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1 INTRODUCTION

The South End of Boston, Massachusetts (Figure I-1), is an urban laboratory of public policy and resident involvement, and physical and social change. Situated like a soft underbelly of Boston's established urban center, the South End once displayed the classic syndrome of an urban slum area: a dilapidated and deteriorating housing stock; a lack of adequate city services; a socioeconomic profile indicating a high proportion of minority groups, unemployed persons, low-income families and individuals, welfare and general relief cases; a high crime rate; a resistance on the part of lending institutions to provide mortgage loans and financing in the area. As in many core urban areas, urban renewal was introduced to the South End to break the perpetuation of the syndrome.
Engaged by the appearance of urban renewal, and the inevitability of approaching change, many residents of the South End realized the personal and individual nature the effects of urban renewal could have. To economically disadvantaged residents of the South End, urban renewal augured imminent change directed at the essence of the South End as an area responding to the needs of lower income groups. This threat of change initiated a consolidation of lower income residents and tenant communities within the South End, not only to protect their prior tenure rights, but also to involve themselves in a reassessment of change, from an impending threat to an effective advantage.

Together, the effects of urban renewal, and the reaction to urban renewal by lower income groups, has resulted in a comeback of sorts for the South End.

The effort of this investigation is to place a South End resident community group, the Emergency Tenants Council, within this context to illustrate and identify the factors which provided the crucial issues and necessary vehicle allowing this resident based community group enough leverage to gain recognition as a legitimate and able developer, responsible for housing development ultimately valued at approximately $16 million.¹
2 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Boston's South End has a history of social change within a physical framework developed on reclaimed tidal marsh. What is presently called the South End was once a narrow neck of land (Figure 1-2), connecting the Shawmut Peninsula (Beacon Hill and the Boston Commons area) to the Roxbury Township (Lower and Upper Roxbury).

Major development in the South End began in the early 1800's. Front Street (Harrison Avenue) was laid out south of Washington Street down to Dover Street (now East Berkeley Street) and the marsh between them was filled. Dover (E. Berkeley) Street was extended from Tremont Street to Front (Harrison) Street and the South Boston Bridge was constructed from Dover (E. Berkeley) Street to South Boston. By 1855 the marshlands between Washington Street and Albany Street, to Massachusetts Avenue, were filled.

While initial growth of the area north of Washington Street was slow, development accelerated during the latter part of the 1800's. During the 1850's Chester Park, Worcester Square, and Union Park were developed, and typified the image of South End estate living in the city:

...beginning with the fifties it rapidly grew into a region of symmetrical blocks of high-shouldered, comfortable red brick or brownstone
houses, bow fronted and high stooped with mansard roofs, ranged along spacious avenues, intersected by cross streets, and occasionally widened into tree-shaded squares and parks, whose central gardens were enclosed by neat cast iron fences.²

However, not all of the South End had such a gracious image of in-town living. The area along Columbus Avenue, developed about 1870, resulted in a less substantial house than in other areas of the South End and throughout the South End there are pockets of flat faced houses of a more economical nature.

The fashionability of the South End as a residential area was short lived. By 1885 the single-family homes had been converted to rooming houses. The primary factor contributing to the conversion of the South End was the Panic of 1873, which left many real estate operators bankrupt.³ Many of the houses in the newly developed areas were heavily mortgaged and foreclosed by the banks. The subsequent attempt by the banks to rapidly dispose of the properties glutted the housing market and caused a severe drop in prices. Allied with the development of the residential Back Bay area in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and the existence of the railroad tracks which separated the South End from the Back Bay and Downtown, the Panic of 1873 signalled the end of the South End as a fashionable residential district. The result was that by 1885 the South End was considered a
predominantly lodging house area, and the ubiquitous South
End row house was gradually subdivided to accommodate the
influx of new residents: the foreign immigrants, the rural
whites, and the poor.

Since the social conversion, the South End, during the
past fifty years, continued as an area predominantly inhabited
by in-migrants to Boston. However, as with the national
historic trend, there was a shift in the ethnic composition
of the arrivals. Foreign immigrants tapered off, and the
migrating rural white became the migrating rural black. Most
recently, the South End has experienced a tremendous growth
in its Spanish speaking population, mainly from Puerto Rico.

3 A GENERAL OVERVIEW

Literally surrounded by commercial, financial, and
medical institutions of metropolitan and regional significance,
the South End's substantially residential area enjoys a
unique location, and position, on a metropolitan and urban
scale. The South End's approximately 600 acres are located
approximately one mile south of Boston's Government Center
Complex and the new City Hall. Boston's central business
district sits between the South End and Government Center.
Directly to the north of the South End, across the railroad tracks, is Prudential Center, the new Christian Science complex housing the world headquarters of the Christian Science organization and the publication offices of the Christian Science Monitor, the new John Hancock building with a height exceeding Prudential Tower thus claiming the distinction of Boston's tallest building, and the new Copley Square Plaza, H. R. Richardson's Trinity Church, Phillip Johnson's new addition to the central Boston Library, and my local Selective Service Office. On the southeast edge of the South End is situated the multi-million dollar operation of Boston City Hospital and Boston University Medical Center, a dominating medical complex with metropolitan and regional implications (Figure I-3).

The South End, within a general use context of the Boston urban area is illustrated by Figures (I-4) and (I-5).

The renewal effort in the South End was part of a massive renewal effort launched by the City of Boston in 1960. "The 90 million Dollar Development Program for Boston," was announced in mid-1960 my Mayor John F. Collins, an upset victor over the Boston "power politician" John E. Powers in the mayoralty contest in 1959, and Edward J. Logue, who helped write renewal history during the 1950's in New Haven, Connecticut, and appointed by Collins to direct Boston's
massive renewal effort as Development Administrator of the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA). The renewal effort in Boston attracted national attention as one of the largest in the nation, where

Boston is (was) being turned into a laboratory demonstration of renewal techniques, which are being applied to its waterfront, to its central business district, and to eight of the city's ancient neighborhoods...this effort may affect 25 percent of Boston's area and 50 percent of its population. 8, 9

The reasons for Boston's massive renewal effort were classic:

Subject to all the unhappy vicissitudes plaguing the American central cities at mid-century -- declining tax base and soaring tax rate, fleeing middle-class residents and businesses, deteriorating housing stock and faltering public services -- Boston's problems were magnified by the city's particularly exacerbated relationship with its metropolitan hinterland and state legislature. 10

With the slogan "Planning with People," 11 and with the key to renewal being rehabilitation of Boston's run-down residential neighborhoods, 12 an heroic renewal effort was underway to create a "New Boston."

