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Appendix 1: East Boston History

Source: Exploring Boston's Neighborhoods, Boston Landmarks Commission

Five islands in Boston Harbor, connected and extended by over 150 years of filling operations, make up the neighborhood of East Boston. Development of the area for homes and businesses began in the 1830s under the direction of the East Boston Company, making this community one of the city's few neighborhoods created with a formal urban plan. East Boston's harbor location enabled it to become a center for shipbuilding and other marine industries, and some of America's most famous clipper ships were built here.

LINKING THE ISLANDS

For Boston's first 200 years, the five islands that now make up East Boston were mostly privately owned and used for farming, grazing livestock, and military fortifications. Noddle's Island and Hog (or Breed's) Island, the two largest of the group, form the basis of the current residential and commercial sections of East Boston. The three smaller islands-Governor's Apple, and Bird-have been incorporated into Logan Airport.

PLANNING A NEW NEIGHBORHOOD

In 1833, General William H. Sumner, the owner of Noddle's Island, formed the East Boston Company to oversee the residential and commercial development of East Boston. The company shaped the neighborhood for nearly a century until it disbanded in 1928. The developers had a planned community in mind, with a grid of straight streets and square to provide open space. The original plan divided Noddle's Island into three sections, today's Jeffries Point, Maverick and Central Squares, and Eagle Hill. The hilly terrain of the Orient Heights are (on the former Hog Island) prevented the company from extending the strict grid-like pattern there.

Believing that reliable transportation would be essential to the neighborhood's accessibility, the East Boston Company in 1833 established steam ferry service from Maverick Square to Rowe's Wharf in downtown Boston. The developers also planned for the community to contain a mix of homes, maritime and other industries, and recreational facilities.

CLIPPER SHIP DAYS

East Boston began to grow and prosper as a shipbuilding center virtually as soon as the neighborhood's first ship was launched in 1839. Shipbuilding and servicing industries came to line East Boston's waterfront, helping make Boston one of the leading ports in the country. East Boston was home to the Border Street shipyard of Donald McKay, the designer of noted clipper ships, including the world-famous Flying Cloud, which broke the established record for a voyage around Cape Horn. Many other shipyards, wharves, and warehouses lined the waterfront, and around 1840, East Boston became the Boston terminal for the London-based Cunard line. Even after the age of wooden sailing ships passed, East Boston remained a center for shipping and marine repair. There was also a diversified base of non-marine industry producing everything from paint to pottery.

IMMIGRATION AND DIVERSITY

As an arrival point with many employment opportunities, the neighborhood grew rapidly during the age of large-scale immigration. East Boston's immigrants came in waves—Canadians in the 1840s and Irish in the 1850s. Russian and Eastern European Jewish immigrants began to arrive in the 1890s, and in the first years of the 20th century the neighborhood had what may have been the largest Jewish community in New England.

Also at the turn of the century, Italian immigrants began to settle in East Boston, becoming the major ethnic group in the neighborhood by 1915. Today, East Boston continues this long tradition of diversity.

NEW HOUSING NEEDS

The influx of immigrants to East Boston between the Civil War and World War I created a need for multi-family housing. Many single-family houses were subdivided, and tenements were constructed in the older
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parts of the neighborhood. The brick apartment buildings in the six-block area between Porter and Maverick streets date to this period of expansion.

By the 1880s, the development of Orient Heights had begun on the former Hog or Breed's Island. This area and nearby Harbor View contain many examples of the Colonial Revival and related styles that recall the buildings of 18-century America.

The growing importance of automobiles created demand for easier access to and from Boston by car. The Sumner Tunnel, Boston Harbor's first auto crossing was completed in 1934, followed by the Callahan Tunnel in 1961. The Third Harbor Tunnel, scheduled to open in 1955, will link East Boston with the Massachusetts Turnpike and South Boston.

Commercial air travel is the most recent transportation technology to have had an impact on East Boston. The original airfield opened in 1923 on the filled flats of Jeffries Point, and passenger service began in 1929. Landfill on Governor's and Apple islands expanded the airport to 2,000 acres in 1948, and in 1966 Wood Island Park was given over for additional runway space. The airport operated under various city and state jurisdictions until the Massachusetts Port Authority was formed in 1959. Now named Gen Edward Lawrence Logan International Airport, the facility is one of the earliest municipal airports in the country and its original General Aviation Administration Building (1927) is still in use, although greatly altered.

RESORTS AND RECREATION

At the time the East Boston Company was formed, both Chelsea and Nahant were popular resort areas, and the developers saw the same potential for East Boston. Their idea paid off when the 80-room Maverick House Hotel in Maverick Square began attracting visitors as soon as it opened its doors in 1835. Maverick House was the first of several hotel buildings on this site to serve vacationers and travelers transferring from ships and trains.

The tradition of recreation has continued in a variety of ways. Incorporated in 1879, Jeffries Point Yacht Club was the first chartered yacht club on the East Coast. In the 1890s, the city established a major recreational development in East Boston. Now, only the large trees shading Neptune Road recall the entrance to Wood Island Park (later known as World War Memorial Park). Designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, the landscape architect responsible for Boston's park system, Wood Island Park covered 46 acres. Its many facilities-men's and women's open air gyms and running tracks, playgrounds, grandstand, field house and bath house-attracted 43,000 visitors in 1895. Unfortunately, Wood Island Park was taken by airport expansion in 1966.

Source: City of Boston Landmarks Commission
Appendix 2: Project Memorandum of Understanding  

Property Re-Use Feasibility Analysis  
Amerada Hess Corporation  

Memorandum of Understanding between CLF Services, Neighborhood of Affordable Housing, and The Watershed Institute  

December 1, 2000  

Purpose and Goals  
The parties to this Memorandum of Understanding have agreed to work together to produce a report regarding the potential re-use of the Amerada Hess Corporation's terminal property in East Boston. Currently, CLF Services (CLFS) has entered into a contract with the Hess Corporation to produce a report that analyzes the potential redevelopment opportunities at the site. By design, this report will include broad stakeholder participation. CLFS, has, in turn, asked both Neighborhood of Affordable Housing (NOAH) and the Watershed Institute (WSI) to complete discrete portions of this report, as outlined below.  

Roles and Responsibilities  
The Watershed Institute  
The Watershed Institute will produce the section of the report that analyzes the legal and regulatory constraints on redevelopment of the property. This analysis will include an analysis of the current zoning of the property, the effect of Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 91 on the property, as well as the effect of Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 21e (the state hazardous waste law). The legal and regulatory analysis will include all topics reflected in The Watershed Institute's Scope of Work for this project, which is incorporated herein by reference. The Watershed Institute will be paid six thousand dollars ($6000) upon the satisfactory completion of this work.  

Timeline: 2 months  

Neighborhood of Affordable Housing  
NOAH shares with CLFS primary responsibility for the Community Outreach and Visioning components of the project. Specifically, NOAH will:  

- **Prepare and maintain outreach list**  
  NOAH will compile and prioritize a stakeholders/contacts list comprised of: East Boston-Chelsea Creek Action Group participants, residential and business abutters, East Boston community-based organizations, key community leaders, City and State elected and public officials, and members of the press. The resulting list (Hess Site outreach list) will number approximately 200 - 300 individual and organizational contacts.  
  Timeline: 2 weeks  

- **Provide outreach**  
  NOAH will prepare (with CLFS and WSI) and mail an initial brief outreach item (letter or flier or postcard; bilingual) and mail out to Hess Site outreach list (postage split between CLFS and NOAH). This item will provide a very brief explanation of the process and an invitation to participate in the planning and implementation of the rest of the process and/or to offer initial reaction and opinion. A more detailed outreach item (prepared by CLFS with NOAH and WSI review) including but not limited to site information and history and a brief outline of the proposed process will be provided to public officials, organizations, individuals that request it. These outreach items should identify EB-CCAG / NOAH as the main contact organization and also list CLFS and WSI.
NOAH will design and place announcements (jointly with CLFS; content similar to above; advertising fees split between CLFS and NOAH) in the East Boston Transcript and the East Boston Independent.

NOAH will design a standardized intake form (jointly with CLFS) in order to record input from persons/organizations.

NOAH and CLF will jointly arrange and conduct introductory meetings with City and State elected and public officials, members of the press, representatives of East Boston community-based organizations and other key community leaders; and will jointly record the input from that outreach.

NOAH will conduct targeted telephone and door-knocking outreach to the remainder of the Hess Site outreach list and will jointly record the input from that outreach.

Timeline: 2 months

- **Jointly Organize and Facilitate Community Workshops**
  NOAH will take a lead role in organizing and publicizing two or more Community Workshops. Sophisticated exercises and facilitation at these workshops, provided by CLFS and NOAH, will result in a prioritized list of acceptable land uses and related guidelines (design, height, density, siting, streetscape, infrastructure, etc).
  Timeline: 2 months

- **Promote continued involvement**
  NOAH / EB-CCAG will organize for continued involvement of the participating people/organizations in the subsequent stages of the Hess Site Re-Use Project.

NOAH will be paid four thousand, eight hundred dollars upon completion of this work ($4,800).

**CLF Services**

For the work under this MOU, CLF Services (CLFS) will act as the prime contact with Amerada Hess Corporation (AHC). Any substantive communication with AHC by CLFS will be reviewed by the Watershed Institute, NOAH and CLFS prior to said communication taking place.

