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ABSTRACT

The effectiveness of community development alone, as a means for improving the conditions of the poor and their environment, has been questioned by many. Action for Boston Community Development, Inc. (ABCD) the designated Community Action Agency for Boston is one group which raises this question; the recent evolution of ABCD's role in community development reflects this agency's resolve to be involved in this process.

In the summer of 1979, ABCD is scheduled to receive a grant award from the Community Services Administration to design and implement a comprehensive community economic development program in the Boston neighborhood of Mattapan.

This thesis is designed to determine the feasibility and viability of ABCD incorporating community economic and development activities into its program operations, and the structural role that it should adopt in this area, considering its traditional role as a human services agency.

Phillip Clay, Associate Professor
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INTRODUCTION

In 1961, the Mayor of Boston, his Development Administrator, members of Boston's civic elite, and politically prominent people created Action for Boston Community Development, Inc. (ABCD), an agency which was later to be designated as the community action agency for the City of Boston. Since 1961, ABCD's role in community development has been an evolving one influenced by its clientele and its primary funding source, the federal government.

The demands which have been made on ABCD by these two groups have seldom been in accord. Its clientele have pushed for a combination of human service programs and economic development programs; the federal government maintained that the two types of programs were best delivered by separate agencies.

In 1979, ABCD is scheduled to receive a grant award from the Community Services Administration to design and implement a comprehensive community economic development program in the Boston neighborhood of
This thesis is designed to determine whether ABCD is capable of incorporating community economic development activities into its program operations, and the role that it should adopt, considering its traditional role as a human service agency. This determination will be made by considering four elements:

1) the goals of ABCD,
2) the resources of ABCD,
3) the resources of Mattapan, and
4) the needs of the residents of Mattapan.

Community Action Agencies can be a strong resource for community economic development activities. If ABCD is successful in its endeavors, there is a strong possibility that the agency will receive additional funds. The structural role that is adopted by ABCD can have a great impact on the development of the community, the agency's short and longterm goals and its chances of receiving additional funds. The information provided in this thesis should provide a guideline that ABCD can follow to determine its best strategy. The design of this task is as follows:

The first chapter will examine the evolution of the role of ABCD in community development. The relationship between ABCD and the federal government has been one in which each has been influenced by the other, and each of their roles in community development
has been shaped, in part, by this contact. The roles of the two in community development will therefore be integrated in the examination. Current perspectives on community development will be discussed in the introduction to Chapter I.

Chapter II will examine the experience of ABCD in community economic development. This chapter will also include a brief section on the role of the federal government in this field. The reasons for this inclusion are two-fold:

1) The federal government has been the primary funding source for the community economic development movement, thus rendering the movement heavily dependent upon the government's fund; and

2) The way in which the federal government has promoted community economic development has had a direct bearing on the role of CAAs in this field.

Current perspectives on community economic development will be discussed in the introduction to Chapter II.

The third chapter examines Mattapan, the proposed site for ABCD's community economic development activities. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section documents the prevailing demographic, economic, and housing conditions in Mattapan. The second section cites the concerns of the residents regarding their neighborhood, and the responses of both the residents and the city government to these conditions.
Chapter IV cites alternative structural roles that ABCD can play in Mattapan and examines the capability of ABCD to play the roles. The chapter concludes with this author's recommendation for the role that ABCD should play in the economic development of Mattapan.
Introduction

As a discipline, community development is relatively new, having been recognized after World War II. As a concept, however, the roots of community development are firmly embedded in the social development of this country. The genealogy of community development is attributed to a union between economic development and community organization. That is, it is believed that community development combines the emphasis on local action and local resources that characterize the community organization field, with the emphasis on planning and systematic movements toward defined goals that one finds in the economic development field.¹

There is no single definition of community development; rather, the term has been defined in a variety of ways depending upon the position and the perspective of the viewer. Social scientists in the field have cited four forms in which community development can be
defined: as a process, as a method, as a program and and a movement. The forms are not mutually exclusive, nor are the distinctions between the four precise. However, the relative importance given to these forms by social scientists in this field makes a brief discussion of them appropriate within the context of a discussion on community development.

As a process, community development refers to the developmental stages traversed by a community as it moves from one condition to the next. In one author's view, community development as a process refers to "the progression of events that is planned by the participants to serve goals they progressively choose." In this regard, strong emphasis is placed on what happens to those involved in or affected by community development efforts.

As a method, community development is viewed as a set of procedures, or techniques for meeting an end. The strategies used can range from imposition, to self-determination. As one author states

Central planners, economic developers, and those representing some one professional field may look upon community development in terms of whether it will or will not help them achieve the concrete material goals they have in mind... The process is guided for a particular purpose... The emphasis in this case is on the end result.
Community development can be used as a program when content is added to sets of procedures. It is within this context that the broad notion of community development becomes focused on special areas such as health, recreation, education and the like. The emphasis here is on "accompanying sets of activities which can be quantified and reported."

Finally, as a movement, community development is viewed as a spontaneous "crusade" or a cause which is emotionally charged. For the purpose of this chapter community development will be defined in the context of the interpretations of the federal government and the community action agency (CAA), Action for Boston Community Development, Inc.

From the perspective of the federal government, community development refers to federal efforts to improve the environment and living conditions of all citizens. This perspective was espoused by both Presidents Johnson and Nixon when speaking of their community development efforts. According to the Brookings Institute, federal policymaking for community development had four basic concerns:

1) Physical improvements of the urban environment;

2) Improvement of the social aspects of urban conditions;

3) Improvement in the performance of local government; and
4) Increased participation by local residents in making decisions that affect their own communities.  

The evolution of federal community development policies has been marked by a somewhat circular pattern. The first series of community development programs began in 1949. These programs concentrated on the physical aspects of neighborhoods, and gave little attention to the participation of low-income persons. The disturbances of the mid-1960's jolted the federal government out of its physical improvement program mode. It was during this decade that the federal government made efforts to integrate physical improvement programs with social service programs, and made steps toward increasing the participation of low-income persons.

The last federal community development policies discussed in this thesis reflect a regression toward earlier policies which strongly emphasized physical development strategies and deemphasized the participation of low-income persons.

In contrast, the role of ABCD in community development followed a path which was more linear. Its definition of community development shifted in the mid-1960's, but the basic tenets of the revised definition have remained the same since that time.

13
The term community development first appeared in federal legislation in the Housing Act of 1949, Title I, which was captioned "Slum Clearance and Community Development and Redevelopment." The ultimate objective of this act was to provide a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family. The preamble of the act stated that:

The general welfare and security of the nation and the health and living standards of its people require housing production and realized community development sufficient to remedy the serious housing shortage, the elimination of substandard and other inadequate housing through the clearance of slums and other blighted areas...7

The program met its goals of "...a decent home and suitable living environment for (some) American families," but only at the expense of thousands of low income persons. In a history of federal programs, Frieden and Kaplan stated that the critics discovered that "the cities were using urban renewal to refurbish the central business district, build housing for middle and upper-income families, and to bolster their property tax."8 Inevitably, the locations designated for urban renewal formerly housed low-income persons. Few of the previous residents were able to return to the "renewed" neighborhoods since the housing commanded rents which effectively priced them out of the market.
The urban renewal program was, at least for the poor, an ineffective program. It was a program of extreme opposites. Urban renewal aggravated rather than improved the conditions of slum residents; decreased rather than increased the amount of housing available to low and moderate income persons; contributed to rather than prevented racial polarization; disrupted rather than fostered neighborhood community development; demolished more structures than it constructed; and began more projects than it completed.

Despite the negative ramifications of the urban renewal program, there were those who continued to endorse physical improvement programs. Policymakers were fond of physical rehabilitation programs because the results were more easily measurable than social programs. Business and trade unions that were related to the construction industry were fond of physical improvement programs because of the potential benefits they could gain from such activities. Local officials were fond of this approach because they felt that such activities would increase the tax base, and enhance the aesthetic quality of their localities. The officials hoped that a visually attractive city would encourage upper and middle income people to return to the city. With such a large and influential support group pressing for physical improvement programs, it
is not surprising that the government continued to enact and fund programs which focused exclusively on physical improvements.

In 1955, the federal government introduced a public works program. This program, legislated as Title II, of the Housing Amendments of 1955 provided loans to local governments. These loans were to be used in financing projects such as street improvements, construction or improvements on buildings other than schools, recreation facility upgrading/construction and other public works projects which were not eligible for aid under other federal agency programs. In keeping with this physical orientation of community development, Congress later added section 706 to the Housing Act of 1961. Under this provision, cities received grants for beautification projects that were targeted for public places.

In Boston, an urban renewal program that was implemented in the neighborhood of the West End in 1958 resulted in the displacement of thousands of low-income residents when over 9000 dwellings were razed. The replacement housing that was built in the West End consisted of high-rise luxury apartments. This action not only aroused the anger of those who had been displaced, but also that of the City Council of Boston.

The legacy of the West End experience influenced
the behavior of subsequent city administrations and was responsible, in a large part, to the creation of ABCD.

**The Origins of Action For Boston Community Development**

After coming into office in 1959 Mayor John Collins, successor to the Administration which had perpetrated the damage in the West End, found himself torn between wanting to renew the central business district of Boston in a way that would appeal to bankers, realtors, downtown businessmen, and middle-class residents, but which would not raise the ire of the City Council. It was feared that recalcitrant council members could cripple the entire renewal program. Compounding Mayor Collins' dilemma was pressure from the Housing and Home Finance Administration which required that local renewal agencies supply evidence of citizen participation in their planning processes. To circumvent potential problems, Mayor Collins, his Development Administrator, and representatives from two social service agencies in Boston created an organization which would promote the human side of urban renewal. In 1961, Mayor Collins appointed the first full-time staff of ABCD and charged them with the responsibility of determining the course that the new organization would follow. The staff was comprised of 10 people who were members of the social-service, business, academic and civic sectors.
of Boston.