Identification of the South End area has long been dependent on the unique characteristics of its historical physical framework (Figure I-6). Many of the blocks and streets in the South End were laid out with particular emphasis on architectural and physical unity. The area characteristically has an interlaced pattern of wide thoroughfares running its length with narrow residentially scaled
streets placed at regular intervals along the area's width. Upon the long rectangular blocks, described by the rectilinear street pattern, sits the area's physical distinction, the South End rowhouse. Typically, the South End rowhouse is a rather elegantly proportioned brick structure, four or five stories high, twenty to twenty-five feet wide and thirty-five to forty feet deep, usually presenting a bow-front facade with large double-lighted, double hung, windows and topped with a Victorian mansard slate roof with projecting dormers. Set back just sufficiently to provide room for the wide stairway leading to the double exterior entrance doors, the rowhouses seem to crowd the streets on which they sit. Within this rectilinear pattern there are intermittent parks where the cross streets were widened to provide a cameo of grass and trees around which clusters of rowhouses were consciously planned and developed. Although originally built as single-family residences, and subsequently cut up into small apartments and flats, the South End rowhouses have managed to retain their distinct architectural character.

A more recent and administrative definition of the South End area has been brought about for the purpose of urban renewal. Although largely identified by its physical nature, the South End Urban Renewal Area is described specifically by its physical enclosures, or boundaries, created by the circulation pattern which surrounds the area.
(Figure 1-6). Along the northwest edge of the area exists the railroad tracks of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad, in a below grade right-of-way. To the north lies the combined easements of the Massachusetts Turnpike and an active railroad right-of-way, both of which are below grade. The easterly edge of the area is confined by the Southeast Expressway and the Expressway ramp connection projected to continue the line of the proposed Inner Belt Expressway along the southwest edge. Although the Inner Belt Expressway has since been rejected as part of the metropolitan transportation system, the physical gap left by demolition activity in the area serves as a reminder to the expressed intent to girdle the South End with a ring of transportation routes.

4 THE SOUTH END IN PERSPECTIVE

When urban renewal came to Boston's South End during the early 60's, the area was characterized as "a microcosm of mid-twentieth-century urban life," and a "rich human stew whose ingredients include Syrians, Chinese, Southern Negroes, Puerto Ricans, blue collar workers, alcoholics, prostitutes, the isolated elderly, and professional middle class 'adventurers' into the urban frontier." The South End experience of rapid conversion during the late 1800's
and early 1900's resulted in the area serving three functions for the City of Boston.

Primarily, the South End served as a "port of entry" for successive waves of immigrants, providing the newcomers with an inexpensive place to live and a location convenient to employment centers. Although many of the foreign immigrants have now been assimilated into the general population, there are still small enclaves of ethnic stock, notably Syrian and Greek, which linger as a remnant of the original beachhead. The South End is still experiencing the influx of ethnic and cultural groups, which included the arrival of a predominant black population witnessed by many core city areas, and most recently the South End has experienced a tremendous growth of its Spanish speaking inhabitants.

Another function which the South End provided was a "home" for persons on the illicit and downward side of life. The skid row population in the South End was estimated, in 1961, as being between 5,000 and 8,000 socially unattached men, serviced by the 116 establishments with liquor licenses, "one for every 270 people in the district." The lodging house population, although a legitimate existence, is by no means an indication of a sound or stable social area and was estimated in 1963 as roughly 50% of the area's approximately 30,000 total population. Further in
evidence of the South End's poorly projected image, was the existence of a relatively small group categorically called the "night people," engaged in prostitution, dope, numbers, and general activities of an illicit character.

The South End also provided a source of unskilled and semi-skilled employment for 12,000 to 17,000 workers within its commercial and industrial areas. The three largest sources of employment are the Boston City Hospital, the Boston University Medical Center, and the Green Shoe Factory, "the biggest shoe-manufacturing plant under one roof in the United States." A large number of families and individuals are supported by employment within the South End area.

Concomitant to the ominous socioeconomic profile of the South End was the proliferation of private and public services available, and well suited to the needs of the area's low income population. Small service shops selling used clothing and furniture, inexpensive meals, inexpensive food stuffs, existed with a variety of social and welfare agencies.

When urban renewal came to the South End, most of the area's physical plant was in disrepair and obsolete. Many of the century old townhouses were blatantly showing their age and concentrated use. They were overcrowded, deteriorating, and neglected. Four of the seven public schools in operation in 1964 were built prior to 1884, and there were only nine
acres of playground space for the South Ends's approximately 7,000 children, not counting the dangerously attractive abandoned buildings, cluttered vacant lots, and intensively parked streets. Built for another era of transportation, the streets resisted conversion to automobile traffic and storage. Chester Park, lying along Massachusetts Avenue, once an elegant cameo of grass flanked by faded, but stately brick bowfront townhouses, was split in deference to the automobile. In 1960, approximately 64% of the housing units were considered substandard and 10.4% of the units were vacant.

In 1950, the South End had a population of 57,501 with a non-white population of 33%, by 1960 the population had declined to 35,190, 41% of whom were non-white. A large portion of the population were single individuals and elderly. According to the 1960 census, 40% of the 6,727 families in the South End made less than $3,000 per year compared to the proportion of close to 18% for Boston families as a whole. The median family income for the South End was $3,524 as compared to $5,747 for the Boston family median.

The South End image was primarily associated with prostitution, dope, numbers, crime, and poverty in the minds of the respectable middle class citizens and planners. To most of Boston it meant slum and ghetto. Although it had its
share of associations with social, economic, and physical indicators which characterize many inner city grey areas passed over by private market forces and taken over by the lower income segments of the population, other aspects of the South End fulfilling the needs of the poor and elderly population were not recognized.

This being so, urban renewal in the South End had a high priority in "The 90 Million Dollar Development Program for Boston," and for obvious reasons. Physical rehabilitation and visibility were the main thrusts in the program for a "New Boston." Although much of the physical housing stock was deteriorated, the basic brick and timber structure of the South End rowhouses were sound and a prime target for residential rehabilitation. The South End had a definite function in the Collins/Logue image of the "New Boston" referred to in their $90 million development proposal. The South End had an historical heritage with a striking and unified architectural character. Despite what may be referred to as "blight," the South End had some tremendously viable assets. One mile from Boston City Hall and Government Center, the South End is close to the Downtown shopping area, adjacent to the retail and service facilities in the Back Bay, and ideal to house the middle and upper income workers projected for the "New Boston." The lucrative advantage of the South End was projected as a residential area, complementing the
Back Bay and Beacon Hill, within close proximity to the major city centers. Like the Back Bay and Beacon Hill, the South End displayed itself as a physical entity, identifiable by its unique architectural character, despite the nature of its "rich human stew."