Working with NOAH and WSI, CLFS will compile the report. Full credit will be given to NOAH, WSI and CLFS. CLFS will most likely subcontract the Market Analysis section of this effort to an as-yet unnamed contractor. CLFS will also share responsibility for the organization and facilitation of the community meetings that are scheduled for spring 2001.

CLFS shall, as soon as reasonably practicable, submit to AHC requests for prompt payment to it of all amounts properly due to WSI and NOAH under this MOU, but shall have no obligation to pay any such amount to WSI or NOAH unless and until such amount has been paid to it by AHC.

The parties to this Memorandum of Understanding agree that the goal of this project is to create a document that the owner or potential developer of the property can use to make informed redevelopment decisions. Community input is key to the success of this project. Further, the parties recognize that Neighborhood of Affordable Housing and The Watershed Institute remain free to advocate independently for an appropriate end use of the property. All lists, outreach material, contacts with stakeholders, and contacts with press will be reviewed in advance and shared by all parties to this MOU.

Agreed to this 1st day of December, 2000.
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Conservation Law Foundation Services, Inc.
By:

Jim Hamilton

Neighborhood of Affordable Housing
By:

Phil Giffee

The Watershed Institute, Inc.
By:

Aaron Toffler
Hess Site Fact Sheet

This Fact Sheet provides some background information regarding the Hess Site and the Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project. The organizations involved in the Planning Project are: East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group, Neighborhood of Affordable Housing (NOAH), CLF Ventures (affiliated with Conservation Law Foundation), and the Watershed Institute. The Planning Project is supported and funded by the Hess Corporation.

The Site

The Hess Site is an 8.34-acre peninsula of vacant land located on Condor Street and owned by the Amerada Hess Corporation. The site is bordered by the Chelsea River to the north, by the Chelsea River and by wetlands to the east, by Condor Street to the south, and by an adjacent industrial property and the Chelsea River to the west. The property includes a small vacant lot across Condor Street to the south. The property is zoned “Industrial” and is subject to a complex set of waterfront regulations including Chapter 91 (a state waterfront law) and Designated Port Area zoning (see below).

Since the 1930s the property has served as a bulk oil storage facility of varying capacities. The above ground storage tanks and associated infrastructure were used primarily in the storage of fuel oil and gasoline. In 1979 all materials in ten existing tanks were removed. The tanks themselves were removed in 1998. The Hess tanks were an eyesore, a source of contamination for the river and had been empty for 19 years. Hess’ decision to remove them was in direct response to community demands for a cleaner, more attractive environment.

Hess has undertaken an environmental clean-up of the site as mandated by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MADEP). NOAH and EB-CCAG, with the help of an environmental consultant, are monitoring the clean-up.

Regulations

The Hess Site is subject to a complex set of waterfront regulations including: City of Boston Zoning Code (the Site is in a Maritime Economy Reserve Subdistrict); Massachusetts Law Chapter 91 (a law regulating tidal shore areas); Designated Port Area (as established by the State of Massachusetts); and Massachusetts Law Chapter 21E (clean-up of environmental contamination). A complete regulatory analysis of the Site and a shorter summary of that analysis are available. Contact NOAH at the number below.

The Planning Project

In the Fall of 2000, the Hess Corporation agreed to support a community-based planning project for the site. The Project is organized and conducted by the organizations listed above. The Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project is a community process in which neighborhood residents and others can plan a future for the site that serves the neighborhood as well as the Hess Corporation or any buyer of the site. The activities of the Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project are/will be to:

- Reach out to all residents, business owners, and others and get their opinion regarding the future of the site.
- Study and report on all the regulations that apply to future development of the site.
- Study and report on the “market conditions” that will affect any future development of the site.
- Conduct public information meetings where everyone can learn more details about the site.
- Conduct planning exercises in which neighborhood residents and others can come up with agreed upon guidelines for development of the site. Such guidelines would include land use recommendations. These recommendations would include the types of land use that would be
acceptable, acceptable with certain conditions, or not acceptable. They may also specify building guidelines (if anything to be built is acceptable) like height, size, and design.

- Produce a report detailing all of the above and present it to the Hess Corporation. This report will represent the expectations that the community will have regarding the redevelopment of the site.

After the report is submitted to Hess, the community can continue to take a role in promoting redevelopment of the site that is consistent with the guidelines created during the Planning Project.

3/22/01

For more information, contact:
Matt Henzy
NOAH, 22 Paris Street, East Boston, MA 02128
(617) 569-0059 x17  matt.henzv@noahcdc.org
What do you think... About the future of the Hess oil tank

- What would you like to see or not see there?
- Do you want new development there? What kind?
Please contact us with your opinions.
Watch for community meetings in early 2001.

East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group (EBCCAG) and others have been working to get Hess to clean up the long-vacant site between Concord Street and the Chelsea River. Hess removed the oil tanks in 1996. Now, Hess is supporting a community planning process to determine redevelopment options for the site. Redevelopment means creating a new use on land that is vacant or underused. This process will be coordinated by East End Coalition, Neighborhood of Affordable Housing (NOA), CLF Services branch of The Common Wealth Law Foundation, and the Waterfront Institute. Together, our organizations are reaching out over the next few months and getting input from community members. We need your opinions and your help to create a redevelopment plan that reflects the interests and needs of the community and all stakeholders.

We can provide more detailed information about the site. To offer your opinions, to arrange a meeting, or for more information, please contact:
Matt Henry
NOAH, 35 Paris Street, East Boston, MA 02128
Phone: 617-506-4177, Fax: 617-506-2007
Email: mhenry@noahbc.org

Que piensas tú... Acerca del futuro del Hess Site?

- ¿Que te gustaría ver o no ver allí?
- ¿Requieres un nuevo desarrollo allí? ¿Qué clase?
Por favor informenos sobre tu opiniones.
Mira por reuniones comunitarias a principios del 2001.

East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group (EBCCAG) y otros han estado trabajando con Hess para empezar a limpiar el sitio vacío entre la Concord Street y el Chelsea River. Hess retiró tanques de aceite en 1996. Ahora, Hess está planeando un proceso de planificación comunitaria para determinar opciones de nuevo desarrollo para ese sitio. Este proceso será coordinado por EBCCAG, Neighborhood of Affordable Housing (NOA), CLF Ventures, parte de Conservation Law Foundation y el WATERFRONT INSTITUTE. Juntos, nuestras organizaciones estarán aprendiendo y escuchando opiniones y sugerencias sobre el sitio. A principios del próximo año, nos pondremos en contacto con nuestros lectores y les daremos más información sobre el sitio. Para proponer ideas y opiniones, escuchar más y participar de la planificación de nuevo desarrollo, escúchame por nuestras reuniones comunitarias a principios del 2001.

Nosotros podemos brindarte información más detallada acerca del sitio de Hess y áreas del proyecto de planificación. Para dar tu opinión, o para más información, por favor póngase en contacto:
Matt Henry
NOAH, 35 Paris Street, East Boston, MA 02128
Phone: 617-506-4177, Fax: 617-506-2007
Email: mhenry@noahbc.org
Hess Site Planning

Come to this series of three meetings and help create a plan for the Hess Site...

- Do you want the Hess Site to continue in maritime use?
- If not, what kind of development would be best?

Meeting 1: Hess Site Background and Information
Wednesday, April 18, 2001
6:30 pm
East Boston High School, 86 White Street
Refreshments, childcare, and Spanish translation provided.

Meeting 2: Create a Plan for the Hess Site
Saturday, May 5, 2001 10:00am - 2:00pm (lunch included)

Meeting 3: Ready, Check: Evaluate the Hess Site Plan
Wednesday, May 23, 2001 6:30 pm
Both meetings at East Boston High School

Please see the "Hess Site Fact Sheet" for more information or contact us at:
NOAH, 22 Paris Street, East Boston, MA 02128
Matt Heney: 669-0099 x37; matt.heney@noahdc.org
Stacey Chancellor: 569-0099 x33; stacey.chancellor@noahdc.org

Published March 30, 2001 Español en la página 40

CLF
Ventures, Inc.
The Watershed Institute

NOAH
Ventures, Inc.
The Watershed Institute

CLF
Ventures, Inc.
The Watershed Institute

Planeación del Hess Site

Venga a esta serie de tres reuniones y ayúde a crear un plan para el Hess Site...

¿Le gustaría que el Hess Site continue siendo de uso marítimo?
¿Si no, que tipo de desarrollo le gustaría más?

1era Reunión: Información sobre el Hess Site
miércoles, 18 abril, 2001
6:30 pm
East Boston High School, 86 White Street
Refrescos, cuidado de niños, y traducción en español será proveido.

2da Reunión: Creación de un Plan de Hess Site
sábado, 5 mayo, 2001
10:00am - 2:00pm (almuerzo incluido)

3ra Reunión: Evaluación del Plan del Hess Site
miércoles, 23 mayo, 2001 6:30 pm
Ambas reuniones en East Boston High School

Para más información, vea la "Lista de Hechos del Hess Site"
Aprovechar en contacto:
NOAH, 22 Paris Street, East Boston, MA 02128
Matt Heney: 669-0099 x37; matt.heney@noahdc.org
Stacey Chancellor: 569-0099 x33; stacey.chancellor@noahdc.org

Impreso el 30 de marzo, 2001 English on the other side
Hess Site Planning
Come give your opinion and help create a plan for the Hess Site...

