

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

**TO: MASSACHUSETTS BAY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**REGARDING: THE READVILLE YARD 5 DISPOSITION AND REDEVELOPMENT**  
**FROM: BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**  
**DATE: AUGUST 11, 2003**

The following is intended to guide the MBTA and potential developers in planning for the redevelopment of the Readville Yard 5 site.

### HEALTH / ENVIRONMENTAL

- Environmental clean up of the site is a top community and city priority and cannot be compromised or delayed by the redevelopment of the site.
- Both the MBTA and potential developers must provide documentation of proposed site cleanup including scope, schedule and allocation of responsibilities between the MBTA and developer.
- Redevelopment of the site should to the greatest extent possible promote better community health by the inclusion of active green spaces, landscape buffers [to minimize visual, noise, dust and pollution], high efficiency “green” building and development strategies, and responsible “green” commercial / industrial uses.

### TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS

- Potential developers must provide an area wide transportation analysis (with traffic modeling to project volumes) that clearly lays out the area wide impact and mitigation strategy of the proposed redevelopment and demonstrates how the proposed redevelopment avoids most and minimizes all impacts on the surrounding area. Additionally, the analysis should identify all on and new off-site locations where infrastructure improvements may be required. [eg. redesign of the Sprague and West Milton Street intersection; the Sprague Street bridge].
- Potential developers must provide and develop a single comprehensively Transportation Strategy for complete redevelopment of the site, rather than separate strategies for each municipality.
- Access to new and existing uses need to be proportionately and appropriately, shared between Boston and Dedham.
- New and previously available site access points need to be considered and fully analyzed from all sides of the site.
- Consideration should be given to designated commercial / truck traffic routes separate from general / local traffic within and accessing the site. Redevelopment proposals should weigh the cost / benefit of such strategies and reflect the results in proposed site designs.
- The use and restrictions of existing roadways, both public and private, within and surrounding the site must be evaluated relative to the proposed redevelopment. Evaluation must include reassessing the regional distribution of commercial / truck traffic and incorporating potential improvements in the development proposal.
- The selected developer must bear all responsibilities of obtaining and providing necessary rights-of-ways and the engineering and construction costs of all new roadways and

infrastructure improvements associated with redevelopment of the site. All new public roadways must be constructed to city standards and be fully accessible.

- Different modes of transportation must be considered and accommodated within the site. Potential developers must fully explore the use of:
  - Pedestrian connections must be provided to the MBTA station; area commercial centers; link to existing sidewalks, pedestrian paths, and green spaces; and provide full accessibility routes.
  - Bicycle trails to connect the new uses to key transit nodes and both regional and local bicycle trails.
  - Such spaces (“walk-to” spaces and bike trails and / or linear open spaces) shall be funded and maintained by the selected developer with public access easements held by the respective municipalities.
- Potential developers must provide a comprehensive strategy for on site parking and include the existing MBTA parking lots adjacent to the site.

### LAND USE / DENSITY

- Potential developers must consider and address the following city land use and development policies that are applicable to the redevelopment of this site:
  1. Housing – provide a minimum 15% on-site affordable component.
  2. Back Streets - support commercial and industrial uses, businesses and jobs
  3. Transit Oriented Development – promote non-vehicle dependant development and uses that take advantage of site’s proximity to the MBTA Readville commuter rail station and allow for higher levels of density and lower parking demands.
- Residential and Commercial / Industrial uses currently border the site. Proposed redevelopment must be compatible with and not threaten these existing uses. Potential developers should consider and study alternative site plans to optimize the compatibility of new uses with the existing abutting uses.
- Potential developers must provide an overall land use strategy that treats the site as a single entity rather than separate strategies for each municipality.
- Potential developers should consider a mix of new uses that could include community, residential, retail and commercial / industrial uses as follows:
  - Community – sports, recreation and fitness facilities.
  - Residential – housing for senior citizens, artist live work space
  - Retail - incidental service and convenience uses that relate to area uses.
  - Commercial / Industrial – responsible and or clean businesses
  - Green Spaces: “walk-to” publicly accessible active and passive open spaces including linear parks, playgrounds, exercise courses and bike trails oriented to the community.
  - Buffer Zones – landscaped and open spaces for visual, acoustical and air screening between different land uses.
- New development should be transit-oriented and promote uses and density levels to take advantage of the adjacent Readville commuter rail station. New uses should be located and designed to minimize the adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhood.