Since the early 60's, when mortgage money for home improvement and home ownership in the area were non-existent, when insurance and financial security balked at the future of the South End, the urban renewal process and the market forces generated by adjacent developments, directing the new future of the South End, have put pressure on property values and rents. The evolving process of economic pressure had made it increasingly more difficult for low income people to secure accommodations in an area so sympathetic to their characteristics.

Also, and during recent years, subtle ethnic and income level change is occurring in the South End. Predominantly white, upper income, young professionals are moving into the area. Referred to as the "Urbanites," they "have decided to buy houses in the South End and convert them back to their original single family use,"\(^{27}\) to the extent that "moving here is like joining a crusade."\(^{28}\)

The upward trend in real estate prices created by the new market in the South End and buttressed by the advent of
urban renewal and three major adjacent developments, the
Prudential Center, the Christian Science complex, and the new
John Hancock Building, as well as Government Center, and the
general thrust of the "New Boston" to attract back to the
city those income groups who had fled "Old Boston's" over-
whelming conditions combined with the net result of continual
displacement of lower income families and individuals in the
South End.

In areas experiencing the combined pressures of urban
renewal and large private development, a critical problem is
created by the demolition, acquisition, and economic attrition
of low rent housing units. An area with a unique advantage
for lower income people, the supply of low rent housing units
within the South End became severely pinched. Dislocated
from the area, the lower income residents were forced to seek
accommodations elsewhere, usually moving to areas where there
was already a high concentration of low income, minority
people. Although it was stated in the South End Urban
Renewal Plan that it was "not the intention of the South End
Plan to force low income families and individuals out of the
area as upgrading occurs," it became readily apparent that
the generated market forces were moving lower income residents
out of the South End, and changing the nature of the area's
functions. The South End Urban Renewal Plan provided "...in
appropriate areas, new housing units...which are within the
income requirements of the residents of the community," the provision was not sufficient to rehouse within the South End, the displaced low income residents.
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Section II
ASSESSING THE CONTEXT: THE SOUTH END

1 DEMOGRAPHIC OVERVIEW

The population of the South End and its changes in composition reflect its sensitivity to the roles the area has played since its initial development as part of the Boston Urban Center. Moreover, the fluctuation of the population and its temperament has essentially occurred within the same physical framework of the brick rowhouses, tenements, and long rectilinear blocks originally developed in the latter half of the 1800's (Figure II-12). After the turn of the century, following the departure of the respectable middle-class settlers, the South End began its illustrious role as a port-of-entry for immigrants and in-migrants to the City of Boston. In 1910, the South End had a population of 76,000, composed mostly of foreign immigrants living in extremely crowded conditions. For most of the early arrivals
economic consolidation and upward mobility situated as a primary goal and by 1940, a majority of the original immigrant population had relocated to other residential areas of Boston. By 1940, the population in the South End was 51,300, 30% of whom were non-white. During the intervening years the foreign immigrant in the South End was replaced by the black rural in-migrant, illustrating a phenomenon realized by many of the major core urban areas in the United States.

The in-migration continued through the 1940's, and for a short period the population in the South End increased. By 1950 the population in the South End had grown to 57,500, 33.1% of whom were non-white (Figure II-13).

Between 1950 and 1960, the population of the South End significantly declined from 57,500 to 35,190, a net decrease of 38.8%. During this same period the City of Boston also registered a decrease in population of 13%, whereas the Boston Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) realized a population increase of 9.24%. The population loss in the South End during this period may be attributed to two factors, an excess of death over births combined and net out-migration from the area by family types whose economic positions had improved. There were relatively few persons of child bearing age. Older age groups, either lingering from the earlier
in-migration or attracted to the area by inexpensive accommodations and close proximity to health care facilities, comprised an unusually high proportion of the population. Between 1955 and 1960, the average excess of deaths over births per year was 133.¹ The 1960 Census recorded 16.8% of the South End population over age 65, and close to 40% over age 55 compared to Boston as a whole with 12.3% over age 65 and 23.3% over age 55.

Comparing racial composition and change (Figure II-14) between 1950 and 1960 in the Boston SMSA, the City of Boston, and the South End, a phenomenon of unequal mobility and increase (or decrease) between whites and non-whites may be detected. The non-white component of the total SMSA population nearly doubled, as compared to the absolute increase of the white population component of 8% which constituted the net gain of 9.24% in the Boston SMSA population. Although the City of Boston experienced a 13% loss of total population, the non-white component experienced an absolute increase of 60%, whereas the white component realized an absolute loss of 17%. During this period the proportion of non-whites in the City of Boston rose from 5.3% in 1950 to 9.8% in 1960. Although during this same period the South End experienced a total population loss of 38.8%, the decrease in the white component of the South End population was considerably higher than the decrease in the non-white component (40% versus
24.3% respectively), thus raising the non-white proportion of population from 33.1% in 1950 to 40.9% in 1960.

The indication of these population changes is that the white population was leaving the City of Boston and relocating in outer areas within the Boston SMSA area, while the non-white population within the City of Boston nearly doubled in number, owing either to in-migration or natural increase, or both. The significant drop in the population in the South End indicates that both whites and non-whites were leaving the South End, however the white component apparently had a higher degree of mobility and choice of location. The net indication of these changes was that the non-white population increased and was restricted within the City of Boston while the white population moved away from the City.

The advent of urban renewal in the South End during the decade of the 1960's did little to alter the trend of population and change by race in absolute terms that was established during the 1950's. Between 1960 and 1970 (Figure II-14), the South End population continued to decrease and experienced a loss of 34.2%, from 35,190 to 23,153. (During the course of urban renewal planning in the South End, the BRA projected a population of approximately 30,000 by 1970.) The proportion of non-whites continued to increase, from 40.9% in 1960 to approximately 50% in 1970. During this period the City of
Boston continued to lose its white population (16.5% loss between 1960 and 1970), and gained in the non-white segment (69.9% increase between 1960 and 1970), and the proportion of non-whites in the City of Boston went up from 9.8% of the City's population in 1960 to 18.1% in 1970. Generally, the absolute trends of migration and natural increase described during the 1950's continued, with the exception that the rate of total population increase exhibited a decline.