Meeting 2: Create a Re-Use Plan
Saturday, May 5, 2001
10:00 am - 2:00 pm
East Boston High School, 86 White Street

- LUNCH PROVIDED.
- Please call us (numbers below) by May 3 to reserve childcare or translation services (Spanish).
- With the help of facilitators and planning exercises, we will decide which land uses are acceptable, acceptable with conditions, or not acceptable.

Meeting 1 (April 18) was full of background information about the site. It is important that everyone is familiar with this information. Contact us (see below) to get the information package mailed to you.

Meeting 3: Reality Check: Evaluate the Hess Site Plan
Wednesday, May 23, 2001
6:30 pm at East Boston High School

For more information contact us at:
NOAH, 22 Paris Street, East Boston, MA 02128
Matt Henry: 617-969-0099 x17; mthe@noahcd.org
Stacey Checchi: 617-969-0099 x13; stacey.chech@noahcd.org

Published April 26, 2001

Planeación del Hess Site
Venga a dar su opinión y ayúden a crear un plan para el Hess Site...

2nda Reunión: Creación de un Plan de Hess Site
sábado, 5 mayo, 2001
10:00 am—2:00 pm
East Boston High School, 86 White Street

- Amerizo será proveído
- Por favor llámenos (a los números abajo) para reservar niño/a o servicios de traducción en español
- Con la ayuda de facilitadores y ejercicios de planeación, decidiremos que usos de la tierra no son aceptables o que es aceptable con ciertas condiciones

La 1era reunión (18 abril) fue lleno de información sobre el Hess Site. Es muy importante que todos estén familiarizados con esta información. Contáctenos si quiere recibir por correo un paquete con información (solamente disponible en inglés).

3er Reunión: Evaluación del Plan del Hess Site
miércoles, 23 mayo, 2001
6:30 pm en East Boston High

Para más información póngase en contacto con:
NOAH, 22 Paris Street, East Boston, MA 02128
Matt Henry: 568-0099 x27; mhenry@noahcd.org
Stacey Checchi: 569-0099 x13; stacey.chech@noahcd.org

Published April 26, 2001

The Watershed Institute
Hess Site Planning
Review the community plan for this former oil tank complex on Condor Street

Meeting 3:
The Community's Plan
Wednesday, May 23, 2001
6:30 pm
East Boston High School,
86 White Street

• Regulatory and market review of the Plan.
• The Hess Corporation has been invited.
• Please call us (numbers below) by May 22 to reserve childcare or translation service
  (Spanish).

For more information contact us at:
NOAH, 22 Pans Street, East Boston, MA 02128
Matt Henry: 617-569-0059 x17; matt.henry@noahadc.org
Stacey Chacker: 617-569-0059 x13; stacey.chacker@noahadc.org
Published May 16, 2001
English other side

Planeación del Hess Site
Analice el plan de la comunidad para este terreno vacío en la Condor Street

3ra Reunión:
El Plan de la Comunidad
miércoles, mayo 23, 2001
6:30 pm
East Boston High School,
86 White Street

• Un análisis de reglamentaciones y mercado del plan.
• La corporación Hess ha sido invitada.
• Por favor llámenos (a los números de abajo) antes del 22 de mayo para reservar niñera o servicios de traducción en español.

El Hess Site es una parada de 8.3 acres en un terreno desocupado, localizado en Condor Street, a la orilla del Chavey Creek, propiedad de la Amende Hess Corporation.

El proyecto de planeación del Hess Site es un proceso de la comunidad en el cual los residentes y otros pueden ayudar a planear el futuro del sitio. Sus opiniones sonaj de el sitio sonlesadas.

El proceso está coordinado por EBCOG, Neighborhood of Affordable Housing (NOAH), CLF Ventures (un parte del Conservation Law Foundation), y el Watershed Institute; y es soportado y financiado por Amende Hess Corporation.

Para más información contáctenos:
NOAH, 22 Pans Street, East Boston, MA 02128
Matt Henry: 617-569-0059 x17; matt.henry@noahadc.org
Stacey Chacker: 617-569-0059 x13; stacey.chacker@noahadc.org

Estricto mayo 16, 2001
English other side

The Watershed Institute
Appendix 5: Regulatory Analysis Summary

Hess Property
146-172 Condor Street, East Boston, MA

Regulatory Analysis

Zoning – City of Boston

- The site is in the East Boston Neighborhood District of Boston
- Condor Street Maritime Economy Reserve (MER) Subdistrict
- Purpose of the MER Subdistrict:
  - To provide for light manufacturing water-dependent uses
  - To preserve sites for Maritime-Dependent Industrial Uses along the waterfront

Uses allowed in a MER Subdistrict:

1. Allowed:
   - any industrial use that needs to be located on the water that is not objectionable or offensive due to noise, hazard, odors or other potential nuisances
   - container redemption center – as long as it is not located within 50 feet of a residential, open space, or conservation protection subdistrict
   - marine-dependent industrial transportation facilities, such as water freight or passenger terminal facility, including docks, piers, wharves, storage sheds for waterborne commodities, and associated necessary rail and truck facilities

2. Allowed, if you get a special permit:
   - retail sale of automotive parts from within a building on the parcel as long as it needs to be on water
   - check cashing business (as long as it needs to be on water)
   - may operate an objectionable or offensive maritime industrial use (based on special danger or hazard, or because of cinders, dust, smoke, refuse matter, flashing, fumes, gases, vapor or odor not effectively confined to the lot or because of noise or vibration perceptible more than 250 feet outside of the lot)

3. Accessory uses – not the primary use
   (a) Allowed:
      - garage or parking lot (that needs to be located on the water)
      - flammable liquid and gas storage (must require a water location)
      - temporary storage onshore of personnel vessels under repair
      - any other accessory use as long as not forbidden by law
   (b) Allowed, with a special permit:
      - manufacturing, assembly and/or packaging of any product which will be sold on the parcel
      - sale of maritime dependent automotive goods
      - permanent dwelling for personnel
      - family day care

Dimensions

Any project must be set back thirty-five (35) feet from the shoreline, twelve (12) feet from the sides of piers, and thirty-five (35) feet from the ends of piers. The Hess site must also have a minimum front, back and side yard of thirty-five (35) feet.
Other Requirements

Maximum floor to area ratio of two (2). Maximum height of 55 feet, with the exception of cranes, silos, etc. used to transfer goods from land to waterborne vessels or for processing of such goods.

Parking Requirements

Must have .5 off-street parking spaces per one thousand (1,000) square feet of Gross Floor Area.

Chapter 91 – State Law

- Tidelands law – any development must get a Chapter 91 license from Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)
- Chapter 91 – lakes, rivers and their tidelands belong to all citizens – development on these tidelands must serve public interest, and cannot interfere with public’s rights in these lands, including fishing, fowling and navigation
- Two types of tidelands at Hess site:
  1. Commonwealth tidelands – tidelands lying seaward of where low water mark was before human impact (filling)
     - If private use of these tidelands is proposed, must compensate the public for interfering with rights to use such tidelands for any lawful purpose
     - Compensation should promote public use and enjoyment of the site – no definitive requirements
     - Must provide for public passage over the site
  2. Private Tidelands – tidelands lying landward of where low water mark was before human impact (filling)
     - Not as much of a public interest in private tidelands
     - In this area (Designated Port Area), private tidelands are generally to be used for a water-dependent industrial use
     - If a nonwater-dependent use were proposed, it would have to be designed to not interfere with a water-dependent use in the future
     - 50% open space requirement
     - Buildings could not exceed 55 feet, if located within 100 feet of the high water mark, and may increase in height one-half a foot for every foot away further away from the water they get after 100 feet
     - A nonwater-dependent project on tidelands would also have to provide for public access in the form of a pedestrian access network near the shoreline
The Hess Site – Cleanup and End Use

Slide #1 What is in the Ground and Groundwater?

Typical Urban Contaminants

Soil
- Fuel Oil Residuals
- Lead
- PAHs (polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons)
  Components of Virgin and Burned Fuels

NAPL – Non-Aqueous Phase Liquid
- Number 2 Fuel Oil

Groundwater
- Dissolved Petroleum Residuals

Slide #2 Where Did It Come From?

Likely Sources
- Historic Fill (PAHs)
- Fuel Storage and Transfer (Fuel Oil and PAHs)
- Maintenance of Above-Ground Storage Tanks (Lead)

Slide #3 What Does This Mean for Human Health?

Method 1 Risk Assessment
Hess Scientists Evaluated:
- Construction and Industrial Future Use Scenarios
- Likely Worker Exposure Routes
- Exposure Point Concentrations of Contaminants
- Compared to MADEP Method 1 Standards

Hess Conclusion:
Exposure Point Concentrations Exceed Method 1 Standards.
- Site Conditions Pose Unacceptable Risk to Workers
- Risk Reduction Required

Slide #4 What Does It Means for the Chelsea River?