During the early months of operation the organization's activity was geared primarily to the development of citizen participation in urban renewal. In 1961 citizen participation in urban renewal meant citizen support of urban renewal activities in Boston. ABCD hired community development specialists and assigned them to urban renewal designated areas for the purpose of promoting this support. However, these specialists encountered strong opposition against urban renewal from local residents in these areas. ABCD found itself in the uncomfortable position of either organizing against the Collins administration, its source of public funding, or challenging the autonomy of affiliated local groups.  

In 1962, ABCD received a grant from the Ford Foundation through the Gray Area's Program and the organization shifted its primary emphasis from community development to social service planning and program design. Although the primary financial support for ABCD's early efforts was provided by the Ford Foundation, other funds soon flowed from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. However, neither this source nor the other provided guaranteed permanent financing, but instead allocated funds based on a competitive proposal review system. And, the continuance of ABCD's
funding depended upon its ability to design programs that satisfied the requirements of its funding sources.

The composition of the staff and board of ABCD remained basically the same until late 1962 when directives came from Washington that the ABCD board be broadened to become a "microcosm" of the community. ABCD's chosen definition of microcosm was community power structure. The board of ABCD was expanded to include 35 "politically prominent people, and wealthy business persons with broad civic interests." There were no representatives from Boston's low-income population on the board. As a result, the planning processes of the board have been described by one critic as an "effort of 'experts' to articulate goals for an entire community of which they are not a part."13

This definition of microcosm was not challenged by the Ford Foundation or the President's Commission on Juvenile Delinquency. Although both assumed that substantial change would not occur unless the target people themselves are involved in the action, involvement can have a range of meanings. As one evaluator stated

involvement and participation by 'the target people' are highly ambiguous goals, of course, and the foundation --like everyone else-- favored them if they meant merely that programs should reach their targets and affect the people they were aimed at, but any more radical interpretation of these phrases was foreign to the Gray Areas Program.14
Neither the Delinquency Demonstration Program nor the Gray Area Program were meant to be experiments in resident participation. The purpose of the programs was to encourage localities to construct proposals based on social science theories and to test their validity. The aim of the program was to benefit the entire community while producing measurably visible effects. Although its clients were the disadvantaged, as a semi-public, semi-private organization, the constituents of ABCD were vague and elusive.

The combination of these circumstances: the lack of a defined constituency; the lack of permanent financing and assured status within some established institutional hierarchy; and the need to design programs which would produce measurably visible effects created an environment in which ABCD became opportunistic, and used community development as both a method and a program. Their emphasis was placed more heavily on executing activities that had been determined by the 'experts', in keeping with the goal of satisfying the Ford Foundation and benefiting the entire community, than on its disadvantaged clients.

In 1964, with the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Community Action Program (CAP) was created, and ABCD was designated by the Mayor of Boston and the Boston City Council as the official CAA. ABCD
was thus formally charged with the responsibility of "...opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity." The Economic Opportunity Act grew out of the federal government's intentions to:

- Redirect and coordinate government to concentrate on the most pressing social needs;
- Explore and promote innovation in meeting these needs; and
- Allow those affected by the resources to determine their own needs and contribute to the planning.

Soon after its enactment, the Community Action Program received a large amount of federal support. Federal expenditures were reported at $237 million in fiscal year 1965 and $628 million in fiscal year 1966. And, by 1965 more than 500 CAAs across the nation had been funded.

The first director of the Community Action Program, Jack Conway, was a strong advocate for a balanced relationship between the three local interest groups that had to be involved in community action: public officials, private agencies, and representatives of the poor. Despite its new form as a CAA, and the position of the national CAP director, ABCD made no efforts toward achieving such a balance until 1965. During this year local civil rights leaders represented
themselves and their low-income constituents as a force that was determined to "end planning for people and with people and begin a program whereby the people can plan for themselves." Concommitant with the demands made by community groups, throughout the nation, many persons were protesting vehemently for the prohibition of further urban renewal efforts, a program which had fully embodied the statement "planning for people and with people." 18

Academicians and researchers alike had produced works which supported the allegations of the people that the urban renewal program merely exacerbated problems of the poor. Finally in the face of such literature and reports, in combination with the visible results of the program, even public officials who supported the program admitted that the urban renewal program failed miserably as a program for eradicating slum conditions in this country. As Norman V. Watson, Acting Assistant Secretary for Renewal and Housing Management was later to admit:

It has often been said by our critics that we have been responsive to the relocation needs of project residents. It has been said, for example, that urban renewal is nothing more than Negro removal. It has been said that we consider relocation as no more than a hurdle which must be overcome to implement the urban renewal plan, and that we pay scant attention to relocation practices. We have been accused of violating the law and of contravening our own administrative regulations.
And today we are being called 'legal lawbreakers.' It is time to be honest with each other and to admit that there is some validity to these allegations. 19

These circumstances could not help but give validity to those demanding changes in the composition of the board of ABCD. As a result OEO delayed the funding of ABCD programs until the Board or Directors adhered to the "maximum feasible participation" clause of the Economic Opportunity Act. In acquiescence the Board released 23 of its old members from duty and added 22 new members. The majority of the new members were chosen at public meetings held by community organizations at the local level. At the end of this transformation, the revised Board had a significantly larger number of blacks, civil rights workers, and persons from low-income families. The reconstituted Board established a decentralized system so that services would be delivered at the neighborhood level.

To create local community institutions, ABCD developed the Kennedy Family Service Center in Charlestown, and the Roxbury Multi-Service Center. Neighborhood Legal Service offices sponsored by ABCD were, for the first time, located in low-income residential neighborhoods under the name Boston Legal Assistance Project (BLAP). Through the joint efforts of ABCD, the residents of Columbia Point, and Tufts University, the first comprehensive Neighborhood Health Center in the nation
was developed in Columbia Point. Publicly funded family planning services were offered to the residents of Boston in cooperation with City Hospital. In addition, community action multi-service centers were organized in eleven Boston neighborhoods by ABCD, known as Area Planning Action Councils (APACs); pre-school Head Start centers in collaboration with concerned parents and community leaders were created in twenty-seven neighborhood locations; and Neighborhood Employment Centers (NECs) were opened throughout the city. The APACs were constituted as non-profit corporations which maintain their own board of directors, composed of residents of the community, the majority of whom are elected by their neighbors.

The idea of community development efforts that promoted maximum participation to the extent of self-determination, and the mobilization of the poor through a government financed program was not favorably received by many officials, civic elite, or intellectuals. One member of Boston's civic elite observed that "letting the poor run the poverty program seemed as foolish to him as sending his children to a school run by children."20 And, a well-known sociologist wrote in the New York Times Magazine in 1966 that:

> It is a grand spectacle, not simply of democracy at work, but of democracy trying to stimulate the response that makes it work better. The danger is
that the degree of social order that any social system needs will be undermined.21

In addition to protestations by civil rights advocates regarding the CAP program, a group of mayors also registered complaints about the program during that same year. The latter group, however, protested that CAAs were mobilizing the poor against them and therefore working to the detriment of city hall functions. The protests of this latter group were given greater weight by President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey and resultant attempts were made to reduce the role of the poor in policymaking. In addition the CAP budget was severely cut by the President.

The negativism that was directed toward the CAP influenced the citizen participation aspect of the next broad-based federal community development program -- Model Cities. In addition, the inability of the Model Cities program to implement its key strategies ultimately affected later developments in the role of ABCD in community development.

The Model Cities Program

The resigned recognition of the inadequacies of the urban renewal program contributed to the disillusionment and growing disenchantment that was felt by many about the federal government's inability to effectively address problems of urban decay. These feelings
were expressed, in part in critical essays, by protest marches and demonstrations. They finally culminated in rioting by those who had suffered the most from the government's ineffectiveness. These activities served as an impetus for the federal government to resume its efforts to design a program which would be efficient, effective, and produce visible signs of improvement.

As a result of these efforts, in 1966 Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, presented the Model Cities program. This program was an attempt to address and make up for the shortcomings and the failures of past government attempts to eradicate the problems of neighborhood and urban decay. And, unlike the CAP which was viewed by some as an "advance guard for the overthrow of local establishments," Model Cities was intended to create government and partnership between residents and city government.\textsuperscript{22} Because of its design, the success of the Model Cities program depended, in a large part, upon the ability of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to implement three strategies: the coordination of federal programs which affected model neighborhoods; the concentration of resources in designated poverty neighborhoods; and the mobilization of local leadership to achieve active citizen participation in the target areas.\textsuperscript{23} HUD felt that coordination was needed to insure that any programs
with the potential to affect the model neighborhoods would be complementary to the activities of the Model Cities program. HUD therefore wanted to create a means through which these programs would be subject to review by its delegate agency, the City Demonstration Agency (CDA), and to approval by the local executive of the participating city. Of the three agencies whose activities HUD sought to coordinate: the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), the Department of Labor (DOL), and the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), none were of assistance to HUD. Neither was HUD successful in implementing its concentration strategy. This strategy would have resulted in concentrating a large amount of money among a small number of specially chosen areas. In actuality, Congress decreased the funding and increased the number of areas, effectively reducing the potential impact of the program.

Federal legislation mandated that widespread citizen participation be included in a city's program. Sherry Arnstein, chief advisor on citizen participation for the Model Cities program, felt that the standards that the government had established were "suggestive rather than prescriptive, permissive rather than restrictive, and a statement of minima rather than optima." Studies of Model Cities programs nationwide
found that cities did develop structures and processes in accordance to the established government standards. The laxness of the standards, however, permitted cities to circumvent meaningful citizen participation.