### COMMUNITY CHARACTER

- Potential developers should demonstrate and explicitly illustrate the ways in which their proposed development responds to and enhances the physical, environmental and social character of the communities in which it is located.

### COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

- The active participation of residents and other stakeholders in the surrounding area must be solicited and engaged in the review of the development proposals and environmental clean up of the site. The City of Boston review of development proposals will also incorporate the active participation of community representatives. Potential developers through their proposals should clearly communicate the benefits of redevelopment for area stakeholders.

For questions or comments related to this memorandum, please contact:

Kairos Shen, Director of Planning BRA at 617/918-4471 or [Kairos.Shen.BRA@ci.boston.ma.us](mailto:Kairos.Shen.BRA@ci.boston.ma.us)

END - TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

## ATTACHMENT A

### **MBTA Readville Yard 5 June 30, 2003 Community Meeting Meeting Notes**

The following meeting notes are intended to reflect the community questions, comments and issues raised during this meeting. In compiling this document, we have endeavored to clarify questions and statements without altering content.

#### TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS

- Redevelopment of the MBTA site should also consider the adverse impacts of potential truck traffic from former Stop and Shop distribution warehouse.
- Sprague Street Bridge has weight limits that residents think should be enforced to limit overloaded trucks.
- Site access: Readville residents expressed interest in opening additional access to and from the site; currently only access is from Industrial Way in Readville since Dedham has privatized Whiting Avenue.
- Requirements for the location and use of new access roads onto and from the site should be provided to potential developers.
- Minimizing and mitigating the adverse impacts of both passenger and truck traffic should be considered in the selection developer and consideration of new site uses.
- There is a lack of police enforcement of traffic on West Milton Street.
- New development and or uses should address the existing problem with traffic congestion on Sprague Street Bridge.
- The Town of Dedham's 8 PM truck ban is diverting all truck traffic through Readville. The burdens of truck traffic should be equal for both Readville and Dedham.

#### ZONING AND LAND USE

- Many residents expressed interest in changing zoning to residential as a way of protecting the character of the neighborhood.
- It was noted that Dedham has changed the zoning of Dedham portion of the site to allow only single-family residences.
- Cluster zoning is an option that should be considered in new housing schemes.
- Development terms and review processes such as "Article 80" need to be explained to the community.
- The community expressed concern for how the remaining MBTA uses on the site would be located and accessed.
- Residents feel that Readville is already burdened with a lot of industrial / commercial uses and are not sure that the site should have more of these kinds of uses.
- The community expressed concern that new residential development on the site would not be affordable for the local neighborhood.
- Dense residential development of the site would be of great community concern and should be limited.
- Elderly housing is a needed in the area and should be considered in reuse proposals.
- A Veterans of War cemetery should be considered in reuse proposals.

## ENVIRONMENT AND QUALITY OF LIFE

- The community expressed great concern at the MBTA's delay in the court ordered clean up of the site. Additionally, the community is concerned that the land sale would let the MBTA off the hook for the last two phases of the site clean up.
- The MBTA should provide a schedule for site clean up which should include community notification of actions.
- Rising asthma incidents and cancer cases in the neighborhood is of great concern to area residents and City Officials. The community should be informed of site clean-up actions and on going monitoring of the site conditions. Actions should be undertaken to address community health issues and concerns.
- Idling diesel trains and train engines are producing excess fumes and should be minimized or eliminated.