Ecological Risk Assessment
- Stage I Ecological Screening Study Found No Discernible Effect
  - Sediment Conditions Consistent with Local Conditions
  - Water Concentrations < Ambient Water Quality Standards
- Method 1: NAPL and Groundwater Concentrations > Method 1 GW-3 Standards for Ecological Effects

Conclusion:
- NAPL Cleanup Required to Prevent River Seeps
- Groundwater Monitoring and Potential Cleanup
Slide #5  What is Hess' Cleanup Plan?

**Completed Actions**
- Product Removal Using Absorbents
- Soil Removal in Limited Areas
- Groundwater Monitoring

**Current Plan**
- **Clean Up the NAPL and Groundwater**
  - Remove Product Using Skimmers in Recovery Wells and Trenches and Monitor Groundwater Conditions
- Potential Limited Additional Soil Removal
- Manage Soil Exposure by Use Restrictions

**Future Options**
- Product Recovery Assisted by Groundwater Pumping
- Air Sparging/Soil Venting to Clean Up Groundwater

Slide #6  What is the Cleanup Timing?

- Conservation Commission Review – Tonight!
- Construction & Recovery Startup – 3 Months
- NAPL Recovery – 2 Year Estimate
- Groundwater Monitoring – 1 Year After Shutdown of Recovery
- Periodic Progress Evaluation – Every 3 to 6 Months

Slide #7  What Remains After the Cleanup?

- No NAPL or Recoverable Petroleum
- Groundwater Petroleum Residuals < Standards
- Soil PAHs/ Petroleum/Lead > Standards for Unrestricted Future Use

Slide #8  What Does This Mean for End Use?

- Plans for Development May Affect Need for Cleanup
  - Adding Fill Will Limit Soil Exposure and Reduce Risk
  - Adding Fill Could Change Significance of Groundwater Petroleum
- Institutional Controls Required to Control or Prevent Contact Activity and Use Limitation – Likely Specifications:
  - Acceptable and Unacceptable Uses
Example: Permit Industrial Use and Construction
Prohibit Day-Care or Single-family Residential Use
  - Soil Management Plan for Any Construction in Contamination
  - Changes in Permitted or Prohibited Uses Require LSP Opinion

**AUL Formulation Can Incorporate Development Plans**

- Cleanup Can Be Adjusted to Accommodate Development
Appendix 7: Market Analysis

Market Opportunities for the Redevelopment of the Hess Site

Introduction

This report assesses market opportunities for the redevelopment of the Hess site on the Chelsea Creek. In doing so, it analyzes current and prospective market demand for a variety of maritime-related, industrial, commercial, and residential uses.

The analysis reflects the following assumptions and limitations. First, it looks primarily at private sector rather than public sector demand. Public sector demand is assumed to be driven by policy and funding considerations rather than market forces. The analysis does, however, take into account that public sector support may be required to achieve private sector development. Second, the analysis does not consider the relative financial feasibility of different development options. The intention is to identify uses for which some market demand exists in order to guide initial thinking on the part of the property owner and the East Boston community about what reuses are possible for the site. Initial feasibility analysis of uses prioritized through the community review process will be conducted during a later stage of this project. Third, the analysis does not restrict consideration to uses allowed by current zoning and land use regulation. It assumes that that changes in current use restrictions are possible through current and future planning processes. Fourth, the analysis assumes that the property owner’s selling time frame is near-term -- roughly one to five years -- and that possible changes in the market environment should be considered within this time frame. Finally, the identification of market demand for a particular use should not be equated with any assumptions about its desirability from the community's standpoint.

Data and information sources used in the preparation of the analysis included economic data, recent plans and studies, and interviews with realtors, developers, real estate advisors, and others with knowledge of market conditions and opportunities.

Site Characteristics

The Hess site is an 8.34 acre site located at 146-172 Condor Street, between the north side of the street and the southern bank of the Chelsea River. It is approximately one-quarter mile to the east of Meridian Street and the McArdle Bridge, which crosses the Chelsea Creek between East Boston and Chelsea. The site was formerly used as a bulk petroleum storage facility but is currently vacant.

Adjacent Uses

From the west of the site to Meridian Street are a variety of industrial and marine-related uses. These include light industrial and warehousing facilities, a marina, and offices and equipment storage yards for marine- and land-based construction operations. These properties generally appear deteriorated, and may be underutilized. Directly to the east of the facility is open space slated to become the Urban Wild Park.

On the south side of Condor Street and extending further to the south, east and west, is housing, primarily two- and three-family stock, interspersed with some commercial uses such as auto repair.

On the north side of Chelsea Creek in the City of Chelsea is a mix of industrial and commercial uses. These include marine terminal facilities for unloading and storage of bulk cargoes (e.g., salt, oil), rental car overflow lots, and freight forwarding facilities.
Transportation Access

Condor Street is a local roadway terminating at Meridian Street on the west and near Eagle Square on the east. It has one travel lane and a parking lane in each direction. The site is located about midway along the street. The site is accessible to Route One via the McArdle Bridge and through local streets in Chelsea (approximately 2 1/4 to the southbound/Mystic River Bridge entrance and 2 3/4 miles to the northbound entrance). It is accessible to Route 1A through local streets in East Boston (approximately 1 mile to the northbound entrance and 1/2 mile to the southbound entrance).

The site is a little less than a mile from the Wood Island T station and a little over a mile from the Maverick station. No MBTA bus routes currently run along Condor Street. The closest bus routes stop about 1/4 mile from the site. The 121, which runs along Lexington Street, connects to both Maverick and Wood Island T stations. The 114, 116, and 117, which run along Meridian Street, connect with Maverick Station in one direction and with Chelsea and Revere in the other.

Options for Reuse

Marine-Related Uses

A marine-related use for the site would be consistent with current zoning. Three uses for which potential market demand exists were identified:

- bulk cargo or other type of cargo facility;
- recreational marina;
- boat building and repair.

Cargo facility. Maritime transportation and related land uses have been declining in Boston and comprise a very small part of the city's economy. In 1999, less than 1,000 workers were employed in the city's water transportation sector (including transportation and related services), well under one percent of the city's total employment. Employment in this sector declined by almost 10 percent between 1995 and 1999, while the city's total employment grew by over 8 percent. Maritime-related industrial uses, which are dependent on the volume of maritime activities, are thus likely to have also experienced a decline. (While no data on maritime-related manufacturing are available, manufacturing employment as a whole declined by over 2 percent between 1995 and 1999.)

While maritime activity has declined, the encroachment of other commercial and residential uses on Boston's waterfront has apparently resulted in a shortage of some types of waterborne cargo facilities in the city. According to shipping industry and Massport sources, there is a shortage of facilities for the offloading and storage of bulk cargoes such as salt, cement, aggregate, and rock. The Chelsea Creek is a good location for such a facility, as evidenced by existing uses along the Creek, and the Hess site is of sufficient size for such a facility.

Another type of cargo facility for which the site may be well-suited is a "roll-on, roll-off" cargo facility. This type of facility loads and offloads waterborne cargo that is shipped on flatbed truck trailers. When the ship reaches its destination, the trailers are either stored landside and eventually attached to trucks for final shipment, or are moved to storage areas at other locations to await final shipment. According to an executive in Massport's maritime division, this type of facility is growing in popularity and may be of interest to shippers into Boston. He believes that the site would comfortably accommodate such a facility.
The use of the site for a cargo facility would likely conflict with the community's desire to maintain at least part of the site as open space. Even if the facility did not use all of the site, the use and appearance of the site would not easily mesh with adjacent open space. The facility would also generate a significant amount of truck traffic.

**Recreational marina.** The site could potentially be used as a recreational marina. There are already marinas in East Boston, including the Quarterdeck Marina just to the west of the site. According to an executive of the Modern Continental Companies, which already operates a marina in Boston and had proposed a marina as part of its Inner Harbor development proposal, demand currently exists for recreational marina space; however, it is highly sensitive to the general health of the local economy. In the long-term, development of additional upper-income housing along the Boston waterfront could spur increased demand for recreational berthing space.

One problem with the site as a marina is that, since the north edge of the site so closely abuts the shipping channel, the piers and docking areas might have to be located on the eastern edge of the site. This may interfere with plans to use that part of the site for open space, including a Harborwalk. Good design may be able to integrate these two uses. If this type of use is further pursued, one possibility would be to work with the Quarterdeck Marina to relocate all or part of its operations. Its current location appears cramped and unattractive. The Marina could consider relocating its berthing facilities and support services (e.g., retail, fueling, restaurant) to the new site, and maintain its on-land boat storage at the current site.

**Boat building and repair.** Very little boat building and repair activities remain in East Boston or anywhere in the Boston Harbor today. It is possible that a boat building and/or repair operation could be attracted to the site if it were displaced from a more desirable location by redevelopment. The number of firms engaged in these activities is so small at this point that the possibility appears remote.

An interesting variant on this type of use would be to seek a builder of traditional wooden boats as part of the development of a larger cultural/educational facility. There has been some discussion of building a museum of East Boston history/Boston maritime history on the site. A traditional wooden boat building facility could provide a complementary attraction for the museum by offering visitors the opportunity to view traditional boat building in progress. It could also provide educational opportunities for local residents through apprenticeships and other educational programs. This type of use would likely require substantial public and/or philanthropic funding to be feasible.

Industrial Uses

Two types of potential industrial uses were examined:

- light industrial;
- warehousing/distribution.