This reluctance to cite specific requirements for citizen participation has been attributed in a large measure to the negative reaction that resulted from OEO's maximum participation guidelines in the CAP legislation. In addition to endorsing weak citizen's participation guidelines in the Model Cities program, Congress passed an amendment in 1967 which gave each local establishment the authority to place the local CAA under its jurisdiction. The Green Amendment also required CAA's to have their board of directors evenly divided between city officials, the private sector and low-income persons. In order to maintain its ability to provide a vehicle through which low-income persons throughout the city of Boston would have the right to self-determination, ABCD managed to arrange a formal agreement with the Mayor of Boston in which the 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 requirement would not be upheld. Rather, ABCD's board was made up of 9 city councilmen, 25 low-income persons, and 17 persons from public, private, and academic sectors.

The role of ABCD in community development was strengthened by national attempts to reduce the
effectiveness of the CAP. Those members of the Board who were, for the first time, involved in a recognized position in the politics of survival gained experience in dealing with the established power structure. According to one author, through the CAP, the poor gained this experience

...by the institutional and procedural means that articulated with that structure. These means included the CAA's themselves and the panoply of rules of the game, in relations with the federal government, with local city or state officials, and other local majority community leaders in business, welfare, health, and so on. 25

This politicization went beyond the board members, and was extended to practically all low-income persons who were involved in the program.

Through the medium of the CAA's a short generation of poverty community leadership has been subsidized and taught how to deal with the structures that had been closed to them in the past. 26

In addition, a fact of primary significance is that low-income people were able to gain these skills through a meaningful employment. CAA benefits provided people with meaningful jobs.

For example it was no longer necessary for a woman to earn her living as a domestic and only have a small amount of energy and time to work for the betterment of her neighborhood... instead (through CAAs), she had a chance to be paid to do just that sort of organizing. 27
Despite ABCD's effectiveness in bringing about these changes, or perhaps because of this effectiveness, the final evolution of the federal government in community development was aimed to further reduce if not neutralize the effectiveness of the CAP as a vehicle for the poor for self-determination.

**New Federalism**

The role of the Nixon administration in community development reflected that administration's theory that though state and local government have not always been responsive to the needs of all people, they are the bulwark of the American political system and have the ultimate responsibility for the health and welfare of the populace. Through the efforts of the Nixon administration, the focus of the War on Poverty was completely shifted.

In order to make the Model Cities program a Republican program, reflective of the "New Federalism" philosophy, the program was essentially transformed into a mayor's program rather than a poor people's program.

First, the program focus was shifted from one in which the priority overall objective was to "enhance the capability and commitment of local governments to respond to the needs of its poorest neighborhoods and poorest residents," to a program in which the basic
mission was to:

enhance the capability and commitment of local governments, working with neighborhood residents, to marshal the public and private resources needed to solve the problems underlying blight and poverty...with the objective of improving the quality of life of all its citizens.30

Second, where the Johnson Administration put pressure on city halls to accommodate neighborhood groups, the Nixon Administration dissuaded city halls from doing this. In keeping with the new philosophy, the program emphasized the structural reform of local governments and aimed for further decentralization of authority to local governments.

Finally, where the Johnson Administration encouraged cities to be innovative in their approach to aid the poor, the Nixon Administration was concerned with innovative methods for reforming the grant-in-aid system. Under the Nixon administration, the CAP along with other human services programs, was designated for elimination. Because several CAAs had been successful in politicizing and organizing the poor, the CAAs and their constituents were able to circumvent the execution of this action. Though the CAP was not eliminated, administrative efforts to design a Republican community development program which would fully embody the "New Federalism" philosophy negatively impacted the CAP. The result of these efforts was a "Special Revenue
Sharing" proposal. This proposal was later signed into law by Gerald Ford as the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act, commonly referred to as the Community Development Block Grant Program. The overall affect of this program was to provide benefits to the affluent, while falling far below its potential to help those places and persons most in need--seriously deteriorated neighborhoods, older cities for whom much of the housing stock was substandard and overcrowded, the poor, and the aged.

Conclusion

The evolution of the role of ABCD in community development reflects its efforts to define what the process of community development should be. In its early stages, perceiving community development as a method, ABCD appeared to be more concerned with its agenda than with what was happening to its clientele. The strategy that the agency used during that time was one of imposition, patterning itself, if not by design then by result, after the urban renewal program, the first federally-sponsored community development program.

After being designated as the CAA of Boston the agency, along with CAAs across the country, was forced to restructure the composition of its board of directors to give representation to the poor. At this point, the
concern of the agency was directed toward the process of community development; that is, creating an environment in which the poor could exercise their right of self-determination. This change in CAA structure was challenged by city officials who viewed the movement as being anti-city hall. The result: the enactment of the Green Amendment and cuts in the budget of the CAP.

Federal officials then created the Model Cities program which emphasized a coordinated approach to solving urban problems, and de-emphasized citizen participation. Finally, with the change in the federal administration in 1968 came a change in priority regarding empowerment of the poor as the Nixon Administration attempted to neutralize the small amount of influence that the poor had attained.

In the face of efforts to reduce its effectiveness, ABCD brought and continues to bring many benefits to the low-income residents of Boston. Broadly speaking, ABCD:

- Politicized the poor who were involved in the Community Action Program;
- Provided a vehicle through which people who had informal influence in their communities or who had leadership potential could further develop and formalize their skills; and
- Provided participants with meaningful employment and the opportunity for upward mobility.
More specifically, ABCD:

- Completely insulated and weatherized 800 low-income housing units in Boston;

- Provided 14,000 families (many of them elderly) with financial assistance to pay their heating bills during the winter months;

- Deleaded 150 homes in which "children at risk" live;

- Provides a Head Start program for approximately 2,000 3-5 year old children each year;

- Conducts a community college program in which 400 staff and community people participate and have the opportunity to gain an official Associate of Arts degree; and

- Provides employment, training, and income to the disadvantaged youth through summer and year round programs. As of 1977, 95,000 youth had participated in the program.

Despite these and other benefits of ABCD's activities, human services alone will never eliminate poverty in this country. Generally speaking, power and economic self-sufficiency co-exist, and it is these factors that are sorely lacking in poor communities. Human services, though certainly an essential element in low-income communities, does not establish economic power, influence, or independence for residents of these communities. It can therefore never provide the security that residents of low-income communities need.

ABCD has been adept at coordinating a full range of human services for the disadvantaged of all age
groups and races. However, because the problems of
the poor are so complicated, uni-dimensional efforts
are not sufficient as solutions; rather, comprehensive,
coordinated development strategies are needed. As one
author aptly stated:

The synthesis between business corporations and community change agencies,
combining the positive elements of each
(can bring) social, political, economic,
and psychological benefits to community
residents that neither approach could
accomplish alone.31

In essence, this synthesis can create a synergism,
a situation in which the simultaneous action of the
two agencies together have a greater total effect than
the sum of their individual effects. ABCD is not un-
aware of the limitations of a strictly human services
approach, but has attempted to achieve an inter-
connectedness between community development activities
and community economic development activities. The
attempts are viewed by many within the agency as an
evolutionary progression of ABCD's role in community
development, and will be examined in Chapter II.
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CHAPTER II
Introduction

Community economic development encompasses the same elements as economic development: business creation, identification of new resources and talent, improvement of social and physical environment, and job creation. The point of difference between the two, however, is that community economic development is used to promote economic growth under the direction and for the benefit of, local residents. Stewart Perry, former director of the Center for Community Economic Development (CCED) in Cambridge, Massachusetts defines community economic development as:

...the creation or strengthening of economic organizations (or, more technically, economic institutions) that are controlled or owned by the residents of the area in which they are located or in which they will exert primary influence. The institutions that are owned or controlled locally can include such forms as business firms, industrial development parks, housing development corporations, banks, credit unions, and the cooperatives and CDCs (community development corporations) themselves as the most
broadly generalized, guiding institutions. They might also include organizations (or services) that upgrade the human and social environment in such a way as to increase the economic value and energy of the community.1

Perry, who in addition to his directorship played an integral part in developing the role of OEO in the CDC movement, strongly states that community economic development does not have the eradication of poverty as its immediate aim.

Community economic development by low-income people cannot be expected to correct all the problems caused by the economic system of our society...A CDC will always (or should) find, cooperate with, or develop other local groups and organizations to do a part of the job. No one organization can do it all.2

Community economic development does, however, give people who have traditionally been excluded from mainstream economic institutions the opportunity to design and manage economic institutions that cater to their needs.

The primary vehicle through which community economic development activities have been conducted in the United States has been the Community Development Corporation (CDC). According to Perry, a CDC exhibits all of the following features:

1) It is an institution focused upon developing a specific territorial neighborhood or area, concerned with problems that are peculiar to that area.
2) The major motivation for development is pride in locality or territoriality.

3) Its corporate structure offers shares or membership primarily to residents of the selected area; if shares or membership are offered to non-residents, the offering is such that control remains with the residents.

4) The goals are multiple, but always include the creation of new economic institutions--fiscal, industrial, or business.

5) The CDC is a means of enhancing the whole range of political, social, and economic opportunities for the groups involved.

6) A CDC ordinarily plans to reinvest profits in further economic activities and in human or welfare services.

7) The constituency is most often economically and socially disadvantaged groups. This vehicle has been particularly useful for the disadvantaged because it combines the values of a community with an economic structure of advancement and mobility that is defined by the community that creates the corporation.

The contents of this chapter will include an examination of the early role of the federal government in community economic development and the impact that this role has had on ABCD's involvement in this field.

The genesis of the community economic development movement occurred during the 1960's, the decade in which thousands of inner-city residents vented their frustration and anger by physically destroying institutions and businesses that they felt perpetuated their oppression. It was in the wake of these riots, which left commercial strips in many of the nation's urban
centers gutted by fire, that attention was directed to the economic underdevelopment of the pockets of poverty concentrated in several large cities across the country.