END - JUNE 30, 2003 COMMUNITY MEETING NOTES

## ATTACHEMENT B

### **MBTA Readville Yard 5 July 24, 2003 Community Meeting Breakout Group Notes**

The following are notes from the four Breakout Groups as recorded by each groups note taker. In compiling this document, we have endeavored to clarify the notes and statements as recorded without altering content.

#### **Group # 1**

**Group Moderator:** John Dalzell, BRA and Jim Clark, BRA

**Community Captain:** Ed Walsh

**Note Taker:** C. McDermott, W&SE Inc.

#### ENVIRONMENT AND QUALITY OF LIFE

- The MBTA should clean up the entire site prior to disposition to a developer. The buck must not be passed to a developer who could go bankrupt in the process leaving the community high and dry.
- The site should be cleaned [remediated] by the selected developer in accordance with governing laws and regulations.
- A buffer should be required between residential and commercial / industrial uses. The presented land use diagrams show a 40'-0" wide landscaped buffer that could include active uses such as a bike path.
- The MBTA has previously "committed to a earthen buffer"
- The "orphan line" should be used to buffer the site from existing residential uses.
- The "orphan line" should be used as a bike path or linear open space as well as buffer.
- The Attorney General has ordered the MBTA to clean the site; the MBTA should clean the site first then sell it.
- Can the City take private ways and make them public? This is possible and is done either with the owners / abutters support or for the overall good of the public.

#### TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS

- The current condition where by all vehicle and truck access from commercial and industrial businesses located in Dedham [via Industrial Way] pass through the Readville community must be corrected. Dedham collects taxes from these businesses and properties while refusing to provide access or incurring the associated vehicle impacts and burdens.
- General discussion of traffic impacts noted that volume and type of vehicles [trucks, cars] vary depending upon land use. Presently, there is no analysis of vehicle volumes. It was noted that the presence of commuter rail and freight rail could lessen road impacts associated with development.
- Planners and developers should "realize" that the truck activity related to the existing commercial / industrial uses on Industrial Way will remain.
- Truck use of residential streets should be "banned".

## LAND USE AND ZONING

- Planners and developers should “realize” that the heavy commercial / industrial uses on Industrial Way will remain and be across the street from any new development. It would not be fair to have new residents abutting the commercial uses.
- If residential uses are introduced, they should be single family homes with buffer areas separating the residences from commercial / industrial uses.
- Single-family home development is not cost feasible [for this site due to acquisition and remediation costs].
- The City should buy the site and just clean it up and turn it into a park.
- Potential Uses: Commercial / industrial businesses, cemetery, golf driving range, open space / park, office – commercial businesses, senior housing.
- Mixed use commercial / residential could be interesting.
- Because of the likely project size, even allowed uses will require City of Boston Art. 80 approval that will involve the community in reviewing the proposed development.
- A Construction Company owner, note that he “moved the business to Industrial Way so folks wouldn’t have to look at my yard and trucks”. It would not be fair to move residential uses onto the site or onto Industrial Way.
- The bus storage business moved to behind the site to stay away from homes.

### **Group # 2**

**Group Moderator:** Ken Barnes - BRA

**Community Captain:** Joe Ciardi

**Note Taker:** Jill Griffin – BRA

## ENVIRONMENT AND QUALITY OF LIFE

- Provide more recreation and green space for the local community

## TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS

- The redevelopment of the site should be transit oriented.
- Except for Roberts Place, the community will not support the access points identified in the site access diagram.
- The Dedham public works yard should be used to provide access from Dedham.

