committee will be held on October 28. It would be great if you could get us your responses prior to that date. If that is not possible, we will need your responses no later than November 7, which will give us time to circulate them to all members prior to our November 11 meeting. I would prefer responses by email for easier circulation to the entire committee. If that is not possible, please mail your responses to me at home - 10 Meadowdam Road. If you have any questions about these questions, please contact me directly (259-1880). 

Yours,

John L. Koenig

*****
John,  

Sorry about the late submittal for this proposal for Public Outreach and Invasives Control. It essentially mimics the proposal from last year. At last week’s ConCom meeting it was decided to pursue this for one additional year as a CPC item. I am still waiting to get feedback on the Pierce Park Ponds from Aquatic Control Technology and SylCon Construction.

The good news is that based on the ACT’s biologist assessment he did not believe the upper pond needs treatment at this time. It really seems like the most important thing is to replace the failed culvert that connects the two ponds and excavate out the drainage swale that feeds the first pond and then do some amount of removal of material from the filled in second pond within the driveway circle. I am confident that this work could be done for less than what was originally proposed but I still do not have good estimates.

Tom Gumbart