In some communities, local leaders took the initiative to channel the energy of residents into activities that would make their environment, in the terms of one author, "a set of opportunities for its inhabitants, instead of a set of problems."^{4} Among these leaders were Deforest Brown, who helped create the Hough Area Development Corporation in Cleveland, Ohio; Franklin Florence, who created FIGHT in Rochester, New York; and the Reverend Leon Sullivan, who set the Zion Investment Associates into motion in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Each of these organizations embodied, in fact created, the CDC philosophy.^{5}

The Federal Role in Community Economic Development

Senators Robert Kennedy and Jacob Javits saw the need for wide scale change, and sponsored federal legislation that today provides the single most important source of funds for all CDCs. This legislation, Amendment Title I-D of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, promoted an approach which included 3 key variables that federal community development policies lacked:

- comprehensive, coordinated development strategies that were not limited to either human services or physical development;
the inclusion of business development strategies; and

limited funds concentrated in a few projects.

Spurred by these two senators, and a concerned group of OEO planners, the federal government became involved with demonstration projects that were modeled on the grassroot community economic development movement.

In making its determination of the best vehicle for implementing community economic development activities, OEO wanted to insure that the control of community economic development would be in the hands of residents, and not in the political arena. As the planning process of OEO concurred with the introduction of the Green Amendment, the agency did not consider CAAs. The end result was a program in which resident-controlled community development corporations received funds to plan and manage their own projects, while their budget investments were subject to OEO approval. In addition, regulations stipulated that CDC boards must be truly independent of local CAAs. Although OEO circumvented CAAs when choosing a vehicle through which to sponsor community economic development, at the request of its constituents, ABCD became involved in the community development movement.
ABCD and Community Economic Development

Within two years after the Board of Directors and staff of ABCD became more representative of its constituents, the agency became involved in community economic development activities. In a statement made to the OEO in 1969, ABCD cited one of its major concerns in the coming years as "encouraging improvements in the economic environment of Boston's poor neighborhoods."^6

The agency made steps toward this end in 1966 when it established a functional area for economic development as part of an overall plan in which the central program staff was divided into six functional areas. The economic development division maintained a paid professional staff of 2-5 persons for a period of approximately four years.

The purpose of the Economic Development Division was to help low-income families make the wisest use of their own resources through consumer action, education, credit unions and to assist the process of institutional change in the marketing, financial, housing and insurance practices within the inner city. The primary strategies used by the agency to carry out its goal were technical assistance, information dissemination and advocacy. The specific activities of the economic development division are described below.
Consumer Action. The division established cooperatives and provided technical assistance to APACs that wanted to reproduce the cooperatives, fitting the needs of their individual communities. Nine APACs used this assistance, and approximately 100 buying clubs: food, furniture, appliance, and vitamin were established. It is estimated that the food items had an annual sales volume of $80,000 and the furniture and appliance cooperatives had an annual volume of $250,000. The advocacy role of the economic development division was exercised by advising legislators, the State Consumer's Council and the Attorney General's Office on the needs of low-income consumers.

Consumer Education. The division promoted consumer education through the medium of a monthly paper Consumer News. The paper was prepared and published by ABCD and distributed to low-income families by the APACs. The monthly press run was approximately 15,000 copies. In addition to the Consumer News, the economic development division prepared and distributed bi-lingual "Consumer Information" brochures and "Tip Sheets" through the APACs. The division used sound films as an educative tool in local consumer education neighborhood meetings and classes.

Credit Unions. The division provided technical assistance to nine APACs to establish credit unions in 1966. By 1968 there were 13 community action fed-
eral credit unions operating throughout low-income neighborhoods in the city, though most were concentrated in Roxbury and Dorchester. These credit unions had approximately 4000 members with savings of $100,000; 1203 had a total of $63,738 outstanding in credit union low interest loans. Four of the credit unions also issued approximately $200,000 in OEO Family Emergency Loans to nearly 1000 families. The total assets of the 13 credit unions at that time was $275,000.

Institutional Change. The economic development division gave high priority to:

1) Testifying and lobbying for and against various bills and administrative regulations that affected low-income populations, primarily as consumers, but occasionally as producers and sellers.

2) Cooperative efforts with various public and private state groups involved in consumer protection.

3) Advocacy roles before administrative licensing boards.

4) Exploration of possible areas of cooperation with city inspection agencies.

Initially, only four APACs had any commitments to economic development; by 1968, ten out of 11 did. The degree of commitment varied considerably, and budget limitations created a heavy dependence on inexperienced and non-professional leadership.

The economic development division submitted a
proposal which brought twelve VISTA workers who held either bachelor's or master's degrees in economics, accounting, business administration and financial management to Boston. The workers were assigned to the APAC directors to fortify the economic development activities. The assignments were only for the term of one year however, and when they departed at the end of 1968, the agency reverted to its original resources. In 1969, ABCD submitted a Special Impact Program Proposal to OEO under Part D of Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This program would have allowed ABCD to hire qualified economic development persons to its staff and broaden its community economic development activities depending upon local needs. Essentially, the goal of the agency was to help the residents of the eleven targeted low-income neighborhoods create a community economic development aim for every APAC. Despite the organizational structure of ABCD, and the agreement made between ABCD and the city government, which was atypical to many other CAAs, its Special Impact Program Proposal was denied.

Within four years of the start-up date, all of the ABCD/APAC community economic development activities were phased out. The failure of these activities has been attributed to two major deficiencies:
1) A heavy dependence on inexperienced and non-professional leadership; and

2) Insufficient funds during the crucial first few years.

ABCD's involvement in community economic development did not cease in 1970; instead, the form of its involvement changed. For the next year, rather than promoting community economic development activities directly through the APACs, primary attention was directed at providing technical assistance to APACs to facilitate their efforts to establish community economic development corporations. The assistance was primarily in the form of proposal writing and presentations. Through the efforts of ABCD, in 1970, Boston's first OEO funded CDCs were created: The East Boston CDC and Circle Venture Associates.

One year later, ABCD received a contract from the New England Regional Commission (NERCOM) to conduct a needs assessment of the communities along Blue Hill Avenue in the Roxbury, Dorchester, and Mattapan sections of Boston for changes in housing, economic opportunity and social services, and to make recommendations for projects that would meet the residents' needs. The contract was for a one-year planning grant which would be considered for continued funding upon the successful completion of the initial contract. Based on extensive discussions and consultations with citizens groups,
voluntary and government agencies, and all other principal actors, ABCD developed an extensive proposal, Project Build, to meet the most pressing needs in the communities as defined by the residents. Beyond the planning process, no further action was taken on the project. The involvement of ABCD with NERCOM coincided with the period in which the Nixon Administration espoused the "New Federalism" philosophy. NERCOM, as one agency designated for elimination, experienced severe budget cut backs. Consequently, the role that NERCOM could play in facilitating ABCD's community economic development efforts through Project Build was effectively reduced.

ABCD has not been atypical in trying to redefine community development. A large number of CAAs throughout the country have expanded, or have intentions to expand, their traditional social service focus to develop, manage, and assist with community economic development activities in their communities. Several reasons have been cited in explanation of this trend:

- CAAs desire for dependable local dollars that are not subject to political or policy fluctuations.
- Pressures from low-income groups for measures of community control that are predicated on a reliable economic foundation.
- CAA belief that successful community economic development can serve the immediate needs of the poor.
CAA hope that community economic development might offer a better way to underwrite new or extended CAP program efforts.

CAA view that successful community economic development is important in revitalizing low-income communities, enhancing their independence, and strengthening their clout in the political process.13

This trend among CAAs has drawn attention to their role in community economic development on both national and local levels. In 1971 CCED prepared a report which described the economic development needs of a selected group of New England based CAPs. Based on the 1971 needs assessment, and their interaction with various CAAs, in 1976 CCED submitted a proposal to provide community economic development assistance to CAAs in New England to the Community Services Administration. In addition to the support of CCED, a group of New England CAAs and CDCs made steps toward establishing a network when, in 1976, a regional conference was held to discuss issues of community economic development.

Nationally, CAP-related organizations appear to be in the process of reassessing the definition of what constitutes acceptable vehicles for community economic development. In 1977, the national director of the CAP, Frank Jones, stated that CAA participation in community economic development is not illegal. The following year, economic improvement specialists were assigned to each regional CAP office to provide
technical assistance to CAAs. Within this past year, the National CAP Association created an economic development committee to assess the role of CAAs in community economic development.

Despite the growing interest among CSA regional, national, and affiliated groups, little action has taken place. CCED has not received a response to its proposal; the regional economic improvement specialists in Boston plays a brokerage role rather than one of direct assistance; and CSA has not translated the CDC experience to CAAs. CSA has, however, provided financial support to CCED to conduct a study during the summer of 1979 on CAA involvement in community economic development. Also, CSA does provide technical assistance grants to CAAs which can be used to promote community economic development activities.

Recently, ABCD identified Mattapan as a Boston neighborhood that is in need of special services. The agency has received one of these grants from CSA, and it intends to use the funds to sponsor a comprehensive community economic development program in Mattapan.

Conclusion

Because of CSA regulations and the lack of financial support, ABCD has been unable to establish a formal "interconnected" relationship between human services and community development that the Executive
Director of ABCD Inc. feels is sorely needed. In his opinion, ABCD has a massive infrastructure unmatched in Boston which, if given flexibility and support, could develop a system which would implement comprehensive development strategies in low-income neighborhoods in Boston; a system which could meet the human service and economic needs of low-income residents.

As a result, in the past decade, the agency's direct involvement in community economic development through the promotion of ventures has not been stable. Its indirect involvement through advocacy and education, however, has been continuous. In addition, ABCD has promoted the economic development of Boston's low-income communities through its manpower personnel purchasing and leasing policies.