However, although the absolute population trends during the 1960's appear to parallel the population dynamics of the 1950's, there was a significant change within the demographic composition of sub-groups in the South End. The most obvious change has occurred in the age/sex distribution. In 1960 the age/sex profile was "V" shaped (Figure II-15), indicating a high proportion of adults and elderly, predominantly men attributed to the South End's "skid row" and rooming house population, with a declining proportion of school age children and infants. The 1970 age/sex profile is "bell shaped" (Figure II-16), indicating a decline in the proportion of older age groups, and an increase in the proportion of the middle age groups and school age groups, although still exhibiting a relative imbalance of a higher proportion of males than females in the middle and older age brackets. The South End profile more closely resembled the City of Boston profile in 1970 than in 1960 (Figure II-17).
The significant drop in the population of the South End could indicate that the area had lost some of its attractiveness to those who had been living there. Like most urban core areas with a high proportion of low income and minority people, the South End experienced a high degree of intolerable physical and social conditions: There had been a high unemployment rate; City services, including schools, parks, street repair, and trash collection had been extremely poor; The health indications of the residents suffered. (The infant mortality rate in 1961 was more than double the City of Boston average, 57.7 per 1,000 births versus 26.1 per 1,000 births respectively, and the South End registered 29.6% of pulmonary tuberculosis in the City of Boston during 1961.)

These conditions enjoined families to move from the South End as soon as they were economically able. This out-migration, however, was primarily led by more moderate income families whose housing requirements for more family residential characteristics outweighed the low economic advantages of the South End.

Although the South End realized a drop of 34.2% in population between 1960 and 1970, there is no doubt that in-migration occurred along with the out-migration, which produced the net population decline. Although the proportion of in-migration is heavily outweighed by the out-migration, recent assessment of in-migration in the South End has
indicated a growing community of Spanish speaking persons in the South End. Replacing black in-migration, the Spanish speaking population grew from approximately 400 in 1960 to approximately 4,000 in 1970. For these newly arrived lower income groups, the priority of housing requirements did not extend beyond the paramount issue of initial economic and household consolidation. Added to this economic relocation problem is the disadvantage of language difficulty, which migration to an established Spanish speaking community cushions.

Another recent in-migration, creating a significant change in demographic composition in the South End, is a "dramatic ethnic and income level change...upper income, mainly white, young professionals are moving into the area to reclaim the rowhouses as single-family homes of the wealthy." Although this phenomenon is difficult to document, especially lacking specific unpublished 1970 Census tract data, examination of the South End and information from long term residents and involved people in the South End confirm this recent trend. Although the conditions in the South End are somewhat less than "middle and upper class," the attraction of this group to the area stems from the excitement of being an "urban adventurer." Also the historic characteristics and architectural style of much of the South End created an image of selective privilege to be
able to reside in a framework of past graciousness.

The Annual Income Distribution in the South End for 1960 is illustrated in Figures II-20, II-26, and II-27.

2 HOUSING OVERVIEW

Housing demand could be considered to be directly influenced by the distribution of population in household units, and conversely the distribution of population in household units in a housing sub-market may be considered to be directly influenced by the available housing supply. The South End has experienced both conditions. Being a small housing market sector in the Boston area, it is difficult to identify the independent and dependent variables in as much as other housing sub-markets in the Boston area may relieve the pressure of a specific independent variable, thus making the dependent characteristic moot. The point is that the South End housing market is not a closed system and has operated for some time as a sensitive part of Boston's total housing market. If housing demand is considered to be influenced by the characteristics of household units, then the response of the South End housing supply prior to 1960 with the proliferation of rooming houses and one-room flats
for the area's primary individuals was a natural response. Other sub-markets in the Boston area were ostensibly required to absorb the housing demand for units with different characteristics. However, a protracted market for lower income families existed within the Boston market and lower income families were obliged to seek the housing supply which accommodated them. The South End provided units for this demand. Although being a vital part of the lower economic range of the Boston housing market, the area often did not provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing. Thus, the South End housing market had a duality of characteristics shaped both by active demand and available supply.

Since the execution of urban renewal, however, there has been a concerted effort to direct the South End housing supply to effect a definite pattern of population distribution in household units. Housing policy, for those involved, in the South End has recently been to expand the supply of "family" units and the accompanying characteristics of a "family" residential area. This policy has been, and can be, effected because the South End, although at the lower economic scale of the Boston housing market for a long period of time, has physical and locational characteristics which have sustained the economic and housing market pressures necessary to keep the area within the competitive housing market. The South End has unique characteristics.
which have prevented the area from being permanently passed over by the housing market, as usually is the case for many other sub-markets in "grey" urban areas on the lower economic end of the housing spectrum.

Figure II-18 shows the distribution of the Boston and South End population in households and group quarters for 1960 and 1970. It can be seen that the proportion of household heads (family households), in relation to primary individuals (individual households), went from 35.4% in 1960 to 41.5% in 1970, while Boston as a whole experienced a drop in the proportion of household heads from 72.1% in 1960 to 64.8% in 1970. The average population per household in the South End, including primary individuals, increased from 1.85 in 1960 to 2.18 in 1970, reflecting the decrease in the proportion of primary individuals in the South End. On the other hand, the average population per household for the City of Boston decreased from 2.93 in 1960 to 2.77 in 1970, reflecting the increasing proportion of primary individuals in the City of Boston. The significant indication is represented by the increase in average family size excluding primary individuals. The average family size in the South End increased from 3.4 persons in 1960 to 3.84 persons in 1970, an increase of 12.9% in family size. Boston registered a family size increase of 1.6%, from 3.67 persons in 1960 to 3.73 persons in 1970.
Figure II-19 illustrates the change in status of the South End housing market in terms of tenure and vacancy. The significant decrease in the total number of dwelling units from 21,484 in 1960 to 11,176 in 1970 can be attributed to extensive demolition along the lower Roxbury portion of the South End in anticipation of the proposed Inner Belt Expressway, demolition of deteriorated units in the Castle Square area, spot demolition of dilapidated buildings throughout the South End, and conversion of cut up rowhouses to larger units. Figures II-20 and II-21 illustrate the change in the number of dwelling units by census tracts. The high vacancy rate in the South End of 15.7% of the housing units is created more by a situation of sub-standard and uninhabitable, although existing, units rather than a weakening in the housing demand.

