



March 28, 2019

Ms. Maria Morelli
Senior Planner
Planning and Community Development Department
Town of Brookline
333 Washington Street, 3rd Floor
Brookline, MA 02445

RE: Geotechnical / Environmental Technical Review
Proposed Mixed-Use Development
1299 Beacon Street, Brookline MA

Dear Ms. Morelli:

Fuss & O'Neill has completed a review of documents associated with the proposed redevelopment of the 1299 Beacon Street property (hereafter, the Site). The materials reviewed included the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) submittals prepared by the Applicant (Brighton Allston Properties, LLC). These materials include architectural submittals, as well as a stormwater report and a geotechnical design report, prepared by Nitsch Engineering (Nitsch) and GEI Consultants (GEI), respectively. We further performed a limited review of Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) case files for nearby environmental sites.

In addition, Fuss & O'Neill's reviewers performed an inspection of the Site to observe the present site conditions.

The objective of our review was to evaluate if the proposed development of the site may pose potential risks to nearby structures, to public safety, or to the environment, so that the ZBA may consider identified risks in its permitting process. We have prepared a summary of our understanding of the conditions, including technical comments based on those site conditions, followed by construction considerations and recommendations for the ZBA to consider in its deliberations of the proposed project.

Executive Summary

Based on the materials provided for review, the Applicant proposed a four-story underground parking garage and 11-story mixed-use building with ground floor commercial spaces and upper-level residential units. Construction would involve demolition of an existing low-rise structure and excavation between two existing low-rise buildings on abutting properties. GEI's report and the

108 Myrtle Street
Suite 502
Quincy, MA
02171
t 617.282.4675
800.286.2469
f 617.481.5885

www.fando.com

California
Connecticut
Maine
Massachusetts
New Hampshire
Rhode Island
Vermont

\\private\dfs\ProjectData\P2019\0018\A10\Deliverables\Report\dcl-Peer_Review_Letter-20190328.docx
Corres.

Ms. Maria Morelli, Brookline Department of Planning and Community Development

March 28, 2019

Page 2

proposed construction activity raise technical questions which should be further evaluated prior to approval of the project. The following conditions warrant further consideration:

- **Dewatering and Groundwater Management:** The foundation construction will require dewatering and control of groundwater. Groundwater infiltration may pose challenges to construction due to the presence of sandy soils (which can be relatively permeable) and the inconsistent presence of clay lenses (which can inhibit groundwater flow). Furthermore, the effluent flow from dewatering would likely be discharged to municipal infrastructure and further evaluation is warranted to confirm that the system is capable of handling the flows and volume. The extent to which dewatering would affect surrounding properties, including impacts to soil loads and entrainment and mobilization of potential groundwater contaminants from off-site disposal sites, should also be evaluated.
- **Foundation Waterproofing:** The foundation system is proposed with a waterproof exterior membrane. The geotechnical report recommends a temporary earth retention system (e.g. slurry walls or drilled secant pile walls) ultimately integrated into the permanent foundation walls. The Applicant should address the potential conflict between waterproofing the exterior of the foundation and use of a drilled earth retention system that is designed to be incorporated into the permanent building foundation walls.
- **Building Loads and Design Parameters:** GEI recommended an allowable bearing capacity for a reinforced mat foundation or spread footings, and stated that the proposed building loads would be less than the weight of soil excavated for the foundation system. Supporting information on the magnitude of the building loads was not provided and therefore Fuss & O'Neill could not confirm that the bearing capacity was sufficient to support the building. The Applicant further recommends a friction coefficient assuming that the spread footings would bear directly on a rough concrete mud mat surface. The Applicant should identify where membrane waterproofing would be situated for the spread footing alternative and adjust the recommended friction coefficient if necessary. We further note that design changes relating to building height and massing have been proposed by the Applicant subsequent to the provision of the aforementioned building load information. The extent to which those design changes have been considered in the loading evaluation is not clear.
- **Abutting Property Impacts:** The proposed excavation would extend to depths exceeding 40 feet below grade and occupy effectively the entire property, leaving virtually no buffer area between the excavation and neighboring properties and structures. The geotechnical report recommends the use of either slurry walls or drilled secant pile walls, meaning the use of vertical walls to the full depth of construction along the property line. Construction activities have the potential to modify soil stresses on and near the site due to

Ms. Maria Morelli, Brookline Department of Planning and Community Development

March 28, 2019

Page 3

changes in groundwater elevations from dewatering, and changes in building loads. The Applicant should address how the integrity of neighboring properties and structures, as well as the integrity of abutting public rights-of-way, will be protected.