The employment and training component of ABCD concentrates on three major areas:

- finding jobs for the economically disadvantaged;
- training the economically disadvantaged; and
- assisting the economically disadvantaged in becoming job ready.

In addition, the majority of ABCD's staff (83%) reside in low-income communities.

ABCD maintains a list of minority and neighborhood based providers of goods and services. The agency has fostered the use of such vendors, by both ABCD, Central, and its delegate agencies, in the
purchase of services (contracts for construction, remodeling, maintenance, security, printing, etc.) and supplies and equipment. On contracts for which bids are required, such contractors are regularly furnished the bidding requests and specifications. Such vendors account for the expenditure of nearly $500,000 of ABCD and APAC funds annually. Several years ago, when a minority owned banking institution was being formed, ABCD joined other organizations in utilizing the bank as a depository of funds. To date, the agency maintains an account with this institution.

Finally, in terms of its leasing practices, the majority of ABCD and APAC facilities are located in the target neighborhoods and are rented from community based organizations or local landlords. With the receipt of the CSA technical assistance grant, ABCD will have the opportunity to create the "interconnected" relationship that was described earlier in this chapter. Before determining the role that ABCD can play in the economic development of Mattapan, one must first determine if there is a need for community economic development activities in Mattapan. The basis for this need will be explored in Chapter III.
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CHAPTER III
Introduction

In the past two decades, the City of Boston has experienced dramatic shifts in population. Much has been made of the emigration of the middle class from the City to the suburbs, and the impact that this shift has had on the economic well-being of Boston. However, little attention and coverage has been given to the less dramatic but equally significant changes which have occurred in the Boston neighborhood of Mattapan.

Boston is a city of seventeen neighborhoods. In the early 1960's ABCD Inc., along with the federal government, surveyed these neighborhoods and identified eleven of them as having significant low-income populations in need of specialized services. The remaining neighborhoods were solidly enough populated by middle and upper-income residents to be deemed economically and socially stable and not in need of such
services.

Since this time, the population and the related physical and psycho-social conditions in the previously "non-targeted" neighborhood of Mattapan has changed. Beginning in the late 1960's and early 1970's, the Blue Hill Avenue/Norfolk section of Boston witnessed an influx of new families.

Many of these new residents were from Boston, while others were migrants, new to the Boston area. The majority, however, were both economically and ethnically different from the old residents. As the homogeneity of the neighborhood changed, many old residents became fearful about the future of their neighborhood. This fear was perceived by realty agents, and block-busting techniques were used heavily in the area. As an example, within a two year span, it is estimated that approximately 900 homes were sold in Mattapan. Many of these homes were purchased by families who lacked the finances to maintain the homes, and it is estimated by the BRA that a minimum of 40% of these sales resulted in foreclosure.

The physical, economic and social changes which occurred earlier were not only the result of population shifts, but were in themselves causative factors in neighborhood decay and instability. The rapid turnover in the housing market, in combination with the fact that the neighborhoods' racial composition was
shifting, created a cycle of self-perpetuating problems. In a study of home mortgage lending patterns in Boston, through statistical analysis it was found that the racial composition of a neighborhood was a "significant factor in explaining bank investment patterns even after controlling for measurable economic and risk-related investment determinants." The study concluded that bank home mortgage lending "appears to be racially discriminatory in effect, if not in intent."

The BRA has acknowledged that red-lining is indeed a problem in sections of Mattapan and that it has contributed to the abandonment problem in that district.

In the summer of 1979, ABCD is scheduled to receive a technical assistance grant from CSA to develop and implement a comprehensive community economic development program in Mattapan. The purpose of this chapter is to document the conditions that prevail in Mattapan and cite the needs of the community as perceived by the residents. The first section of this chapter presents a profile of the community, looking at demographic, economic and housing conditions. The second section cites the concerns of residents regarding neighborhood conditions and examines the responses of residents and the city government to these conditions.
Section I
General Overview

Mattapan is located seven miles south of downtown Boston. The neighborhood is flanked by the wealthy suburb of Milton as its southern border, by Dorchester as its northern border, with Hyde Park on the west.* The neighborhood is divided into four sub-areas: Wellington Hill and Blue Hill Avenue/Norfolk in the northern section of Mattapan, and Eastern and Western Mattapan in the southern section.

According to Census data, the population of Mattapan has increased slightly over the past twenty years, from 44,290 in 1960, to 45,449 in 1970. The 1975 State Census cited the population of Mattapan as being 47,674.

Demographics

Race

Longitudinal data on the racial composition of Mattapan indicates that the neighborhood has undergone significant racial change over the past two decades. The total non-white population increased from 0.4% in 1960 to 42.1% in 1970, to 80% in 1977.2

Age

The 1975 State Census data on the age distribution within Mattapan indicate that Mattapan has a

*See map in Appendix.
relatively young population; 36.2% of the total Mattapan population was under twenty years of age, as compared to 33.4% for the City of Boston as a whole. According to the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA), currently there are fewer elderly in Mattapan than in the city as a whole. Only 22% of the adults in Mattapan are over 55, as opposed to 28% citywide.

**Education**

1970 Census data indicate that the median level of education of Mattapan residents was in parity with that of the City of Boston (12%). More recent information on Mattapan from the Boston Urban Observatory (BUO) in 1977 indicate that 40% of the residents have high school diplomas; 25% did not complete high school, and 35% of the residents have some college.3

**Housing**

Housing in Mattapan varies widely both by type and condition. Housing types range from a predominance of multi-family units in northern Mattapan to a predominance of single family units in the southern sections. There has been very little new construction in Mattapan since 1970. Housing attrition in Mattapan during the period between 1970 and 1974 far exceeded the number of new units constructed resulting in a net decrease in the amount of housing stock of 222.4

According to the 1970 Census data, only 20% of the housing stock in Mattapan has been built since
1959. Twenty-five percent of the housing was built between 1940 and 1959, and the remaining 55% was older, having been built before 1939. Much of the older housing stock is multi-family units and is concentrated in the northern section of Mattapan—76% of the housing was built before 1939. Due to its age, this housing requires frequent and costly repairs.

Of the total number of dwelling units in Mattapan in 1970 (7039), 679 or approximately 10% are in need of repair with costs in excess of 1000.5

A 1973 survey of housing conditions in Mattapan found that approximately one-half of the residential buildings that were identified as being in need of major repairs were located in Wellington Hill. A study conducted later in 1976, of over 1/3 of the residential structures in Wellington Hill, discovered that 8% of the housing stock needed repairs which would cost over $1000 per dwelling unit.6 Forty-eight percent of the homes surveyed needed repairs costing between $500 and $1000 per unit.

According to BRA statistics, the majority of Mattapan residents (55%) are renters; 10% of the residents own their homes and 32% of Mattapan residents have mortgages. The median monthly housing costs in Mattapan for 1977 as estimated by the Hart Survey was $167, as compared with the City average of $178.00.
The number of occupied housing units was relatively high and in parity with figures for the citywide average (94.5%) in 1970. For this same year, the vacancy rate estimates as a percent of all housing units, was 5.5%, slightly lower than the 6% rate for the city. 7

Economics

Income

The median income level of residents in Mattapan according to the 1970 Census data was $10,158 in absolute dollars. Within the neighborhood sub-categories, the median income level of families in the northern section of Mattapan was substantially lower than the Neighborhood average. According to the BRA, the Blue Hill/Norfolk section had a median family income of $7857; the Wellington Hill section had a median family income of $8350. The number of families with incomes below $5000 in the district of Mattapan was lower than that of the city as a whole; 16% and 22%, respectively. 8 Again figures for Wellington Hill and Blue Hill/Norfolk are higher than that of the district average: 22% of the families of Wellington Hill had incomes less than $5000 as did 24% of families in Blue Hill/Norfolk.

Employment

BRA employment estimates for 1977 cited the unemployment rate in Mattapan for those sixteen years
old and over as 21.6%. This figure is 8.8 percentage points higher than the comparable unemployment rate for the City of Boston.

Statistics from the Dorchester Neighborhood Employment Center for the program year 1977-1978 indicated that 15% of their clients came from Mattapan. And, in a 1977 study by the BUO on the social service needs of Mattapan residents, 15% of the sample population indicated that they had skills which did not match their present job; 10% indicated a desire to increase their work hours; 15% indicated that they were dissatisfied with their present job but did not know where to go for help in Mattapan.

Business

The center of most of the activity in Mattapan is in the central business district located in Mattapan Square. The main shopping corridor of the square is approximately 3 blocks long and is parallel to Blue Hill Avenue. Within this corridor are several retail shops, banks, offices and eating places. Though most of the merchants reside outside of Mattapan the business in the square provides convenient shopping, and employment for residents in and around Mattapan. Over the years, the City of Boston has invested funds to increase and maintain the viability of the square. These funds have been designated for rebate programs for merchants who make physical improvements to their
place of businesses, foot-patrol-police protection in the square, street and lighting improvement, and parking facilities. As of 1977, Mattapan Square had the lowest vacancy rate (1%) of any neighborhood business district in Boston. The merchants of the square are well organized, the majority of whom are members of the Mattapan Board of Trade Association. The Association is a strong support group for merchants who are located in Mattapan Square.

Although Mattapan Square is one of the most viable neighborhood business districts in the City of Boston, as one travels north along Blue Hill Avenue, within two blocks the character of the neighborhood changes. As one resident stated, "once you leave the square and go down Blue Hill Avenue, it's like a desert."9 There are a few small shops along Blue Hill Avenue, but they are scattered, and many are in disrepair. Interspersed between the shops are burned out abandoned buildings, legacies of the riots of the sixties.