The traditional function of the South End's housing supply, serving those with a minimum of economic choice and mobility, has been severely altered by the advent of urban renewal, not only in the South End, but also in the City of Boston. Although the complexity of the housing market in the South End makes it difficult to identify the subtle dynamics of the supply and demand, some very obvious trends in housing market changes can be established.

Throughout the 1960's, upward economic pressure has
been placed on the South End's housing stock, brought about by both internal and external pressures, seriously affecting the ability of lower income residents to remain in the area. Two internal pressures, resulting from the advent of urban renewal have previously been mentioned: The attrition and demolition of existing housing units in the South End, and the in-migration of upper income residents willing to pay higher prices for living in the South End. External developments include activity in the area northwest of the South End: Prudential Center, the Christian Science complex, the new John Hancock Building, and other hotel and theater complexes. The upward pressures have also invited non-resident real estate speculators who add to the competitive pressure on real estate prices in the South End private market. Without the aid of government subsidized housing, the lower income residents are finding it increasingly more difficult to remain in the private housing market in the South End.

The net effect of these trends is the continual displacement pressure on the lower income residents, who have only a few options for relocation, if any, and can only relocate to areas in Boston already inundated by lower income minority groups creating a tremendous demand for housing on a severely restricted lower income market.
Figures II-22 and II-23 illustrate, by census tract, the effect these upward pressures have had on the median contract rent and the median value of owner occupied units in the South End. Using in both cases the Boston medians for 1960 and 1970 as the respective base values, the figures dramatically show how the rise in median rent and value outpaced the average inflationary gains in the City of Boston for the period between 1960 and 1970. In every census tract, with available information, the rise in the median value of owner occupied units in the South End have exceeded the relative inflationary rise in the City of Boston, and in two tracts the median value exceeds the Boston median of $19,500 in 1970 by approximately 50%. Median rents in the South End have behaved in much the same way, though not as dramatically. Nevertheless, in four tracts the median rent in 1970 exceeds the Boston median of $98. Taken together, these figures indicate that most of the upward pressure has occurred along the upper portion of Massachusetts Avenue and in the portion of the South End north of Tremont Street, the area closest to the external development activity around Prudential Center. These figures also illustrate the unprecedented economic pressures which are driving many lower income South End residents out of the South End.
3 COMPOSITE CHARACTERISTICS BY CENSUS TRACTS
Figure II-2
PERSONS PER ACRE 1970
Source: 1970 Census

0-25
26-50
51-75
76-100

SOUTH END AREA
Figure II-3

DLWELLINGS PER ACRE (GROSS) 1960

Source: 1960 Census
Median = \( \frac{1}{2} \) 40 d.u./acre
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Figure II-4
Dwellings per Acre (Gross) 1970
Source: 1970 Census
Median = ± 25 d.u./acre
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Figure II-5
PERSONS PER DWELLING UNIT 1960
Source: 1960 Census
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Figure 11.6
PERSONS PER DWELLING UNIT 1970
Source: 1970 Census
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Figure II.7
ROOMS PER DWELLING UNIT (MEDIAN) 1960
Source: 1960 Census
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Figure II-8
% of Dwelling Units Deteriorating 1960
Source: 1960 Census

0-19%
20-39%
40-59%
60-80%

SOUTH END AREA
Figure II-9
% OF DWELLING UNITS DILAPIDATED 1960
Source: 1960 Census
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Figure II-10
CARS PER DWELLING UNIT 1960
Source: 1960 Census
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Figure II-11
MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME PER YEAR 1960
Source: 1960 Census
MEDIAN = $3,524
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4 FIGURES REFERRED TO IN SECTION II
Figure II-12
POPULATION TREND: Boston Urban Area/ Boston/ South End
Horizontal: years    Vertical: population

Figure II-13
TOTAL POPULATION & COMPARISON OF POPULATION CHANGE 1950-1970
Boston SMSA/ Boston/ South End

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMSA</td>
<td>2,369,986</td>
<td>+9.24</td>
<td>2,589,301</td>
<td>+6.4</td>
<td>2,753,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>801,444</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
<td>697,197</td>
<td>-8.05</td>
<td>641,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South End</td>
<td>57,501</td>
<td>-38.8</td>
<td>35,190</td>
<td>-34.2</td>
<td>23,153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure II-14
POPULATION AND CHANGE BY RACE 1950-1970
Boston SMSA/ Boston/ South End

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boston SMSA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,314,261</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>+8.0</td>
<td>2,502,209</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>2,602,741</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>45,725</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>+90.5</td>
<td>87,092</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>+73</td>
<td>150,959</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,369,986</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+9.2</td>
<td>2,589,301</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+6.4</td>
<td>2,753,700</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boston</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>758,700</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>628,704</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>-16.5</td>
<td>524,790</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>42,744</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>+60</td>
<td>68,493</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>+69.9</td>
<td>116,362</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>801,444</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>697,197</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
<td>641,071</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>South End</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>38,480</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>20,796</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>11,635</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>19,021</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>-24.3</td>
<td>14,394</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>11,518</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>57,501</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-38.8</td>
<td>35,190</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-34.2</td>
<td>23,153</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure II-15
TOTAL POPULATION DISTRIBUTION--SOUTH END 1960

WHITE as a PERCENTAGE of TOTAL POPULATION

NONWHITE as a PERCENTAGE of TOTAL POPULATION
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Figure II-16
TOTAL POPULATION DISTRIBUTION—SOUTH END 1970
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OTHER RACES as a PERCENTAGE of TOTAL POPULATION
Figure II-17
TOTAL POPULATION DISTRIBUTION--BOSTON 1970
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### Figure II-18
DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION IN HOUSEHOLDS AND GROUP QUARTERS 1960-1970
Boston/ South End

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pop. in Households</td>
<td>656,854</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>- 8.4</td>
<td>601,725</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. in Group Quarters</td>
<td>40,343</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>- 2.5</td>
<td>39,346</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POPULATION</td>
<td>697,197</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>- 8.1</td>
<td>641,071</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Heads</td>
<td>161,729</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>-12.8</td>
<td>140,966</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Individuals</td>
<td>62,703</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>+ 22.3</td>
<td>76,656</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS</td>
<td>224,432</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
<td>217,622</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Head of Husband/Wife Household</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>102,147</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Male Head</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>6,906</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Head</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>31,913</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS *</td>
<td>161,729</td>
<td>- 12.8</td>
<td>140,966</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV. POP. PER HOUSEHOLD</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>- 5.5</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. POP. PER HOUSEHOLD Excluding Primary Individuals</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>+ 1.6</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOUTH END