**Light industrial** uses such as woodworking shops are already established to the west of the site. While the development of additional light industrial space is possible, market conditions do not appear to be favorable. First, according to the East Boston Master Plan document, there are high rates of existing underutilized marine industrial properties in the neighborhood. It is likely that this existing space will have to be absorbed before new space is developed. Second, the relatively low industrial lease rates for current properties, about $6-7/square foot, is likely to make newly constructed space uncompetitive.
One potential source of demand for light industrial space is the specialty food processing industry. The city of Chelsea already has a significant amount of food processing activities, including producers of specialty fresh foods for grocery stores and central food preparation kitchens for restaurant chains. Companies in this industry may be willing to pay a premium for modern industrial space with relatively good access to the regional highway network and Logan Airport.

Warehousing/distribution space (e.g., freight forwarding) is another possibility. Freight forwarding commands higher rents than light industrial (up to $15/square foot near the airport), and the development of new facilities on McClellan Highway (e.g., the Logan Air Commerce Center) indicates robust demand for this type of facility. Demand is likely to increase over time. However, given the time-sensitivity of these operations, the Hess site has the disadvantage of a somewhat remote location relative to facilities on or closer to McClellan Highway, and would be likely to command lower rents than more conveniently located facilities. From the community’s perspective, this type of use would also have the disadvantage of a high volume of truck traffic.

Commercial Uses

Three types of commercial uses were examined:

- retail;
- general office;
- hotel.

Retail. Demand for retail uses on the site is unlikely, particularly in the near-term. The site is on the edge of residential areas and has poor access to public transportation. Moreover, there is still underutilized retail space in the neighborhood’s two main commercial districts, Maverick and Central squares. The emphasis of retail development activity (e.g., through the Main Streets Program) is on strengthening these two major retail nodes. In the longer-term, a significant expansion of housing stock on or nearby the site could stimulate demand for some convenience retail activity.

Office. Given its remote location and poor access to public transportation, the site is not attractive for general office development. Other sites in the neighborhood, including McClellan Highway, the Logan Airport perimeter, inner harbor development parcels, and upper story space in existing commercial districts, are likely to be more attractive for various types of office uses. Until these areas are fully developed and utilized, the potential for the development of the site for office use is low. Office development might be possible if a single user willing to sign a long-term lease, such as a public agency, were identified. This would only be likely to occur if the user could find some clear advantage to locating operations with a significant number of employees in that specific location. What that advantage would be is not evident at this point.

Hotel. The remoteness, poor transportation access, and low visibility of the site make it a very unlikely location for hotel development. A number of hotels have been proposed for the neighborhood, but these are either adjacent to the airport or along McClellan Highway.

Residential Uses

Existing adjacent residential uses make the development of the site for housing a clear possibility. In addition, the growing population of East Boston should translate into increased housing demand and a tighter
housing market. According to new Census data, the neighborhood’s population increased by more than 5 percent between 1990 and 2000, making it one of the city’s fastest growing neighborhoods.

The strength of demand for housing on the site will depend on the type of housing that is developed. There is unlikely to be demand for upper-income housing at this time. The industrial character of parts of the surrounding area, the deteriorated condition of existing properties, and the lack of amenities make the marketability of housing to upper-income households very problematic. The provision of amenities internal to the development would increase the cost of what is already likely to be a very high-cost site to develop. The character of the area would have to change dramatically in order for the market for upper-income housing to develop. Any upper-income housing development in the neighborhood is much more likely to occur in the inner harbor area, such as on Clippership Wharf and Pier 1. Nor is senior housing of any kind likely to prove attractive, given the site’s distance from retail services and public transit.

There is much more likely to be a market for moderate- to middle-income family housing. Such housing would be more compatible with the adjacent housing stock. It would also provide a natural step up for those whose incomes are too high for deeply subsidized low-income housing but too low to afford housing in the increasingly costly middle- to upper-income market. The lack of housing in this middle market is of general concern throughout the city and is increasingly the focus of new housing initiatives. This housing could be developed at low- to moderate-density (e.g., townhouse style) and structured to provide ownership opportunities, which encourages greater stability. It would likely require some level of public subsidy.

Residential development could be scaled to leave a portion of the site as open space. However, it is unlikely, given the likely calculus of development costs and proceeds, that the housing development would throw off surplus revenues to cross-subsidize the open space development.

Artists’ Live-Work Space

Artists’ live-work space is essentially a hybrid of residential and light industrial space. Artists, which can include both fine artists and craftsmen, live in the space but also use it as studio space to produce their works. As such, it has some of the elements of light industrial space (e.g., loading docks, storage areas, specialized utility and ventilation demands, high ceilings, large elevators). Because of the nature of their activities, artists are more amenable to living in and adjacent to industrial areas than are most other households.

A lot of this type of space has been developed in Fort Point Channel, the South End, Jamaica Plain, and other parts of the city. It is typically developed in old warehouse space, but can also be developed through new construction. Development pressures in Fort Point Channel are displacing some artists and forcing them to look for other space elsewhere in the city or outside of the city. The city of Boston has taken a special interest in developing such facilities in order to encourage artists to remain in the city, and the BRA recently hired a staffer to promote them.

The development of artists’ live-work space could be combined with the development of community-oriented cultural facilities such as artists exhibition and arts education space. A cluster of arts-oriented activities might also attract small-scale retail activities such as a coffee house or restaurant.

The development of such facilities would likely require public or philanthropic subsidies to make it affordable.

Open Space
The preservation of the site as open space could, of course, be secured by obtaining public or philanthropic funding specifically for this purpose. Absent such resources, a model of developing part of the site for economic uses and using any surplus revenues to cross-subsidize retention of the balance of the site for open space has been suggested. However, given current market conditions (i.e., the types of uses for which market demand exists and which are compatible with partial open space preservation) as well as the likely high costs of site development, the potential for this scenario succeeding in the near-term is remote. When potential reuses are prioritized, financial analysis of the most desirable reuses can be conducted to test this hypothesis.

One alternative model that has been suggested is the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) model. Under this model, a developer pays to transfer the development rights on one property (the property to be preserved as open space) to a second property, in order to develop the second property more densely than would be possible under normal zoning and land use regulations. The proceeds of the transaction are used to compensate the owner of the first property for preserving the property as open space. Some localities have incorporated the TDR model into their land use regulations. To my knowledge, this is not the case in Boston. However, it could be taken under consideration as part of the master planning processes now underway.

Interview List

- Barry Abramson, Abramson Associates (real estate consultant)
- Beate Becker (arts consultant)
- Arthur Lane and Bill Eldridge, Peabody and Lane (agent for bulk shippers)
- Jed Mannis, Shelter Island Fund (plans and packages limited development projects)
- Travis Powell, Commercial Broker, Spaulding and Slye/Colliers
- Tom O'Regan, Commercial Broker, Cushman and Wakefield
- Bob Shepard, Vice President, Modern Continental Cos. (commercial property developer)
- Mark Stevens, The Stevens Group (commercial leasing agent)
- Brad Wellock, Manager of Contracts and Regulatory Affairs, Maritime Division, Massport
Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project

Community Meeting #1

18 April, 2001

Agenda

1. Welcome -- Lucy DelMuto (CCAG)

2. Project History – Stacey Chaker (NOAH)

3. Project Overview – Jim Hamilton (CLF)

4. Work To Date
   ♦ Environmental – Nancy Roberts (Roberts Consulting)
   ♦ Regulatory and Zoning – Aaron Toffler (Watershed Inst.)
   ♦ Market Analysis – Peter Kwass (Mt. Auburn Assoc.)
   ♦ Community Outreach – Matt Henzy (NOAH)

5. Conclusion & Wrap Up – Nancy Radicchi (CCAG)

Save The Date -- Next Meeting

Saturday May 5th, 2001
10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
(Lunch Provided)

East Boston High School – 86 White Street
HESS SITE PLANNING WORKSHOP  MAY 5TH 2001  10:00AM to 2:00PM

Welcome  2 minutes  Lucy DelMuto, Chelsea Creek Action Group

Introduction and Goals  5 minutes  Matt Henzy

Summary of Existing Information  15 minutes  Jim Hamilton

Site Opportunities and Constraints  5 minutes  Hubert Murray

Stakeholders
Roles, Expectations and Agendas:  10 minutes  Stacey Chacker
- The Property Owner
- The Environmental Regulator
- The Public Sector
- The Community (see next items)

Whole Group Brainstorm  30 minutes  Hubert Murray
Concepts / Programs / Places

BREAK FOR LUNCH  30 MINUTES

Study Groups (3 or 4)  60 minutes  Team Leaders

Report Back  30 minutes  Team Leaders

Conclusions and Next Steps  15 minutes  Jim Hamilton
Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project

Community Meeting #3

23 May, 2001

Agenda

1. Welcome -- Lucy DelMuto (CCAG)

2. Project Context/Overview – Matt Henzy (NOAH)

3. Results from Meeting #2– Stacey Chacker (NOAH)

4. Regulatory Analysis – Aaron Toffler (WSI)

5. Market Analysis – Peter Kwass (Mt. Auburn Assoc.)

6. Comments / Questions

7. Conclusions – Jim Hamilton (CLF Ventures)

8. Comments from Hess Corporation – Alex Sagebien

9. Wrap Up – Nancei Radicchi (CCAG)
Appendix 9: EB-CCAG minutes (abridged)

East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group
Monthly Meeting Minutes – Excerpts related to Hess Site
December 2000 – October 2001

MEETING MINUTES, December 20, 2000
Attending: Ana Gomez, Susan Voloshin, Vinny Ieni, Mary Ellen Welch, Fran Doherty, Lucy Del Muto, Maddy McComeskey, Fran Riley, Dominic Rinaldi, Bobbi McDermott, Pat Fidler, Karyl Staia (Friends of Belle Isle) Irene Rizzo & Irene Landry (Boston Transportation Department) Mike O’Connor (District 7 police) Aaron Toffler (Watershed Institute) Susan Loucks (CCAG project coordinator), Stacey Chacker & Matt Henzy (NOAH)

I. Hess Site Planning Process:
A. Project Background: Hess corporation has agreed to fund a process where Conservation Law Foundation, the Watershed Institute, NOAH staff, and the community look at possibilities for healthy redevelopment of the parcel. This includes looking at zoning and other regulations. The community doesn’t own the parcel, but we can have significant say in what happens to it if we work together in creating a sensible, supported alternative. Currently, NOAH is starting broad community outreach to gather ideas for the area, extending exercises CCAG has done within the group last year.