- **Soil Management:** Excavation for the proposed foundation cavity will generate approximately 25,000 cubic yards of soil for off-property disposal. Disposal may generate approximately 1,000 truck trips and construction conditions should be evaluated with regard to traffic, noise, and related issues. Furthermore, environmental characterization data of soil was not provided. Given the urban setting of the site and the identification of a fill horizon in the subsurface of the site, the soil quality should be evaluated with enough lead time to identify and permit appropriate management strategies prior to excavation.

Additional detail on these topics is included in the sections below.

Proposed Development Conditions

Based on the materials provided for review, the site is proposed for redevelopment as an 11-story building, consisting of ground-level mixed-use and upper-story residential occupancy. The existing site slopes down gradually from the north to the south, from approximately elevation 57 to 54 feet. The building would be constructed on a four-story underground parking garage extended to a maximum depth of approximately 40 feet below existing ground level (approximately elevation 10 to 15).

Construction is proposed to involve demolition of an existing low-rise (one to two-story) brick building and then excavation. The underground garage would occupy the entirety of the property and extend to the full depth of excavation. The proposed earth retention system is recommended to be incorporated into the permanent foundation walls for the building. Due to its depth beneath the existing groundwater table, the foundation is recommended to be waterproofed and to approximately elevation 40 (i.e. 15 feet below ground surface), and damp-proofed above.

The southern (Sewall Avenue) frontage would feature an entry plaza and setback from the street, and the building footprint would be smaller in upper levels. The northern frontage on Beacon Street would be set along the existing streetscape with minimal setbacks.

Existing Explorations and Documentation

The Applicant's consultant, GEI, provided a geotechnical report for review. GEI prepared geotechnical design recommendations based on a field program performed in December 2018. The field program involved the performance of five test borings and installation of one monitoring well in the current parking areas on the southern side of the property. GEI documented the presence of

Ms. Maria Morelli, Brookline Department of Planning and Community Development

March 28, 2019

Page 4

a horizon of fill material between 10 and 22 feet thick on the property, over horizons of sand, silt and clay that may or may not be continuous.

Four of the borings extended to 51 feet below ground surface. Two of these borings terminated in lean clay, while the other two terminated in soil identified as silty sand. GEI identified the groundwater table at a depth of approximately 20 to 26 feet below ground surface. GEI indicated that the depth of groundwater varied within the monitoring interval (December 12 to 27, 2018), and recommended an evaluation of seasonal variation. Waterproofing recommendations were benchmarked to elevations higher than the measured groundwater elevations.

As construction practices, GEI recommended that the selected earth retention system be designed to act as a ground water cut off by extending the bottom of the earth retention system into a restrictive contiguous soil horizon (i.e. clay or bedrock). The foundation area would be dewatered and excavated to finished depth. During construction, internal bracing of the shoring system is anticipated due to the depth of the excavation. The building foundation was proposed as a waterproofed mat slab, with foundation walls waterproofed to approximately 15 feet below ground surface (five to ten feet above the observed water table). GEI recommended installation of temporary observation wells to monitor the groundwater levels outside of the foundation on adjacent properties during construction.

In reviewing GEI's report, we have identified the following technical questions and considerations:

- **Building Loads Information:** GEI indicated that the building could bear on the underlying sand and clay and recommended an allowable bearing pressure of 3 kips per square foot (KSF), and stated that total settlement would be expected to not exceed one inch. A bearing capacity and settlement analysis was not provided.
 - a. The bearing capacity was presumed to be adequate because the building would weigh less than the displaced soil. No building loads or bearing capacity assessments were included with the application to validate this assumption. The bearing capacity should be evaluated against the proposed building loads once the building configuration and associated loads have been identified.
 - b. In addition, portions of the site design have evolved to address comments on the streetscape, resulting in changes to building massing and with potential impacts to the resulting loads. The extent to which those design changes were coordinated with the geotechnical recommendations was not clear.
 - c. Since the proposed building loads are anticipated to be less than the existing soil weight at the proposed depth of the bottom of the footings, the geotechnical engineer should address the potential for displacement as a result of soil swelling due to unloading rather than consolidation settlement.