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pop. in Households</td>
<td>33,547</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>- 38.7</td>
<td>20,555</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop. in Group Quarters</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>- 57</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POPULATION</td>
<td>35,190</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>- 34.2</td>
<td>23,136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Heads</td>
<td>6,427</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>- 39</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Individuals</td>
<td>11,714</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>- 53</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS</td>
<td>18,141</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>- 48</td>
<td>9,426</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Head of Husband/Wife Household</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Male Head</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Head</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS *</td>
<td>6,427</td>
<td>- 39</td>
<td>3,916</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV. POP. PER HOUSEHOLD</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>+ 17.8</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av. POP. PER HOUSEHOLD Excluding Primary Individuals</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>+ 12.9</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excluding Primary Individuals
Figure II-19
HOUSING UNITS, TENURE, AND VACANCY STATUS 1950-1970
Boston/ South End

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>54,266</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>61,165</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>59,230</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>163,837</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>163,267</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>158,392</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14,115</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>14,826</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HSG UNITS</td>
<td>222,079</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>238,547</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>232,448</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

South End

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>13,345</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>16,471</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>8,309</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3,343</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HSG UNITS</td>
<td>15,283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21,484</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11,176</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure II-20
1970 CENSUS TRACTS

SOUTH END AREA
Figure II-21
Change in the number of housing units in the South End by census tracts 1960-1970
Figure II-22

MEDIAN CONTRACT RENT IN SOUTH END BY CENSUS TRACTS
AS % OF BOSTON MEDIAN 1960-1970

1960 Boston median = $60

1970 Boston median = $98

Figure II-23

MEDIAN VALUE OF OWNER OCCUPIED UNITS IN SOUTH END BY CENSUS TRACTS

AS % OF BOSTON MEDIAN 1960-1970

1960 Boston median value = $13,500

1970 Boston median value = $19,500

*Tract 704,711,712 have suppressed data for owner occupied units.
Tract 704 includes the Castle Square redevelopment project and all three tracts have heavy industrial and institutional uses.
**Figure II-24**
CONTRACT RENTS IN THE SOUTH END 1960-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renter Occupied Units</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>$84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent Brackets</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 0-59</td>
<td>10,925</td>
<td>1,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60-79</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>2,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80-99</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>1,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100-119</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120-149</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150-199</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200-299</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300-+</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure II-25**
CONTRACT RENTS IN BOSTON 1960-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renter Occupied Units</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent Brackets</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ 0-59</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>19,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60-79</td>
<td>43,509</td>
<td>31,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80-99</td>
<td>43,798</td>
<td>31,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100-119</td>
<td>28,260</td>
<td>23,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120-149</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>22,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150-199</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>18,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200-299</td>
<td>7,897</td>
<td>11,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300-+</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure II-26
MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME IN SOUTH END BY CENSUS TRACTS
AS % OF BOSTON MEDIAN 1960-1970
1960 Boston median = $5,747
1970 Boston median = *
Figure II-27
ANNUAL INCOME DISTRIBUTION—1960

SOUTH END 1960
median family income: $3,524
families: 6,727

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>FAMILIES</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-999</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-2,999</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-3,999</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-4,999</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-5,999</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000-6,999</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000-7,999</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000-8,999</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000-9,999</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-+</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6,727</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BOSTON 1960
median family income: $5,747
families: 164,215

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>FAMILIES</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-999</td>
<td>5,698</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>9,432</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-2,999</td>
<td>12,229</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-3,999</td>
<td>16,256</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-4,999</td>
<td>20,331</td>
<td>12.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-5,999</td>
<td>24,306</td>
<td>14.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000-6,999</td>
<td>19,053</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000-7,999</td>
<td>15,080</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000-8,999</td>
<td>11,387</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000-9,999</td>
<td>8,129</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>16,869</td>
<td>10.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
<td>4,428</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-+</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>164,215</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure II-27 continued
BOSTON SMSA 1960
median family income: $6,687
families: 640,526

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>FAMILIES</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-999</td>
<td>15,207</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,999</td>
<td>23,312</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000-2,999</td>
<td>32,197</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-3,999</td>
<td>45,702</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-4,999</td>
<td>64,861</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-5,999</td>
<td>86,156</td>
<td>13.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000-6,999</td>
<td>76,842</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000-7,999</td>
<td>67,392</td>
<td>10.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000-8,999</td>
<td>53,207</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000-9,999</td>
<td>39,380</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>90,769</td>
<td>14.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-24,999</td>
<td>32,431</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000+</td>
<td>13,070</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>640,526</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Bar chart showing distribution of family income.]
Section III
AN AGENT OF CHANGE: THE SOUTH END URBAN RENEWAL PLAN

1 A SHORT HISTORY

The South End existed with its historical "human stew" because economic and physical restrictions confined a supply of low-income housing to a central city area. Social forces, trends, and discrimination concentrated the poor and minority to this older section of the city. Upon this neglected fabric lay the advantages of public transportation access, social and welfare services, and central location to employment, service, and commercial facilities. In these terms, the existence of the South End was severely threatened.

The low income families and individuals, forced into older and dilapidated neighborhoods because of a low-rent entry level, were threatened by the rising phoenix of the
"new South End". Many of these low income neighborhoods, because of adverse circumstances and the common problem of poor housing conditions, eventually found themselves united. Faced with imminent displacement and relocation, in all probability to lesser desirable areas, these neighborhoods assembled strong personal relationships and internal associations which, in some instances, resulted in a formal organization directed to improve the physical and socio-economic position of the residents. Following the approval of the South End Urban Renewal Plan in 1965 by the Boston City Council, the South End experienced such a phenomenon as the direction of the rehabilitation of the South End became apparent.