## LAND USE AND ZONING

- Ideal development would include some of the following uses:
  - Sports Center for kids, bike path and / or recreation fields
  - Preserve the “Orphan Line” for a linear green way
  - Artist live / work space
  - Single family houses ok for the Dedham portion of site
  - Senior housing
  - Mixed Use housing / commercial
  - Business Center
  - Strip Mall
  - MBTA Parking
  - National Cemetery
  - Casino
  - Light industrial and commercial – no heavy manufacturing

- Inappropriate development would include:
  - Town houses
  - Hospital facility
- MBTA storage use should not dictate the final site plan

**Group # 3**

**Group Moderator:** Dana Whiteside, BRA

**Community Captain:** Tim McCarthy

**Note Taker:** Philip Jean, Transit Realty Associates

ENVIRONMENT AND QUALITY OF LIFE

- A concern was voiced about the current danger posed by the site as it continues to be posted with signage warning of contamination in addition to the existence of the perimeter fence.
- The group voiced comments about the historically poor relationship between area residents and the MBTA. The residents' feeling of ill will toward the MBTA is because the site has not been remediated since it was acquired; even-though the MBTA purchased the land knowing it was contaminated. The relationship worsened when the MBTA entered the property in 2000 and cut down trees that had provided the community with a significant barrier from the site, in order to install a fence around the perimeter of the site.
- A community member stated that the MBTA had promised publicly to clean the site just after the time of purchase in 1987, but has done nothing to date.
- The community voiced displeasure with the MBTA since they never acted independently to remedy the site, and in fact had to be forced by the Attorney General's office to take action under court order.
- The overall feeling toward site clean up is that the MBTA should clean up the site first instead of passing this responsibility to a developer with the sale of the property. The community feels that the MBTA continues to shirk its responsibility to clean the site, which continues to pose a risk to the community.
- Concern was voiced about the various cost estimates determined by the MBTA's consultant to clean the property based upon the level of development. The group felt that the cost estimates were not sufficient for a developer to assume the risk of completing site clean up and maintained that the MBTA should sell the property clean.
- The question was asked why the MBTA would not clean up the site. The MBTA's environmental consultant stated that the MBTA was involved in a lengthy process under DEP guidelines and that continuance of that process was now timely to proceed with plans for future re-use of the site.
- The group questioned whether or not the MBTA had to clean the site to a pristine condition subject to the court order. The MBTA's environmental consultant stated that the level of clean up was dictated by the DEP and that it was estimated that \$1,000,000 would complete the remediation to a standard suitable for industrial uses.
- The group questioned why the site was suddenly protected with a fence and the issue of contamination surfaced. The MBTA consultant stated that the DEP became involved in the site during a routine "records" review. The group then maintained that the MBTA should abide by the court order and deliver the property to a cleaned to the standard for residential uses.

- The group discussed the concept of cleaning the site to the standard required for a particular level of development. An industrial development would require the least amount of remediation and a residential development would require the highest level of site clean up.
- The group questioned whether clean up would require the removal of soil to a depth of ten feet. MBTA's consultant stated that monitoring wells throughout the site did not indicate contamination in the groundwater. Furthermore, contamination of the soil was limited to the top six inches.
- A question was asked about the required level of remediation to the approximately five acres of the site to be retained by the MBTA. MBTA's consultant stated that the retained acreage would have to be cleaned to the DEP standard for its intended use.
- The group learned that most heavily contaminated portion of the site was located in Dedham and that consistent testing procedures used throughout the site including testing of the soil piles.
- The group questioned the level of contamination under the cement pad on the site. MBTA's consultant stated that the pad was an impervious cap to any contamination below it and required no further action pursuant to DEP regulations.
- The group questioned if the Dedham acreage required clean up to a standard that would support residential uses since it was zoned Residential. The MBTA consultant explained that the level of remediation was based on the future use of the property. A residential use would require a residential standard where an industrial use would be subject to an industrial standard.
- The group expressed concern that a developer might propose a plan for the site and then determine that the clean up costs would make the proposal unfeasible, and then walk away from the obligation to remediate. The MBTA explained that the DEP clock continues to run and that the developer would have to move forward with the clean up. If the selected development team fails to meet this obligation which, the MBTA would be obligated to complete the clean up. The group expressed a lack of trust in the MBTA to step back into and complete the process should a developer walk away.
- The group expressed concern that the MBTA's profit motive (the requirement that they sell to the highest responsible and eligible bidder) worked to prohibit effective clean up of the site. The concern was expressed that if a developer does not have enough resources to both clean and develop the site, the clean up would be short funded in favor of the development.

#### TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS

- Initial discussion centered around traffic impacts from new development on neighborhood streets. Concern was voiced that too many of the neighborhood roads empty onto W. Milton Street, which is already too congested.
- Concern that W. Milton Street already carries considerable commercial traffic and the proposed access ways into the site via private ways running through W. Milton St. residences would cause additional hardship. Area residences already suffer from structural degradation.
- Access to the site from Four Corners might be more acceptable, but any residential development on the site would still require the new development to be accessed through existing residential neighborhoods.

#### LAND USE AND ZONING

- The group expressed their displeasure with any potential industrial development, and was concerned that an industrial user might submit the highest bid, thereby controlling future reuse of the site.

- The group proposed that the MBTA trade this site with the city for some other city owned land and that the city complete the clean up and convert the site to a park.
- The group expressed a preference that the site environmental clean up be completed and that there be no new development.

#### **Group # 4**

**Group Moderator:** Jim McCarthy

**Community Captain:** Victor Carrara

**Note Taker:** Kelley Race

#### ENVIRONMENT AND QUALITY OF LIFE

- What is the extent of clean up?
- Who approves selection of the clean up contractor and how can the community be sure that a responsible contractor is selected.

#### TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS

- Currently traffic Sprague St is very congested – too many cars.
- The community is very concerned about any new access to the site from W. Milton St.
- Existing St. Ann’s Church / Rectory traffic causes Sprague St. and W. Milton to back up. New development must improve access and circulation to the church.
- Sprague Street Bridge is in need of repair - \$9M may be available [from the State?] for reconstruction. Redevelopers of the site may need to include fixing the bridge.
- Boston bears an unfair portion of the truck route burdens – the adjacent municipalities should bear their fair share.
- Boston bears the burden for access routes – the adjacent municipalities should bear their fair share.
- The school bus storage yard generates a lot of traffic. Currently vehicles enter and exit the site twice a day.

#### LAND USE AND ZONING

- The Boston portion of the site should be zoned for residential redevelopment.
- MBTA developer selection process needs to assure community that both site developer and contractors are responsible community employers with proven track records for providing fair wages; pension and health care benefits, job training and apprenticeship opportunities.

END - JULY 24' 2003 COMMUNITY MEETING - BREAKOUT GROUP NOTES

## ATTACHEMENT C

### Readville Neighborhood Committee – Rail Yard Use

Notes provided by: Ray Foley

77 W. Milton St. Readville, MA 02136;  
(H) 617- 361-8572 or (W) 617-449-1265.  
email [rfoley@processfacilities.com](mailto:rfoley@processfacilities.com).

1. The MBTA should be made to meet the court ordered clean up of the Rail Yard and not try to pass it off to a developer.
2. The MBTA should give the people of Readville and Dedham an answer to the past questions of:
  - Why they did not inform the neighbors of the rail yard that the land was contaminated when they discovered the problem?
  - Why they did not bother to even put up a sign for 10 years?
3. The Readville / Dedham Land use committee back in 1986 overwhelmingly endorsed the use of the land for residential use or secondly open-space. Therefore the land should be cleaned up to be the level required for residential use. Not industrial as proposed by the MBTA.
4. Readville is already saddled with enough industry.
  - Commuter Rail Storage
  - Grants
  - Bus storage (with no community input)
  - Several construction firms
5. There are still numerous vacant industrial buildings in the Westinghouse complex and along Hyde Park Ave. that should be utilized before adding new industrial facilities.
6. Readville is still zoned for Industrial while Dedham has already rezoned their portion of the land for residential, Therefore making the purchase of the land less attractive to any developer.
7. Dedham has privatized both of the access roads, thus forcing any access to the property through Readville.
8. The one access road is already a hazard (buses, trucks, commuter traffic). There has already been a fatality in the area.
9. The people on West Milton Street have had to endure enough already between having industry and railroads polluting the area.
  - Buses running diesel fuel
  - Rail cars running diesel fuel
  - Construction
  - Burtman iron works Paint fumes