Ms. Maria Morelli, Brookline Department of Planning and Community Development

March 28, 2019

Page 5

- **Waterproofing Method Clarification:** The dewatering concept recommends exterior waterproofing on portions of the vertical walls, and indicates that the shoring system (i.e. the slurry walls or drilled secant pile walls) can be incorporated into the permanent foundation walls. The method to install the exterior waterproofing under this scenario should be clarified.
- **Additional Boring Coverage:** The geotechnical assessment was performed in accessible areas of the site, namely the rear (south) parking lot. The area occupied by the building was not explored. We recommend that if the project is approved, additional borings be performed in the existing building footprint following building demolition, to confirm the assumed subsurface conditions beneath the building are consistent with those under the parking lot.
- **Dewatering:** Two of the four deep soil borings extended into a silty sand horizon. The proposed excavation would pass the shallow groundwater table, and dewatering would be required. Deeper exploration would be necessary to ensure that a contiguous impervious horizon can be used to isolate the work from infiltration during construction which may reduce the potential for continuous construction dewatering. GEI noted that dewatering would be warranted, but did not comment on the potential groundwater yield or associated dewatering requirements. Therefore Fuss & O'Neill could not confirm that the dewatering and management of groundwater is feasible.
- **Off-property Access:** Temporary observation wells are recommended to be installed outside of the proposed excavation area on adjacent private property or the public right of way, and would require additional outside coordination.
- **Excavation Method Details:** The proposed excavation depth of greater than 40 feet below grade relative to the site dimensions would limit the potential for a ramped access to the bottom of the excavation. The proposed methods for excavating and loading out soil from that depth should be identified, and the anticipated level of off-site impact (laydown and staging areas, use of public roads, etc.) should be documented for the ZBA's review. Depending on the methods selected, impacts to neighboring properties and public ways should be evaluated.

Additional information is warranted to evaluate these conditions.

Environmental Assessment (21E) Documents

No environmental site assessments were provided for Fuss & O'Neill's review as part of this process. Fuss & O'Neill reviewed publicly available environmental case files for the vicinity of the

Ms. Maria Morelli, Brookline Department of Planning and Community Development

March 28, 2019

Page 6

site, maintained by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP). The 1299 Beacon Street property was not, itself, identified as a "disposal site" in the context of the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (310 CMR 40.0000 and MGL 21E). Release tracking numbers (RTNs, MassDEP case files) were identified for nearby properties and are summarized briefly below:

- 11 Longwood Avenue, RTN 3-3675 – Mike's Texaco. Petroleum contamination related to a former gasoline filling station was closed via a Class A3 Response Action Outcome (RAO) and Activity and Use Limitation (AUL) in 1999. Light non-aqueous phase liquid (LNAPL, petroleum product) was reportedly present at the time of the AUL filing, and the AUL prohibited uses which would allow site occupants to come into contact with soil and groundwater in the proximity of the groundwater table.
- 30 Longwood Avenue at Sewall Avenue, RTN 3-15954: located immediately south of the 1299 Beacon Street property, a release of benzene affecting groundwater was identified in the late 1990s. In 1999, IES, Inc. (IES) submitted a Class B Response Action Outcome (RAO) reporting that the condition originated from Mike's Texaco at 11 Longwood Avenue, but that the release posed No Significant Risk. At the time of closure, benzene and petroleum hydrocarbons were detected in multiple groundwater samples.
- 1285 Beacon Street, RTNs 3-2048 and 3-30852: A gasoline filling station was historically located approximately 200 feet northeast of the 1299 Beacon Street property and releases of petroleum were identified in the 1980s in connection with historical fuel storage and distribution practices. Between 2006 and 2007, petroleum-contaminated soil was removed to a depth of approximately 25 feet below grade during site construction and a Class A2 RAO was provided for the primary release. In 2012 and 2013, a Utility-Related Abatement Measure (URAM) was performed to replace drain lines in Beacon Street, and to manage petroleum-contaminated soil derived from 1285 Beacon Street.