Section II
Resident Concerns

In a survey of Mattapan residents that was sponsored by the Mattapan Branch of the Boston Public Library in 1973, crime, the poor academic and antiquated physical conditions of the schools in the area, the
lack of recreational facilities for teenagers, the lack of adequate city services, housing abandonment and deterioration, and the lack of cultural or educational resources in the area were cited as issues of major concern to the residents. Since that time the City of Boston has sponsored a host of programs in Mattapan to address these concerns.

The types of programs that have been sponsored by the City can be grouped into four areas: housing, neighborhood business district, capital improvements and neighborhood services. Specific programs which were related to the expressed needs of the residents are described below.*

City Response

In 1973 the City of Boston instituted the Mayor's Housing Improvement Program (MHIP). This was an experimental program to provide incentives for owner occupants of one to three family homes throughout the city to rehabilitate their homes. MHIP lasted for approximately two years, at which point it was expanded to the Housing Improvement Program. Since then, the HIP program has been a major tool used by the City of Boston to revitalize Mattapan and other areas of Boston. The basic function of the Housing Improvement

*See Appendix for a complete synopsis of the programs sponsored by the City in Mattapan.
Program has not deviated from the original concept as mandated by the experimental Mayor's Improvement program. Essentially this program provided homeowners with a rebate (20-50% based on income) for investments made on code-related improvements to their properties.

In addition to the Home Improvement Program, the city sponsors a Homesteading Program. Under this program, homes are purchased and rehabilitated by a non-profit organization (Community Training Dynamics) which is affiliated with the city. After completion homes are sold for the cost of the rehabilitation.

Security

In addition to the regular police services, in 1975 the city contracted with the Boston Police to provide a security patrol in the Mattapan Square Business District. The Boston Police Department is funded directly by the city for the security services to pay overtime wages and neighborhood groups receive money from the city to publicize the services.

Despite the existence of these services in Mattapan, a survey conducted by Peter B. Hart, Research Associates in 1977 found that Mattapan residents felt that well maintained housing, safety, parks/recreation activities, low taxes, city services and employment opportunities were missing in Mattapan.
The dissatisfaction with city services in Mattapan, and the perceived lack of responsiveness of the city to the needs of Mattapan residents has become manifest in proliferation of neighborhood block clubs and street associations.

**Neighborhood Groups**

Currently in Mattapan, there are approximately 30 block clubs. The majority of the block clubs deal specifically with issues concerning their particular street, and are organized to cover small sections of Mattapan.

The groups are practically oriented and exist to improve communication among residents. As one resident stated, "fear is what brought us together, the neighbors weren't communicating, crime was rampant in the area..."10 The groups have social activities as well as those that are specifically to improve the conditions of their areas. The activities range from the formation of citizen's security patrols and "house watches" to sponsoring street festivals and bowling leagues.

In addition to the various block associations, there are two associations that transcend street boundaries, comprised of residents from all of Mattapan. One such group is the Mattapan Block Association, which develops and programs activities for the entire
Mattapan Community. Their activities to date have included programs for youth, the formation of a housewatch-crime prevention network, the organization of a neighborhood alert community patrol, and a clean-up campaign. The organization generates its own funds through fund-raising activities.

The other Mattapan wide block association related group is the District Council #3. The District Council #3 has been in existence for two and one-half years. Its original and present function is to act as an umbrella organization, to provide for cohesiveness between the numerous block associations in Mattapan. Operating under the assumption that in unity there is strength, District Council #3 acts as a channel for street organizations to air their grievances so that these grievances can be collectively presented to the city. It is represented by four forces in the community: the local block clubs; the Mattapan Board of Trade; community agencies, service groups and churches; and the local police department. One of the major, immediate concerns of the council is raising the confidence of residents about their neighborhood. During the years in which the population of Mattapan underwent rapid demographic changes, it received a lot of negative publicity from the media. The publicity merely exacerbated the fears of residents concerning the future of their neighborhood. Consequently, an
inherent function of the council is to strengthen the community by instilling the feeling among residents that they have a vehicle for control, a means through which their needs can be addressed. According to one of the coordinators of the council, this function is perhaps the most important one because it has been instrumental in encouraging residents to remain in the area.

In addition to the citizens groups there are three community development corporations in Mattapan.

Through the efforts of the District Council #3 a community development corporation was incorporated in March of 1979 to address the problems with which city has had, in the opinion of the council, minimal success, citing the economic development of their community as a high priority. This CDC is currently in the process of searching for the resources needed to allow them to hire staff to begin developing programs for the community. One of the coordinators of this group stated that this community development corporation would be autonomous from the City of Boston and that it was likely that the two would be competing for similar funds.

Another Mattapan CDC has been incorporated as an autonomous legal entity since September 1978. Again, this CDC is in its formative stages and has not implemented any programs to date. The organization has
recently submitted applications for funding from a variety of sources, including the City of Boston, so that they can hire consultants. Two projects that the organization is considering concern the Mattapan Branch Public Library, and the lack of adequate health facilities in the area. This group is currently composed of the original organizers, and has plans to conduct a major membership drive in the fall of 1979.

The Lena Park Community Development Corporation is also located in Mattapan. The services offered by Lena Park are primarily referral and informative, directing residents to the social services offered in and around the area. Though Lena Park is primarily a social service agency, it has incorporated a housing preservation program into its services. The housing preservation program relies heavily on the homesteading program, including counseling services on maintenance, and is concentrated in the Dorchester area.

Conclusion

The profile of the neighborhood is indicative of the disparity in the housing conditions and socio-economic conditions that prevail in Mattapan. Although the City of Boston has implemented a variety of programs in Mattapan throughout the CDBG program, few have materially benefited the majority of residents in Mattapan to their satisfaction. The city's housing
programs have not halted the decline and abandonment in northern Mattapan where the worse conditions prevail.

Only 12% of Mattapan residents eligible for the program have participated, while the total number of eligible structures as cited by the BRA is 2858. Clearly, the Housing Improvement Program is not meeting the needs of the majority of eligible residents in Mattapan. Studies of the HIP have suggested that low participation rates can be attributed to the inability of eligible persons to provide the "front-end" cash that is needed to participate. By the BRA's own admission:

To address the housing in extremely declining residential areas within the Mattapan district the present 20% rebate program has been ineffective in an approach for a comprehensive housing rehabilitation effort.11

In view of the large number of homes that are in need of rehabilitation in Mattapan, one might question the effectiveness of the homesteading program. Through the program, 25 homes were rehabilitated in 1978 while only nine homes are scheduled for rehabilitation in 1979.

Finally, despite the viability of business district in Mattapan Square, the businesses in the square are predominantly small retail stores that are not labor intensive. Few residents are able to find employment
in the neighborhood, and the unemployment rate in Mattapan is 8.8% higher than the citywide average.

The recent proliferation of neighborhood groups in Mattapan is a visible sign that the residents have needs which have not been met by current services. One neighborhood leader who has been active in Mattapan for the past 12 years stated that the delivery of city services is based on the priorities of the city. In his opinion, Mattapan is low on the city's priority list, and consequently the city is responsive only in crisis situations. The groups are currently organizing themselves so that they can begin to exert control over the forces of order within their community. With this framework, one group has identified the economic development of Mattapan as a high priority item.

With the receipt of its grant, ABCD will be in a position to assist the residents of Mattapan in their endeavors. Chapter IV will examine the potential role that ABCD can play in the economic development of Mattapan.
CHAPTER III

Footnotes

1 Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Home Mortgage Lending Patterns in Metropolitan Boston, 1977.


4 Boston Urban Observatory, "A Feasibility Study for the Development of a Multi-Service Community Center in Mattapan" (Boston, Mass.: University of Massachusetts, 1977).

5 Boston Redevelopment Authority, "A Demonstration Program to Arrest Housing Abandonment in the Mattapan Section of the City of Boston" (Boston, Mass.: BRA Research Department, 1973).

6 Ibid.

7 Ibid.

8 Interview with Father Murphy of St. Angela's Church, Boston, Mass., January, 1979.

9 Interview with Henry Paige, President, Mattapan Block Association, January, 1979.

CHAPTER IV
Introduction

In a manual on economic development, the authors cite the CAA as a potential source for supporting community economic development activities. As mentioned in Chapter III, ABCD is scheduled to receive a technical assistance grant to design and implement a comprehensive program which will coordinate social service programs with physical and economic development programs. The agency has a long history of demonstrated effectiveness in social service programming. Its record in the economic development field as Chapter II indicated has not yet been fully established. The purpose of this chapter is to determine a feasible structural role for ABCD to play in the economic development of Mattapan. This chapter is arranged in the following manner:

Section 1 presents an outline of the skills that are needed in community economic development.
Section 2 presents an examination of ABCD to determine how well ABCD's resources match those which are needed in community economic development.

Section 3 cites alternative roles that ABCD could play in the economic development of Mattapan.

Section 4 presents the conclusions of the chapter and a recommendation for the most feasible role for ABCD.

Section I

In a manual on economic development, the authors cited three ways in which a CAA could assist with economic development activities. They were: as a source of technical assistance, as a funding source, and as a power resource.1

Technical Assistance

The CDC experience suggests guidelines for the type of technical skills that an organization needs to promote community economic development. The skills can be categorized into four areas: planning, legal, fiscal and management.

Planning

Planners are needed to perform four basic functions:

1) Grantsmanship Functions - that is locating funding sources which are interested in funding the proposals that the organization develops.

2) Program Evaluation - the organization must be able to design, implement and analyze programs, customized to programmatic and funding source needs.
3) Program Determination - the organization must be able to conduct needs assessments of the community that it intends to serve.

Legal Assistance

Legal assistance is needed to satisfy five basic functions:

1) To design the organizational structure to implement community economic development activities.

2) To design mechanisms for specific forms of development which might require the creation of subsidiaries.

3) To assist with tax problems.

4) To assist with securities problems.