Fran R. inquired about what would happen if the Hess corporation decided to sell the property before this project was finished. As owners, they could legally do that. CCAG hopes that Hess funding this project means they are invested in hearing the results and working with them. NOAH will write a letter to Hess expressing our strong desire that they hold off sale of the property until the community has a chance to finish the process.

MEETING MINUTES, January 17, 2001
Attending: Ana Maria Gomez, Lucy Del Muto, Fran Riley, Dominic Rinaldi, Billy Rinaldi, Bobbi McDermott, Julie Forbes, Florence D’Avella, Edith DeAngelis, Nancei Radicchi, Kwabena Kyei-Aboagye Jr. (EOEA), Cindy Delpapa (Mass Riverways), Karyl Staia (Friends of Belle Isle), Dan Simmons (District 7 Police), Aaron Toffler & Nick Rosenberg (Watershed Institute), Susan Loucks (CCAG project coordinator), Stacey Chacker & Matt Henzy (NOAH), Deborah Brown (EPA), Grace Perez & Janet Kovner (Mystic River Watershed Association)

II. Updates:
Hess Site: Outreach has started with the Hess site visioning process, including door-knocking and advertisements in local newspapers. Conservation Law Foundation Services requested that the letter proposed in December (strongly encouraging Hess not to sell the site until the community process has been completed) be delayed until after a meeting with Hess. Committee members approved a delay while we explore strategies for working with Hess. Fran Riley suggested we try to involve the Trust for Public Land once again, to see what other strategies the community might develop for purchasing the land from Hess.

MEETING MINUTES, February 21, 2001
Attending: Ana Maria Gomez, Susan Voloshin, Lucy Del Muto, Mary Lally, Dottie D’India, David Fernandez, Jesse Kahn, Antonio Gambale, Vinny Ieni, Mary Ellen Welsh, Daphne Concur, Katherine Simpson, Joseph Battersby, Arthur Cardoza, Nancei Radicchi, Gail Miller, Joseph Mason (Land Use Council), Vincent LaBella (representing Councillor Scapicchio), Frank Ganter, Perry Boudreau (Boudreau Boatyard), Pat Shepard (Riverways Program), Karyl Staia (Friends of Belle Isle), Stephanie Marrow & Dan Simons (Police Department), Nadine Flynn, Carmen White, & Karen Henry (Tufts University), Aaron Toffler & Nick Rosenberg (Watershed Institute) Susan Loucks (CCAG project coordinator) Matt Henzy, Stacey Chacker & David Norman (NOAH)

III. Hess Site:
The Hess Site Visioning process is still looking for people who have ideas on what should be built on that property. If you are interested in talking about this, contact Matt Henzy at NOAH. Matt and the other partner organizations on this project are also starting to organize community meetings that will educate people about the regulatory and market constraints on development, and also bring together community ideas that have
been shared so far. CCAG members felt that the ideal arrangement would be two meetings, one held in the evening and one approximately a week later on a Saturday. The CCAG April meeting will likely be devoted to the educational presentation. Joe Mason stressed the importance of visiting other existing groups with this information.

MEETING MINUTES, March 21, 2001

Attending: Ana Maria Gomez, Susan Voloshin, Lucy Del Muto, Vinny Ieni, Mary Ellen Welsh, Nancei Radicchi, Gail Miller, Stanley Buonagurio, John Barbero, Tony Gambale, Karyl Stoia (Friends of Belle Isle), Stephanie Marrow (Police Department), Nick Rosenberg (Watershed Institute) Susan Loucks (CCAG project coordinator) Matt Henzy, Stacey Chacker (NOAH)

IV. Hess Site:

The Hess Site planning process is gearing up for meetings in April and May. At the last meeting, members agreed that two meetings would be appropriate – one to learn about the background, and one to do the planning. It seems helpful to have a third one as well, in order to do look more closely at the zoning and marketplace restrictions and “nip and tuck” the final plan. The meetings should not conflict with any airport hearings. The meeting schedule is set for Wednesday April 18 (instead of the regular CCAG meeting), Saturday May 5 (10-2, lunch included) and Wednesday, May 23 (again, instead of the regular CCAG meeting.) The Hess site has always been a big part of the CCAG agenda and all members are strongly urged to come out and participate in this process.

Note: EB-CCAG did not have regular meetings in April and May due to the community meetings held for the Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project. EB-CCAG resumed regular meetings in June but did not discuss the project during that meeting.

MEETING MINUTES, July 18, 2001

Attending: Ana Maria Gomez, Anita McCandless, Vin Ieni, Metro Voloshin, Dale Dean, Cheryl Gambale, Antonio Gambale, Maddy McComiskey, Carmella Ferrante, Christopher Blackler, Roseann Bongiovanni (Chelsea Green Space & Recreation) David Prusky, Debra Blandin, Nancei Radicchi, Roberta Horn, Arthur Horn, Florence D’Avelia, Edith DeAngelis, Dick Lundgren (Historic Massachusetts), Louis Silvestro (Channel Fish), Gail Miller, Karyl Stoia (Friends of Belle Isle), Aaron Toffler & Nick Rosenberg (Watershed Institute), Chris Busch (BSC group), Thai Taing (ROCA), Susan Loucks (CCAG project coordinator), Stacey Chacker & Matt Henzy (NOAH), Kristi Rea & Tom Olivier (EPA) Gail Lynch, David Friedland, David Tooley, & Peter Richer (Waste Management) Brian McLaughlin (Boston Parks & Rec Department)

V. Hess Site

A. Update: Matt updated the group on the Hess process. EB-CCAG has written a letter to the owner of Amerada Hess Inc., asking if they could donate the land to the community. The Conservation Law Foundation is currently writing a report of the process which should be available within a few weeks, and will be mailed out.

B. Hess Meeting Feedback: Matt asked those who had been present at one or more of the Hess Site planning meetings if they could provide feedback. Generally, members felt that the process had been successful, and people had been satisfied, especially by the presence of a Hess representative, and that this presence needed to continue. Edie said that it was a good illustration of how businesses can take responsible steps, if nudged by the community. Nancei reminded us that the process is not complete until we had a chance to review the draft report.

C. DPA status: Members considered whether we wanted to push for de-designation of the Hess site. Taking it out of the Designated Port Area would mean we could push for other uses, but it would also mean losing certain development protections. Members felt that we did not want to push for designation at this time.
**Hess Site:** The draft report from the Hess Site community meeting series is available through the NOAH office. Call Matt at 569-0059 x17 to request a copy of the Executive Summary or the entire report.

---

**MEETING MINUTES, September 19, 2001**

Attending: Vinleni, Susan Voloshin, Roberta Marchi, Nancei Radicchi, Maddy McComiskey, Tony Gambale, Cheryl Gambale, Arthur Cardoza, Ana Maria Gomez, Mary Ellen Welch, Lucy Del Muto, Louis Silvestro (Channel Fish), Deborah Brown (EPA), Susan Loucks (CCAG project coordinator), Matt Henzy (NOAH).

**VI. Hess Site**

A. **Publicizing EB-CCAG Hess Site Plan:** Matt distributed a draft cover letter that will be sent around along with a summary of the Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project. The distribution will include regulatory agencies, elected officials, community organizations. Matt asked for feedback on the cover letter. Follow-up meetings with elected officials and others may happen after we distribute the report. Executive Committee will be asked to attend such meetings, and Tony volunteered to attend also.

B. **Potential Buyer:** Remains unidentified. Hess will not disclose the information.

C. **Trust for Public Land (TPL):** Matt reported that TPL is interested in starting a discussion with EB-CCAG about trying to acquire the site and develop it in accordance with the EB-CCAG vision for the site. They are interested in possibly forming a development partnership with NOAH in order to accomplish this. Background information about TPL was distributed, including a summary of TPL’s involvement in the EB Greenway project. Mary Ellen spoke highly of TPL and of TPL staffperson Nancy Kafka in particular. A consensus was reached to continue the discussion with TPL and to invite Nancy Kafka to attend October 17 meeting to provide more information.