Generally, the nearby environmental releases are inactive, having achieved regulatory status of "No Significant Risk" pursuant to the Massachusetts regulations. For several sites, those findings are predicated on AULs and relate to (at the time of filing) ongoing or foreseeable conditions. A longstanding dewatering project which lowers the groundwater table significantly may have the potential to draw groundwater flow toward the project site. An evaluation of construction dewatering should include an evaluation of the zone of influence and whether the proposed activity may draw potentially contaminated groundwater toward the project site.

Furthermore, while 1299 Beacon Street is not a listed disposal site, it is located within a densely urbanized area and a horizon of fill material, ranging from 10 to 22 feet thick, was identified in the geotechnical borings. Given the large volume of soil proposed for excavation and off-site disposal

Ms. Maria Morelli, Brookline Department of Planning and Community Development

March 28, 2019

Page 7

(as noted below), construction-phase fill management strategies should be developed, with consideration for potential "urban fill" conditions, and appropriate off-site locations should be identified.

Soil and groundwater generated from the site may have the potential to contain contaminants. Due to the absence of environmental soil and groundwater quality from the site the presence, nature and magnitude of potential contaminants is not documented. If management of contaminated soil or groundwater is required at the site, these activities may require regulatory permitting and coordination which could pose unanticipated delays to the project schedule if not completed prior to construction. The applicant should propose a strategy to manage the potential impacts to the construction schedule for soil and groundwater management and the potential for complications from environmental conditions.

External Construction Impacts

In consideration of the potential construction, we have identified the following:

- Prolonged construction dewatering could lower the groundwater table on adjacent properties during and for some time following parking garage construction, and could affect the soil stress profiles on adjacent foundations. GEI recommended installing off-property monitoring wells to evaluate changes to groundwater levels during the project. Those wells would be installed on properties owned by other parties, potentially including the Town. Town-owned properties would include roadways and warrant additional coordination (e.g. street opening permits).
- Dewatering effluent would be discharged to the municipal storm infrastructure. The stormwater report, prepared by Nitsch Engineering, indicates that the storm infrastructure is located in Sewall Avenue, exclusively. Neither report evaluated dewatering flows or quantities, nor identified the capacity of the storm infrastructure.
- Excavation to the dimensions indicated on the proposed plans (i.e. 40 feet deep, 18,000 square feet) would generate approximately 25,000 cubic yards of soil for off-site disposal. Removal of that soil may generate approximately 1,000 truck trips of roughly 25 cubic yards or approximately 30 tons per truck, to and from the site during construction. The Applicant should provide some level of detail regarding traffic management during soil excavation, specifically addressing potential queueing, noise and similar issues.

Additional information is warranted to evaluate these conditions.



Ms. Maria Morelli, Brookline Department of Planning and Community Development

March 28, 2019

Page 8

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on our review of the materials provided by the Applicant's design team, we have identified the following conditions which warrant additional evaluation:

- Construction-phase dewatering should be quantified, and evaluated as it pertains to the following issues:
 - Hydraulic loading to municipal infrastructure
 - Stresses on nearby foundations
 - Environmental quality of pumped groundwater
 - Zone of influence and potential contaminant migration from off-site releases
- Excavation and construction-phase soil management should be evaluated regarding the following conditions:
 - Means and methods to achieve the excavation depth,
 - Impacts (property use, access requirements) to surrounding areas.
 - Evaluation of soil quality and selection of appropriate disposal locations
 - Traffic and public safety impacts related to large-volume soil management
- Additional information should be provided relative to building loads and the evaluation of bearing capacity, settlement and related conditions.

Please feel free to contact the undersigned with questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Daniel LaFrance, PE, LSP
Project Manager

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'John A. Chambers'.

John Chambers, PG, LSP
Senior Vice President