5) Specifically for CAAs, legal assistance is needed to investigate and correct potential problems related to meeting CSA regulation.

Fiscal Assistance

Fiscal assistance is needed to perform six basic functions:

1) Determination of the reasonableness of financial data included in the budget.

2) Financial analyses of budgets.

3) Preparation of financial reports for funding sources.

4) Maintenance of contract files, billing files, and the like.

5) Billing procedures.

6) Financial performance auditing.

Management

The skills of managers are needed to carry on the functions needed to maintain the actual operation, being
concerned with:

1) Production.
2) Marketing.
3) Labor market preparation.
4) Financing.
5) All aspects of management.

In addition to these services, Susan Horn-Moo of CCED cites three types of persons whose skills are critical to community economic development activities. They are: persons whom she terms "entrepreneurial types," organizational development specialists, and economic development planners who are skilled in business techniques. The "entrepreneurial type" is the key person in community economic development. This person is needed for the purposes of:

1) keeping abreast of federal and private funding sources, and
2) making the arrangements for ventures.

The organizational development specialists are needed to:

1) insure that residents are kept abreast of all activities, and
2) act as the liaison between the residents and the staff to insure that the community has constant and influential input into all project programs.

The economic development planners are needed to perform the following functions:
1) identify potential ventures - through research and studies such as land inventory and market analysis

2) prepare venture packages for financing

3) develop models for housing development, and

4) develop business packages for light industry including operating costs, financing methods, and management assistance.

Funding

A sponsor of community development activities must also have capital to support and maintain staff, programming activities, and venture start-ups.

Power Resources

Finally, the impact that a sponsor of community economic development can have is greatly influenced by its "power resources," that is, its ability to mobilize the poor, the business community, the government sector--the three groups that are key to the process.

The three factors described above are not discrete, rather each individual one can potentially influence the other. For example, an agency that is well-established and has a working relation with the business or government sectors can use its relationship as a vehicle through which to obtain funds and technical assistance. As a report entitled "Community Economic Development and the States," prepared by Carl Sussman and Stephen Klein found, although state
planning and assistance is inadequate or non-existent, "Once rapport has been established with state officials, they often became allies in search for further aid."²

The following section of this chapter will examine the capacity of ABCD in the three areas described above.

**Section II**

Although ABCD can "purchase" the resources needed to provide assistance to Mattapan residents, the CSA grant is only guaranteed for one year. The capacity of the agency to provide assistance with its present resources must also be considered. The role that ABCD can play in community economic development can be hampered or facilitated by its internal and external resources.

**Technical Assistance**

An analysis of the experience of the staff of ABCD indicates that the agency does not have the expertise in community economic development to provide a core staff to the residents of Mattapan. The assistance that the agency can provide is:

- Legal services such as tax, leases, corporate by-laws preparation and reports
- Grantsmanship
- Program evaluation
- Proposal development
- Program monitoring
• Statistical gathering and analysis of information
• Determination of the reasonableness of financial data
• Financial analyses of budgets
• Preparation of financial reports for funding sources
• Billing procedures
• Financial performance auditing
• Personnel services
• Training for community organizers

With the possible exception of providing a community organizer or training in this area, the agency can only provide support services.

Funding Source

With the grant from CSA the agency could hire staff with the appropriate skills. Outside of those funds, the fiscal structure of ABCD allows little flexibility for the agency in the allocation of its funds. An analysis of the fiscal structure of ABCD indicates that its current capacity will not permit it to be a strong financial source for community economic development programs, except perhaps to provide equity or seed money. Although the agency operated programs at the level of $21,030,428.00 in 1978, managing funds from three federal sources, 82% of the funds were earmarked for specific programs. The remaining 18% were used to support staff and ABCD's dele-
gate agencies.

To increase funds to support economic development activities in Mattapan the agency would need to either reallocate its non-earmarked funds, or seek funding from additional sources. The first option would be politically difficult to implement. The ABCD board of directors makes the decisions concerning fund allocation, and the APAC directors occupy the majority of seats on the board. It is highly unlikely that the board would condone further decreases in funds for service delivery. The amount of funds that the agency receives are barely adequate to meet the existing service needs of low-income residents, as budget increases lag behind inflation. Much of the flexible funds are invested into programs which provide a large number of jobs for community people. When one considers the fact that community economic development programs typically cannot hire a large number of people, one better understands the reluctance of APAC directors.

The agency's ability to seek funds from other sources is limited as well, as federal regulations stipulate that CAAs are not eligible to receive excess funds from nongovernment sources. As stated in section 225-C, Title II of the Community Services Act of 1974,

Director (of a CAP) shall not require non-federal contributions in excess of approved cost of programs/activities after calculating the per centum of federal assistance.
ABCD could apply for CSA Title VII Community Economic Development funds. This would limit the agency's options, in regard to its role in Mattapan since CSA regulations would require that the CDC be autonomous of the agency.

**Power Resources**

Although its internal fiscal and personnel structure is too weak to support community economic development, as an institutional power, the agency has a working relationship with the low-income population of Boston, other human services agencies, and the business, industrial and government sectors.

The Board of Directors of ABCD, Inc. is presently composed of 51 members, which govern all of ABCD's programs and develop the policy of the agency. Twenty-five of the members are publicly elected representatives from eleven of Boston's low-income neighborhoods. Seventeen other members are from the business, financial, labor, religious, university, and social service communities, Black and Puerto Rican civil rights groups, and public housing tenants organizations. Boston's nine city councillors also have seats on the ABCD Board.

Within the organizational structure of ABCD, there is a department which functions as liaison between the Agency and the private and government sectors.
Through this department, the Industrial and Government Relations, numerous linkages have been established with the business community through organizations such as the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Restaurant Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, and the like. Much of the department's time is spent making arrangements with business firms to provide instructors, equipment for training, on-the-job training, and job placements for ABCD clients. The industrial and governmental relations staff also arranges for businesses to provide technical assistance to staff of various departments at ABCD.

This division also has a legislative committee which acts in a public relations and advocacy function. There is a two-way communication network between the industry and government sectors. The committee maintains continued contact between the agency and congressional representatives, keeping the representatives informed and aware of the needs and demands of ABCD clientele. Congressional representatives often obtain ABCD's opinion on legislation, and reciprocally the agency often obtains letters of support from congresswomen and men.

ABCD coordinates its activities with other agencies in four ways: program planning, development and implementation, technical assistance and training, and
advocacy. Its services are frequently requested and utilized by the federal, state and city governments, as well as private agencies.

**Implementation**

As a recent example, early in 1978 ABCD was called upon by the Governor of Massachusetts to implement the Boston Emergency Fuel Assistance Program. Special crisis intervention funds, appropriated to the Community Services Administration by Congress, were made available to the states via a formula allocation. These special funds were designated by Congress for payments to utility companies and fuel dealers on behalf of low-income eligible households for energy/fuel supplies. As the implementing agency for Boston, ABCD collaborated with over 62 agencies, among which were the State Department of Public Welfare, local neighborhood service centers, the Little City Halls, home care corporations, and other agencies to identify, recruit, assess and verify over 6000 eligible households. The project involved the development and implementation of standardized intake process forms for use by all collaborating agencies, procedures for verification of information, linkages with local banks and utility companies for the escrow payments, all publicity, and media coverage. ABCD designed and implemented this system in a three week period. The agency later received commendations from CSA, the
Governor of Massachusetts and the General Accounting Office for the thoroughness and quality of the system.

**Technical Assistance and Training**

In the area of technical assistance and training, ABCD's most recent collaborative efforts in the training field were conducted by staff from ABCD's Housing and Energy Conservation Department. In response to concerns initiated by ABCD neighborhood staff, the housing staff offered two series of housing advocacy training sessions. These workshops were attended by one hundred social service and community workers from agencies throughout the city.

**Advocacy**

The advocacy role of ABCD has been carried out at the state and national level, with respect to both the legislative and executive branches of government. From time to time, this activity has increased resources available to Boston's low-income community. At the time when the national administration was actively seeking to destroy community action, ABCD successfully opposed this action in court, and played a leadership role in the eventual restoration and increase of community action funding.

The agency has constantly advocated on behalf of the poor and the disadvantaged in the form of public statements on issues such as welfare reform, the energy crisis, and unemployment; by providing testimony
at legislative hearings in Boston and in Washington; and by meeting with Cabinet level officials to advise on policy matters affecting programs.

ABCD has been effectively instrumental in opening up policymaking and advisory boards in many public and private organizations to participation by representatives of the groups to be served including minorities and women. Its record also includes an array of former employees or board members who now hold top level positions in the Boston Office of the Community Services Administration, the HEW Offices of Human Development, and the Children Youth and Families unit, the Small Business Administration, the Federal Trade Commission, and other public and private agencies.

ABCD recently coordinated its advocacy activities with over fifty human services organizations including consumer, advocacy, civic, professional and provider groups to form the Massachusetts Human Services Coalition (MHSC). MHSC was organized to ensure a more active citizen participation in the formulation of human services policies. The organization has focuses on research, policy analysis, informational updates, and a statewide grassroots project to coordinate local and regional advocacy groups. Through MHSC, ABCD has, and continues, to play its advocacy role. MHSC meets with state officials to present its position and recommendations on issues affecting the poor.
Section III

In view of the problems and resources in Mattapan, there are four options that ABCD may consider in determining its ultimate role in the economic development of Mattapan. The options can be grouped under the categories of

1) Direct Involvement
2) Indirect Involvement
3) Catalyst
4) Technical Assistance

The four options are described below.

Option 1 - Direct Involvement

Under this option ABCD could use the technical assistance grant to lay the groundwork for the agency to become involved in the development and management of Mattapan based enterprise. The agency could examine the possibilities of:

- converting a current program component into a for-profit enterprise (e.g. weatherization)
- expansion into new areas
- bringing industry into the neighborhood (e.g. subcontracting from a business or light industrial firm).