The following short descriptive history of the renewal planning process in the South End is provided as both an agent of change and as background to the process of change which altered the context and thus the situational aspirations of the people of the Emergency Tenants Council.²

Early in 1961 existing community organizations in the South End, notably the venerable United South End Settlements (USES), and its planning appendage the South End Planning Council (SEPC), began formally meeting to represent the South End during the Urban Renewal planning process. The Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) introduced the
planning process through USES and SEPC, as these two organizations had significant historical precedent in their concern for the welfare of the South End community as a whole, and presented, among diverse groups and interests in the area, a formal organizational framework and leadership position. The original planning committee was composed of 12 members, predominantly from USES, and included the BRA project director as an ex-officio member.\(^3\)

The South End Urban Renewal Committee (SEURC) was officially formed in mid-1961, and represented "something of a cross-section of the non-problem South End interests groups,"\(^4\) if not by actual delegated authority, then by assumption of a committee member to represent an identifiable group's interests. The SEURC began weekly meetings during September 1961, and being relatively early in the planning process, expressed broad views and concerns which stressed social as well as physical planning as necessary to improve the "quality of life." The committee began by identifying some preliminary issues, which were:\(^5\)

1 concentration of liquor licenses too great  
2 community center needed  
3 new and rehabilitated housing for elderly needed  
4 facilities for homeless men  
5 should be a cross-section of socioeconomic levels  
6 traditional social problems will remain and should be considered in the planning process
The SEURC was broadened in December 1961 to be more inclusive in its representation and added representatives of neighborhood associations although loosely formed, and representatives of the South End Businessmen's Association, the South End Neighborhood Renewal Action Committee, and an organization representing South End institutions. The reorganized SEURC formed a 41 member committee which became a broader based agent for the South End during the bargaining process of urban renewal. The broadened base of the SEURC instituted neighborhood associations, whether existing or newly formed, as a means of community involvement, and established neighborhood associations as a significant component in the South End planning process, although only through representation on the SEURC.

Coming out of the first year, the BRA, in its annual report noted that:

The South End is one of the most highly organized residential areas of the city. Despite the existence of blight, there is strong pride in many of its areas and a deep desire to improve and rehabilitate. The South End represents, from every standpoint, a good example of a neighborhood which can be rehabilitated, but can rehabilitate only if the confidence of the residents is maintained and encouraged and the plans that are set up reflect their needs as well as the city's.6

The BRA presented an optimistic commentary on a mechanism established, from divergent interests in the South End, to deal with urban renewal.
While the SEURC was searching its way through plans that could be "set up (to) reflect their needs as well as the city's," the BRA was at work preparing a physical sketch plan which would attempt to incorporate the issues and desires of the SEURC. In December 1962 the BRA presented to the SEURC the sketch result of its efforts.

This initial plan predominantly proposed a "common way" or "green strip" concept running the length of the South End and was intended to provide a central spine of activity, stylistically "stitching" together, as well as reinforcing, a simplistically presumed dichotomy in the South End between the "good" family residential areas, and the "problem" areas. The "green strip" was to provide a focus of activity, relating the mutually identified areas along a pronounced central axis. A cluster of community facilities, commercial facilities, and new housing was proposed for the center of the project area creating a physical "heart," or central activity area. The sketch plan also proposed a concentration of 2,500 public housing units at the Lower Roxbury end of the area, below Massachusetts Avenue.

Passing through the SEURC with no definite commitment, the sketch plan went to the neighborhood groups for examination and discussion. Confusion resulted in the community groups regarding the bargaining issues and the
decision making process, as well as background information and input concerning the proposal. Consequently, reaction to the plan proposal at the neighborhood level ranged between "loud and violent" to skeptically reserved examinations.

In short, the sketch plan proposal was rejected by the neighborhood residents, primarily because of their exclusion from the actual physical planning process. For many of the residents the experience of suddenly being shown a renewal plan was disturbing. Although the neighborhood associations had representation on the SEURC, and among the Committee there was adequate information, information on the level of residents not directly involved in the renewal process was scarce. A majority of residents were without knowledge of the process since initial contact was made in December 1961, when the neighborhood associations were formed to broaden the base of renewal involvement.

The rejection of this initial plan by a resident power base presented a crisis in the renewal process and both the BRA and SEURC recognized the need to overhaul its organizations in order to continue. The SEURC restructured from within and appointed a native South Ender as the new chairman of the SEURC. The BRA reorganized
its staff, and a new BRA project director was appointed in the South End. Although there was apparently a highly complex interplay of forces and decisions which prompted both changes, a basic issue was the unresolved decision-making process and the responsibility for decision initiative, which resulted in encumbered relations between the South End leadership and the initial BRA project director. Sluggish and undefined progress on the South End plan compounded matters. However, by the summer of 1963, participants in the renewal process were ready to resume. Ed Logue later summed up this transition which signalled the beginning of the second phase of planning in the South End with somewhat of an understatement,

In May of 1963, a preliminary plan was shown to the community. In June of 1963, based on reaction and data gathered from the preliminary plan, a revised plan was started under the direction of the present (the second) director.

During the fall of 1963, the new project director, recognizing the complexity of the South End and the tremendous need for resident community support to carry a plan approval though, adopted a procedure called "walking the neighborhoods." To get first hand knowledge of the existing neighborhoods, the BRA staff walked up and down neighborhood "turf" with residents of the area, exacting detailed and specific desires from each neighborhood. Unlike his predecessor, although neighborhood associations
had been formed during the initial stages of the renewal process, the new project director created a power base from the different neighborhood residents, giving them a genuine sense of participation. This walking process reaffirmed the neighborhood associations as the basis of the renewal plan, and established them as a major and significant component in the decision making process.

Sixteen neighborhood associations were established (Figure III-1), and although not all were actually involved, they existed in the framework of representation in the event a forum for resident expression was required. The BRA heralded in its 1963 report:

The project staff is in daily contact with citizens' groups from the South End . . . . Sixteen committees of neighborhood residents had been formed, attesting to the vitality interest of residents of the community. These include:

- Blackstone Neighborhood Association
- Bradford and Shawmut Neighborhood Association
- Cathedral Tenants Association
- Chester Park Neighborhood Association
- Claremont Park Neighborhood Association
- Cosmopolitan Neighborhood Association
- Ellis Neighborhood Association
- Eight Streets Neighborhood Association
- Pembroke Pilot Block Association
- Tremont Associates
- Union Park Association
- United Neighbors of Lower Roxbury
- Worcester Square Association

In January 1964, what became known as the "Concept" was introduced by the BRA (Figure III-2). The "Concept"
postulated a division, not as the original "green strip" did in dividing socially different segments of the South End in a common physical framework, but a division which represented a rational physical basis between residential use and institutional/industrial use. The "Concept" described basically two adjacent ovals, one a residential oval which included a concentrated community center, and the other, a smaller oval designated for institutional and industrial use. Focusing the issue at the physical conflict of mixed land use in the South End, and not clearly describing the specific elements in each oval, the "Concept" by-passed specific conflicts between interest groups situated in the respective ovals.