D. **CLF Ventures (Conservation Law Foundation):** Matt reported that CLF is interested in continuing with a role in this project, specifically in facilitating a purchase of the site by an appropriate developer that would implement the EB-CCAG vision for the site. Jim Hamilton of CLF will write a proposal regarding doing this work. CLF, along with the rest of the Project Team (NOAH and Watershed) may seek additional funding in order to do this work.

E. **DPA Status:** Aaron and Nancei spoke to the question of whether “de-designation” of DPA status would be beneficial to the end goals of EB-CCAG regarding the site. Aaron said that in order to implement the community vision for the site it would have to be de-designated eventually. Aaron also reported that the process for de-designation is lengthy and complex. The group decided to leave this question until after Nancy Kafka had presented and the potential with TPL was clearer.

F. **Portion of Site on south side of Condor Street:** It was noted that we tend to forget this part of the Hess property. We need to include this part in our discussion and work regarding the Hess Site.

---

**MEETING MINUTES, October 17, 2001**

Attending: Vinny Ileni, Susan Voloshin, Roberta Marchi, Nancei Radicchi, Ana Maria Gomez, Lucy Del Muto, Cristopher Blackler, Karl Pastore, Karyl Stoia (Friends of the Belle Isle Marsh), Roberta Marchi, John Vitigliano, Priya Patel and Brian McLaughlin (Boston Parks and Recreation Department), Bob Cummings (East Coast Engineering), Ken Haines, Michelle Crowley (Hargraves Associates), Sam Seidel, Manuel Delgado, Debra Blandin (District 7 Police), Nancy Kafka (Trust for Public Land), Louis Silvestro (Channel Fish), Aaron Toffler, Tim Dube and XXXX (Watershed Institute) Stacey Chacker (NOAH), Susan Loucks (CCAG project coordinator).

**VII. Hess Site and the Trust for Public Land**
A. **Hess Site Update:** Matt, Stacey, Lucy, Vinny and Aaron went to talk with the Conservation Law Foundation regarding their continued involvement. CLF is looking for funds to continue to with the Project.

B. **Trust for Public Lands Involvement:** Nancy Kafka from the Trust for Public Land presented on the possibility of our two groups partnering to achieve goals on the Hess site. The Trust for Public Land (TPL) is an organization that helps communities gain open and community space by supplying financial, political, technical, and bargaining resources. TPL may buy the “option” on a piece of land (essentially, buying time while an appropriate buyer is located) or may buy the property outright. TPL eventually transfers all land back into public ownership.

TPL has been a big partner on the East Boston Greenways project, and is interested in continuing to work in Boston. There is a possibility of a partnership regarding the Hess site, however, many questions need to be answered. Some of these questions include:

- What is the political climate regarding Hess? Is government supportive of our ideas? Could we make this a priority in government, and if so, how?
- What other kinds of partners would we need to make this happen, and can we get those partners?
- How much money would the project need for success, and how do we raise those funds?
- Is this the right time to do this?

C. **Next Steps:** TPL has a private donor who is interested in learning more about the potential of connecting the East Boston Greenway down to the Chelsea Creek, and may fund a study to look at feasibility for that idea. The TPL needs us to meet with governmental representatives, and learn what they think about the Hess site and what they can support. CCAG also needs to identify other allies, and our opposition. We can use the plan generated at the end of the Hess meetings this spring, as long as we have a clear idea of what we want from the people we’ll be talking to. Stacey will come back next month with a more explicit strategy regarding our potential involvement.
Appendix 10: ‘Don’t sell’ letter to Hess

East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group

February 22, 2001

Alex Sagebien  Christopher S. Colman
Manager Refining and Marketing Remediation  Associate General Counsel
Amerada Hess Corporation  Amerada Hess Corporation
1 Hess Plaza  1 Hess Plaza
Woodbridge, NJ 07095  Woodbridge, NJ 07095

RE: Hess Terminal Site - Condor Street, East Boston, MA

Dear Mr. Sagebien and Mr. Cooper:

I am writing, on behalf of the East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group (EB-CCAG), to express our belief in the importance that Hess retain control of the old East Boston Hess Terminal during the Hess Terminal Site Redevelopment Planning Project (the Project).

EB-CCAG fully supports, and is actively participating in the Project. As you know, the Project is being coordinated by CLF Ventures and is currently underway. We appreciate your commitment to the Project in principle, and your willingness to enter into a contract with CLF Ventures in order to implement this process. We believe, as we understand that you do, that this is the best way to plan and implement a redevelopment of the site that meets the needs of the community and of the Hess Corporation.

EB-CCAG believes that to relinquish control of the property prior to the completion of the Planning Project would be detrimental to its successful completion. We would be pleased to hear your thoughts on this matter.

EB-CCAG is a dedicated group of East Boston residents and others that works to address environmental issues along the East Boston side of the Chelsea Creek. Neighborhood of Affordable Housing (NOAH), a local community development corporation, organizes and coordinates the work of EB-CCAG.

If you have any questions or comments, you may contact me at NOAH (569-0059 x13). Any correspondence should be addressed to EB-CCAG at the address below. Thank you for your interest in this matter.

On behalf of EB-CCAG,

Stacey Chacker
NOAH

cc: Jim Hamilton and Scott Darling, CLFV
    Aaron Toffler, Watershed Institute
Appendix 11: ‘Donate land’ letter to Hess

East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group

July 5, 2001

John B. Hess,
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036

RE: Hess Terminal Site - Condor Street, East Boston, MA

Dear Mr. Hess:

I am writing, on behalf of the East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group (EB-CCAG), to update you regarding the community planning project for the Hess Terminal Site in East Boston and to make a specific proposal regarding the disposition of the site.

As you are aware, the ‘Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project’ was conducted over the past few months. The Project had your organizational and financial support, and we were pleased to have Alex Sagebien, Manager of Refining and Marketing Remediation, at the final meeting on May 23rd.

The Project was a community process in which neighborhood residents and others helped create a plan for the site that serves the neighborhood as well as the Hess Corporation or any subsequent owner. Over the course of hundreds of interviews with neighborhood residents and businesspeople, and three public meetings with an overall attendance of 120 persons, the community created a balanced plan which calls for open space, a cultural/recreational component, and a commercial component (provided the business is environment and neighborhood friendly). Our organizational partner CLF Ventures (affiliated with Conservation Law Foundation) is currently preparing a report to the Hess Corporation that will detail the Planning Project and provide supporting documentation. Now that the community has a clear vision for the site, we would like to address the question of ownership.

We propose that the Hess Corporation donate the entire site to the community (through an appropriate, mutually agreed-upon third party) in the name of your father, Mr. Leon Hess, who was known as a great philanthropist. If the land were donated, the community would drop the commercial component from the plan and would support development of the site as open space with a cultural/recreational use. The Hess Corporation would benefit through association with the redeveloped site. This association would be manifest in physical elements on the site as well as in the minds of the people of East Boston and surrounding communities. We also understand there would be some tax benefit to the Hess Corporation as a result of donation and conservation of the land.
Please see the enclosed documents for more background on the site and the Planning Project. If you would like to discuss this matter you may contact NOAH at 617-569-0059, Stacey Chacker ext. 13 or Matt Henzy ext. 17. Any correspondence should be addressed to EB-CCAG at the address below. Thank you for your consideration.

On behalf of EB-CCAG,

Nancei Radicchi
Executive Committee

cc: Jim Hamilton and Scott Darling, CLFV
    Aaron Toffler, Watershed Institute
    Alex Sagebien, Manager of Refining and Marketing Remediation, Amerada Hess Corporation
    Christopher S. Colman, Associate General Counsel, Amerada Hess Corporation
Appendix 12: Hess reply letter to EB-CCAG (retyped from the original)

AMERADA HESS CORPORATION

H.I. Small, Jr.
One Hess Plaza
Vice President, Terminal Operations
Woodbridge, NJ 07095

August 14, 2001

Ms. Nancei Radicchi
East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group
C/o NOAH
22 Paris Street
East Boston, MA 02128

Re: Hess Terminal Site / Condor Street, East Boston, MA

Dear Ms. Radicchi:

Thank you for your letter of July 5, 2001 to John Hess, who has referred it to me for reply. As you know, Hess has been actively seeking community input on proposals to redevelop the area where our former East Boston Terminal was located. The purpose of this effort was to help Hess and any future owner identify some of the development options which will be compatible with the area and be a benefit to East Boston.

Hess believes that this property can be redeveloped in a responsible manner, sensitive to the community needs for open space and public access. By returning this site to a productive use, the end result will be “win-win” for Hess and the community. Several prospective buyers have expressed interest in this site, and Hess is presently working with an interested party on a contract to purchase the site. Accordingly, we are not in a position to consider donating the East Boston site.

Hess remains fully supportive of community involvement in the planning process and we well encourage any prospective buyer to continue to build a partnership with the East Boston community.

Very truly yours,

H.I. Small
Vice President, Terminal Operations
East Boston residents and other participants at the Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project community meetings held on April 18, May 5, and May 23, 2001 created the following Land Use Plan for the Hess Site on Condor Street in East Boston.

The Plan was written by CLF Ventures (affiliated with Conservation Law Foundation) based on results of planning exercises held during the meeting series; and was reviewed by Project co-sponsors East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group, Neighborhood of Affordable Housing, and the Urban Ecology Institute (formerly the Watershed Institute). Further information about the Hess Site and the Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project is available upon request (see contact information below).