Option 2 - Indirect Involvement

Under this option, ABCD could work closely with the CDCs in Mattapan, providing human services programming, community outreach, and support services.
(e.g. proposal development, advocacy, research). To encourage the formation of formal ties between ABCD and the CDC, the structure of the boards could be one in which membership overlaps. That is, ABCD could provide seats on its board of directors for Mattapan resident CDC members and the CDC could provide a seat on its board of directors for an ABCD representative. This is an option which the Natchitoches Area Action Association, a CAA in Louisiana has chosen. The CAA does much of the groundwork for economic development proposals such as writing all of the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) applications. The CAA has also performed feasibility studies on potential industrial ventures in Natchitoches.

**Option 3 - Catalyst**

Under this option, ABCD could play a catalytic role similar to that which the agency played in the formation of the East Boston, Charlestown, and Chinatown CDCs. Since there is at least one CDC in Mattapan that is interested in promoting economic activities, ABCD could give its technical assistance grant to that CDC to use as seed money for its operations.

**Option 4 - Technical Assistance**

Under this option, ABCD could use its technical assistance grant to provide a staff to the Mattapan CDC. The CDC would exercise the decision-making power over the economic development activities.
This is a strategy which is exercised by the Northwest South Dakota CAA in Sisseton, S.D. The CAA provides technical assistance to a separately incorporated body that is funded through the South Dakota State Department of Agriculture.

The option chosen depends in a large part on the type of commitment ABCD can make to the community, and the goals and objectives of ABCD in regard to its posture on economic development. The ultimate goal of the agency is to assist in the economic development of all of its target neighborhoods. This posture will obviously have a bearing on the extent of the involvement that ABCD can assume in Mattapan.

Conclusion

The limited scope of ABCD's staff and monetary resources constrains the options of the agency in terms of the role it can play in community economic development. As Section II indicated, the agency could provide assistance such as grantsmanship, conducting needs assessments, teaching strategies of community organizing, fiscal management, and certain types of legal assistance. However, none of the staff have experience in community economic development, and the extent of technical assistance that the current staff can provide is clearly limited.

In reference to the first option, community
economic development activities which involve the establishment of ventures or enterprises require a financial structure that has the ability to undertake capital investment commitments over a time frame of at least three to five years. In order to sponsor business ventures sufficient funds are needed in the beginning to support the enterprise until income from sales is built up to cover operating expenses. ABCD has no track record in this area and would undoubtedly find it difficult to obtain funding. To implement such a strategy would require an enormous time commitment from the agency. Consequently, other program areas could suffer, or the agency could be forced to relinquish its ultimate goal of developing a system which could meet both the human service and the economic needs of low-income residents throughout the City of Boston. The analysis of the agency suggests that ABCD has neither the fiscal structure, nor the staff on board that would allow it to fulfill such a commitment.

An alternative to this problem would be for ABCD to establish a corporate body for the purpose of operating economic development ventures in Mattapan. Since the agency wants to promote community economic development, the corporation would need to be comprised of a majority of Mattapan residents. For ABCD to establish another corporation in Mattapan with a focus
similar to existing organizations could prove to be
counter-productive. If the agency were to attempt
to implement options 2 or 3 there are potential prob-
lems. Option 2, which would involve the establish-
ment of overlapping boards, could potentially establish
the "interconnectedness" that was discussed in
Chapter II. There are two factors which could im-
pede the immediate implementation of this strategy.

1) The agency has no formal long standing
relationship with the Mattapan community.

2) The agency had no input into the initial
development of the CDCs.

In view of this, one might question the ability and
feasibility of ABCD to exercise this option at the
onset.

The third option, that of giving the grant
to the CDC as seed money, could easily be accomodated
by ABCD's current structure. However, this goal would
not contribute to ABCD's goal of establishing an
"interconnected" relationship between the delivery
of human services and economic development activities.
Exercising this option would also prevent ABCD from
gaining the reputation and experience that would fos-
ter its efforts to achieve its longterm community
economic development goal.
Recommendation

Based on all of these factors, this author recommends that ABCD's role be a two-phased one combining elements of options 2 and 4. The first phase would require that ABCD hire staff skilled in community economic development and community organizing techniques, to offer assistance to the community based organizations (CBOs). The relationship of ABCD to the CBOs should be that of consultant; teaching the residents community economic development strategies, helping them identify internal resources, and helping them find and utilize methods to coordinate human service delivery and community economic development activities. The ultimate objective would be to create a situation of resident self-sufficiency. It is important that ABCD maintain this objective since there is no guarantee that the agency will have future financial support for economic development activities.

Phase II involves the establishment of a formal network between the residents involved in the economic development activities, and those involved in the human service programs that ABCD will put in place in Mattapan.

This type of relationship would bring several benefits to both the Mattapan community and ABCD. The residents would have:
1) the right to self-determination,

2) staff with the expertise to help them convert their ideas into action,

3) the benefit of the influence of power of ABCD, and

4) a comprehensive program to meet its needs.

Alternatively, ABCD would gain:

1) a track record in community economic development, and

2) skills and experience which are transferable to other low-income areas.

In terms of a long term strategy for ABCD, the agency should give serious thought to continuing to play the role of a technical assistant to CBOs and residents in need of such assistance. According to CCED, there is a void in this field that needs to be filled. With greater numbers of CBOs becoming involved in community economic development a greater drain is made on the existing resources, both monetary and human. At the Massachusetts Conference on Community Economic Development in 1975, the conference organizers were constantly asked why community based groups did not have the staff and technical capability to undertake economic development activity. There appeared to be a lack of knowledge among groups interested in community economic development of where and what kind of resources were available on a local, regional and statewide level to meet the information, technical
assistance and training needs of CBOs.

To perform the function of a technical assistant, ABCD would need to hire full-time staff who are skilled in economic development. The agency should therefore consider establishing a legally separate body which would have more funding source options than ABCD presently has.

Because of its power base and experiences in dealing with the poor, the power structure, the public sector and the private sector, ABCD has the potential to play a very strong role not only in the economic development of Mattapan, but also throughout low-income communities in Boston.
1 The amount and type of resources needed depends on the degree and type of involvement in community economic development.
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APPENDIX
1979-1980
MATTAPAN
NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION STRATEGY

Project Components

HOUSING

- Housing Improvement Program: cash rebates (20-50% of cost) available to low-moderate income home owners for home improvement repairs $ 200,000
- Wellington Hill Urban Homesteading Program: promotes home ownership for individuals who meet "sweat equity" and financing requirements; involves properties in need of serious rehabilitation 90,000
- Morton/Gallivan Housing Development: replace and repair wood siding 30,000
- Groveland Elderly Housing Development: roofing repairs 50,000
- Demolition and Boarding: for the boarding of potentially sound buildings and the demolition of unsalvageable structures 65,000
- Mattapan Neighborhood Marketing Program: neighborhood confidence, marketing and image-improvement project 50,000

COMMERCIAL REVITALIZATION

- Mattapan Square Amenities: street furniture, marketing aids and signs for the Mattapan Square business district 10,000

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

- Parks and Recreation
  
  Trees, various locations 8,400
• Skimcoating
  Astoria Street, Flint Street to end $ 9,000
  Colorado Street, Mattapan Street to Monterey Street 18,000
  Colorado Street, Monterey Street to Cummins Highway 18,000
  Mattapan Street, Fottler Road to Blue Hill Avenue 8,000
  Woolson Street, Blue Hill Avenue to Norfolk Street 12,000
  Astoria Street, Elizabeth Street to Walter Playground 4,500

• Lighting
  Leston Street Lighting (Poles only) 17,000
  Woolson Street Lighting (Poles only) 24,000
  Hosmer Street Lights (Poles only) 20,000

• Sidewalk Reconstruction
  Astoria Street, Flint Street to end 45,000
  Astoria Street, Elizabeth Street to Walker Playground 22,500
  Hillsboro Street, Hazelton Street to Ormond Street 50,000
  Hillsboro Street, Ormond-Wellington Hill W. only 16,250
  Hosmer Street, Blue Hill Avenue-Norfolk St. 85,000
  Idaho Street, River Street to Manchester Street 65,000
  Leston Street, Woolson Street to Morton Street 72,250
  Woolson Street, Blue Hill Avenue-Norfolk Street 102,000
• Public Facilities
  Renovations to Elderly Center, Mattapan Chronic Disease Hospital $50,000

  Foley Building electrical system, Mattapan Chronic Disease Hospital 350,000

• Traffic and Parking
  Itasca Street Speed Bump/Sign 60,000

HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES
• Mattapan Youth Athletic Club: youth athletic program in Almont Park 9,000

• Youth Activities Commission: provides neighborhood youth workers in the evenings (5:00 p.m. to midnight) 12,000

• Mattapan Health Center: pediatric, obstetrical, gynecological, and dental services 50,000

• Mattahunt Community School After-school Reading Program: reading, counselling and skill development for elementary school children 18,000

• Mattahunt Community School After-school Day Care Program 15,500

• CB Security Patrol: neighborhood security patrol operated by the District 3 Community Council, in coordination with the Boston Police Department 15,500

• Senior Shuttle 22,000

IMPROVEMENTS TO NON-PROFIT FACILITIES
• Mattapan Health Center: site acquisition and rehabilitation 100,000

WELLINGTON HILL CONCENTRATED INVESTMENT AREA
• CIA Specific Activities
  Urban Homesteading Program (90,000)
  Demolition and Boarding (65,000)
• Neighborhood-wide activities which directly support the CIA strategy

Housing Improvement Program
Mattapan Neighborhood Marketing Program
Mattapan Health Center
CB Security Patrol

TOTAL MATTAPAN NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION PROGRAM $1,793,900