## **ATTACHMENT D**

### **Boston Transportation Department – Submittal Requirements**

The developer will be responsible for assessing and mitigating the short-term and long-term impacts of the proposed project and submitting the following documentation to BTM:

1) Transportation Access Plan – The Transportation Access Plan (TAP) shall fully describe all transportation-related issues surrounding the proposed project. It should include the following principal components:

- Description of Existing Transportation Conditions – A summary of existing general and truck traffic, public transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and parking conditions in the study area.
- Evaluation of the Proposed Project’s Impacts – A detailed description of the proposed project and a detailed analysis of the proposed project’s long-term impacts on traffic, public transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and parking conditions.
- Mitigation of the Proposed Project’s Long-Term Transportation Impacts – Identify appropriate measures to mitigate the proposed project impacts, including physical and operational improvements, transportation demand management (TDM), and long-term proposed project impact monitoring.
- Description of the Proposed Project’s Short-Term Impacts and Proposed Mitigation – A general overview of the proposed project’s construction impacts, construction schedule and phasing, and measures to mitigate the short-term impacts. This will be a summary of the more detailed Construction Management Plan (CMP) to be submitted to BTM under a separate cover.

The TAP will comprise of the transportation components of the proposed project’s various environmental filings, such as the Draft Project Impact Report (DRIP) or the Final Project Impact Report (FPIR). The TAP may be a separate document. In any case, the TAP should adhere to the guidelines and scope of work in the BTM Transportation Access Plan Guidelines.

2) Construction Management Plan: The Construction Management Plan (CMP) shall include a detail proposal for the proposed project’s construction: schedule, phasing, occupancy of the public right-of-way, access and delivery requirements, transportation impacts, and mitigation. The developer shall submit the CMP to BTM, under separate cover from the TAP. The proposed project’s general contractor typically prepares the CMP. Guidelines for preparation of the CMP are available from BTM. The CMP shall be completed prior to the issuance of a Building Permit from the City of Boston’s Inspectional Services Department (ISD).

3) Transportation Access Plan Agreement: The Transportation Access Plan Agreement (TAPA) is a formal legal agreement between the developer and BTM. The TAPA formalizes the findings of the TAP, the mitigation commitments, elements of access and physical design, and any other responsibilities of the developer and BTM. Since the TAPA must incorporate the results of the technical analysis, physical design, and assessment of mitigation requirements, it must be executed after these processes have been completed. However, the TAPA must be executed prior to approval of the proposed project design through the City of Boston’s Public Improvement Commission (PIC). An electronic copy of the basic TAPA form is available from BTM. It is the developers responsibility to complete the TAPA so that it reflects the specific findings and commitments for the proposed project, and to get BTM review and approval of the document. The completion of the mitigation identified in the TAPA is a condition for a Permit of Occupancy from ISD.

## **ATTACHMENT E**

City of Boston “A Citizen’s Guide to Development Review under Article 80 of the Boston Zoning Code”

The following Inter-net link is for downloading a PDF version of this document:

<http://www.cityofboston.gov/bra/PDF/Documents/Article%2080%20Citizens%20Guide.pdf>

Potential respondents may obtain a copy of this document by either writing or visiting the Boston Redevelopment Authority at Boston City Hall, One City Hall Square, Boston, MA 02210 or by visiting the Boston Redevelopment Authority’s Web site and downloading a PDF version from the main page.

<http://www.cityofboston.gov/bra/default.asp>

END – A CITIZEN’S GUIDE TO DEVELOPMENT REVIEW UNDER ARTICLE 80