Desirable Uses:

A. Public Amenities
People expressed a desire for open space and an interest in water related uses, such as a ferry terminal.
- Natural open space designed to link up with other areas (Urban Wilds, Emerald Necklace, Greenway)
- Ferry terminal
- Harbor Walk/ Bike Path
- Handicapped access
- Space for children

B. Cultural/Educational
There was a lot of interest in creating a use that was historically and culturally appropriate to the area. Some of these ideas related to the Marine heritage of East Boston. People also seemed interested in having an educational component for youth and others.
- Museum related to history, industry or crafts
- Environmental Education such as an environmental cleanup demonstration site
- Rowing or sailing program
- Amphitheater or other facility for cultural events
- Could be affiliated with a University or scientific research program

C. Economic Generator
People liked the idea of having part of the area be an active working area where things were grown or created. Other ideas focused on making use of the waterfront location.
- Fish hatchery, Aquaculture
- Marina
- Artists’ space: woodworking, glass blowing ceramics, small boat building
- Hydroponic Farm, Greenhouse or Compost facility
- Boat Repair
- Mixed use development including some residential

Undesirable Uses:
- Housing
- Daycare/Kindergarten
- Airport related use
- Industrial use
- Hotels
• 'Stand alone' parking lots (limited parking for supported use OK)
• Retail, office space
• Active recreation (i.e. baseball, soccer) – except for limited use from small boats

For more information, contact:
NOAH, 22 Paris Street, East Boston, MA 02128
Matt Henzy  617-569-0059 x17  matt.henzv@noahcdc.org
Stacey Chaker  617-569-0059 x13  stacey.chacker@noahcdc.org
Appendix 14: CLFV Report – Executive Summary

1. Executive Summary

The goal of the East Boston Terminal Re-Use Planning Project is to develop a series of plausible, community-generated re-use options for the site and to provide this information to Amerada Hess Corporation to guide internal decision-making. The Project Team consisted of: The Neighborhood for Affordable Housing, The Watershed Institute, Mount Auburn Associates and CLF Ventures, and was charged with investigating the legal, economic, and community issues surrounding the property. Working closely with community stakeholders, the goal of the study was to generate a range of site re-use plans consistent with community needs, regulatory conditions, market forces, and developer requirements.

Above all, this was a community-based process. Three community meetings were held in East Boston on April __, May 5, and May 23, 2001. In preparation for these meetings, grassroots organizers at NOAH raised community awareness for the project by distributing over one thousand fliers in the neighborhood, both in Spanish and English. NOAH and EB-CCAG canvassed and telephoned hundreds of people. Similarly, hundreds of residents, local businesses, and local government representatives were invited to participate in the re-use planning project by suggesting what they wanted to see on the site—and what they wanted not to see on the site. Through outreach and public meetings, the team educated East Boston community members in the history, environmental contamination, health and ecological implications, and cleanup plans for the site. Using all this background information, community members helped create a re-use plan for the site.

Meanwhile, market analysts at Mount Auburn Associates studied the economic viability of the business component of potential re-use scenarios. The site itself occupies some eight acres amidst a mixture of light industrial, commercial, and residential uses, and is adjacent to both the Chelsea Creek and the site of future Urban Wild. Access to both roads and public transportation is poor. The economic study focused on near-term private sector demand, and analyzed twelve different marine, industrial, commercial, and residential uses for their market demand, compatibility with site characteristics, compatibility with adjacent uses, and community impact issues.

Land use specialists at the Watershed Institute researched the complex regulatory framework that will govern the site’s use. The site is zoned within a Maritime Economy Reserve subdistrict, which is designed to provide for light manufacturing water-dependent uses and to preserve waterfront sites for maritime-dependent industrial uses. In addition, state tidelands law (Chapter 91 of the General Laws of Massachusetts) governs the use of both public and private tidelands. Any use of the public tidelands must promote public use and enjoyment of the site, or else the public must be compensated accordingly. The private tidelands lie within a Designated Port Area, where private tidelands are generally used for a water-dependent industrial use, and impose specific building requirements. Furthermore, the site is contaminated and is currently undergoing an Immediate Response Action cleanup in accordance with the Massachusetts Contingency Plan.

In a series of open community meetings, participants created a land-use plan with three components: small- to medium-size neighborhood-friendly business; a cultural/educational facility; and open space that is open to the public and includes waterfront access. These three components would co-exist and be mutually beneficial. For the business component,
participants identified three possibilities that would be supported by the community: pleasure boat marina, commercial aquaculture, and artists' space. The project team then studied the specific market and regulatory issues surrounding these three business uses.

The following report is presented so as to identify the key questions related to development of the site.

This report is not the end of the process, but rather a midpoint. Amerada Hess Corporation now has the information, the tools, and perhaps most importantly, the community goodwill to spur redevelopment of the terminal property into a site that satisfies both Amerada Hess Corporation and the community of East Boston.
Appendix 15: Letter to public officials

East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group

October 31, 2001

RE: Amerada Hess Terminal Site, Condor Street, East Boston

Dear «Salutation» «LastName»:

We are writing to call your attention to the Community Land Use Plan for the Hess Site, a community vision for redevelopment of the Amerada Hess Oil Corporation's former oil tank complex at 146-172 Condor Street in East Boston. We seek to ensure that the site is developed in accordance with this Plan. We would like to familiarize you with the site and with the Community Land Use Plan.

East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group (EB-CCAG) is a dedicated group of East Boston residents and others that works to address environmental issues along the East Boston side of the Chelsea Creek. Neighborhood of Affordable Housing (NOAH), an East Boston community development corporation, organizes and coordinates the work of EB-CCAG.

The Plan was created during the Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project, a participatory planning process conducted during the spring of 2001. The Planning Project was a collaboration of CLF Ventures (affiliated with Conservation Law Foundation), Urban Ecology Institute (formerly Watershed Institute), NOAH, and EB-CCAG. The project was endorsed and funded by the Hess Corporation itself. Please see the enclosed Fact Sheet for background information on the site and on the Planning Project. In addition to the Community Land Use Plan, the key outcomes of the Planning Project include a regulatory analysis, and environmental analysis, and a market analysis of the site. All of these reports are available upon request.

The Plan calls for three components to redevelopment of the Hess Site: small- to medium-size neighborhood-friendly business; a cultural/educational facility with an emphasis on the maritime history of East Boston; and open space that is open to the public and includes waterfront access. These three components would co-exist and be mutually beneficial. Please see the enclosed Community Land Use Plan for the Hess Site.
We hope that this letter serves to familiarize you with the Hess Site, the Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project, and the Community Land Use Plan. Members of EB-CCAG and members of the Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project Team would be happy to meet with you at your request. Thank you for your consideration. Please direct any questions or comments to Matt Henzy or Stacey Chacker at NOAH at 617-569-0059 (Matt x17, Stacey x13).

Sincerely,

Nancei Radicchi  
EB-CCAG

Stacey Chacker  
NOAH
Appendix 16: Outcome measurement survey and results

NOAH Outcome Measurement Survey Results
Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project

The survey was sent by mail on October 30, 2001 to the 60 meeting participants in the Hess Site Re-Use Planning Project. Fifteen responses were received by return mail. No follow up phone calling was done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Before (scale of 1-5)</th>
<th>After (scale of 1-5)</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants gain knowledge about Hess Site</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>nm</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A shared vision for the Hess Site</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief community power re: Hess Site</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
<td>nm</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in EB-CCAG as a vehicle for power</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>nm</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nm = not measured  na = not applicable

1) How much did you learn about the Hess Site during the Hess Site Planning Project?
   Nothing/Very little/Some/A lot

Respondents- 14  Score: 3.4 Out of 4

2) The question "What do the people want to see on the Hess Site?" was answered during the Hess Site Planning Project.
   Strongly disagree/Disagree/Uncertain/Agree/Strongly Agree

Respondents- 14  Score: 4.0 Out of 5

3) As a result of the Hess Site Planning Project, the community increased its ability to influence what will happen on the site.
   Strongly disagree/Disagree/Uncertain/Agree/Strongly Agree

Respondents- 15  Score: 3.9 Out of 5

4) Community opinion regarding the future of the Hess Site was already clear before the Hess Site Planning Project.
   Strongly disagree/Disagree/Uncertain/Agree/Strongly Agree

Respondents- 15  Score: 3.4 Out of 5

5) The Hess Corporation (or any future owner) has a right to do what they want with the Hess Site.
   Strongly disagree/Disagree/Uncertain/Agree/Strongly Agree

Thrown out due to lack of clarity.

6) The East Boston Chelsea Creek Action Group is a good way for residents and small business owners to protect and promote their interests in the Chelsea Creek area.
   Strongly disagree/Disagree/Uncertain/Agree/Strongly Agree

Respondents- 15  Score: 4.8 Out of 5

7) Residents and small business owners have no control over what happens on the Hess Site.
   Strongly disagree/Disagree/Uncertain/Agree/Strongly Agree

Respondents- 14  Score: 2.1 Out of 5  (2.9 inversed)
Appendix 17: Master List

A master list of activity levels, including Participants, Interest, Key Prospect, and Prospect, among Hess Site area residents is available at the Shapiro Library.