Within this conceptual framework for planning, the individual details of the renewal plan were worked out with the different neighborhood associations and interest groups. Compromises were struck at a specific and detailed level as the "Concept" was generally accepted as the basis for overall decisions and direction. The neighborhood groups played an important role in working out compromises on specific issues in the plan development. The "Concept" was taken to 155 separate meetings, and the urban renewal plan was gradually refined to include the input from these meetings.
By the fall of 1964, the BRA was ready with a second specific plan proposal. On October 5, 1964, the second proposal was presented to the SEURC, and consequently reviewed by a more enlightened collection of neighborhood associations. Included in this proposal was a series of general concepts, or assumptions, which were developed during the period of plan refinement through the community groups. They were:

The designation of industrial and residential areas.

"Gateways" to the South End should be developed at connecting points to other areas designed to create a new image of the South End.

A community center, developed in the vicinity of West Canton Street and Shawmut Avenue, to provide a focus for community activity by including public, community facilities.

Traffic through residential areas would be decreased through street improvements.

A concentrated program of health, education, welfare, and other services would be undertaken as part of the renewal program.12

The BRA, in its 1964 Annual Report, announced that:

An 88 million dollar renewal plan for the 566 acre South End was announced to the public in October 1964. Provision of a stable residential and industrial-commercial community is the primary object of the plan.

Rehabilitation of existing housing stock is emphasized with 75 percent of the dwellings earmarked for preservation.13
The South End Urban Renewal Committee voted to accept the plan in June 1965 and the public hearing held on August 23, 1965, "indicated widespread community support," for the plan. The Boston City Council heard the renewal plan and approved it in December 1965, approximately five years after the beginning of the renewal planning process. The final South End plan emerged as a series of specific neighborhood proposals bargained and compromised within the overall "Concept." The South End plan generally called for:

- Rehabilitation of more than 3,000 residential structures.
- Construction of more than 3,000 new private 221-d-3 units.
- 300 family units of public housing and 500 units for the elderly.
- Relocation phased so that persons wishing to stay in the South End were provided for.
- Development of a community center complex.
- Provisions for new school locations to replace the obsolete existing schools.
Summary of Objectives of the 1965 South End Urban Renewal Plan (Figures III-3, III-4, III-5).

Basic Objectives: eliminate severe conditions of blight, deterioration, obsolescence, traffic congestion and incompatible land uses in order to facilitate orderly growth and to achieve neighborhood, industrial, commercial and institutional stability.

Strengthen the physical pattern of local neighborhood activities.

Provide an economically, socially and racially integrated community.

Acknowledgement of basic residential and industrial/institutional competing land uses: The non-residential community should be developed in such a way as to provide necessary medical and industrial expansion without destroying the basic fabric of the residential community.

A Residential image: The gateways to the South End residential communities from South Cove, Back Bay, Fenway and Roxbury should be residentially oriented.

A Community Center: A diversity of compatible uses should be encouraged in the center of the South End.

Encourage economic investment: Remove the concentrations of deteriorated and deteriorating buildings which depress the physical condition and character of the area, impair the flow of investments and mortgage financing, and restrict adequate insurance coverage.
Protect private investment: Protect and expand the city's tax base and arrest the trend of economic decline; and by stabilizing property values, protect private investment.

New housing opportunities for area residents: Provide, in appropriate areas, new housing units which provide the highest level of amenity, convenience, usefulness, and livability which are within the income requirements of the residents of the community.

Provide new housing specifically designed to meet the needs of the numerous elderly residents in the community.

Opportunities provided within the South End for the construction of up to 2,500 new moderate rental dwelling units.

Proposal of 500 units of public rental housing for elderly persons and 300 family units.

Relocation provisions: Approximately 1,730 families and 1,820 single person households reside(d) in clearance sections in the project area.

Of the total 3,550 households, about 2,412 (69%) need(ed) one bedroom units or similar housing.

Relocation staged over 7 year period (1966-1972) with average of 500 household moves per year. Because a majority of families interviewed have (had) voiced a preference for remaining in the South End, the relocation program is (was) scheduled so that housing opportunities will (would) be available to meet the demand.

With vacancies in existing private and public housing in the South End, moderate rental construction, units of new elderly and family public housing, and units which can be made available under the demonstration rehabilitation program, the supply should meet the relocation demand.
Rehabilitation: Preserve, maintain, and reinforce the positive, unifying and unique qualities of the street patterns, rowhouses, parks, and squares.

All properties and building within the Project Area which are not designated for acquisition by the BRA to be maintained at or brought to a level which achieves a decent standard of safe and sanitary housing.

Public Facility improvements:

Five schools, four elementary and one intermediate, to replace five of the existing public schools.

A branch library located in the center area.

A community center building, including a swimming pool, located in the center area.

Field and playground improvements.

Street and traffic improvements.

Sewerage and storm drainage system improvements.
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Ushered through the renewal planning apex of approval, the South End commenced the "achingly slow, and essentially undramatic" rehabilitation renewal process. It could hardly be expected that, following approval, the plan would spring to life; that the plan that had taken five years to generate for acceptance would result in instant renewal, although some may have been under this illusion. Subject to delays characteristic of renewal projects, physical progress on the production of plan components was slow and two years after approval the South End plan realized serious problems. Relocation demand and new housing supply were out of phase: new housing construction was behind schedule and the relocation schedule was advanced. Designated public improvements, included in the plan and dependant on city agencies other than the BRA for actual production, were behind schedule. Concurrently, and compounding the evidence of serious
problems with the committed direction of the S.E. plan, the
dynamics of an urban population inevitably began changing
the composition of the South End. Frustration from slow
progress, unfortunate impact on the area's lower income
residents and relocatees, compounded by a changing complex-
on of the area, became newly created forces in the South
End.

In 1967 the emergence of a vocal organization represent-
ing low-income interests began challenging the equipoise of
the South End power coalition, and began influencing the
direction and outcome of urban renewal. Threatening to
seek a court order to stop urban renewal in the South End,\(^3\) 
Community Assembly for a United South End (CAUSE) based
their action on a report investigating the effects of urban
renewal on low income housing in the South End.\(^4\) The report
summarized the impact of urban renewal and charged, "in ef-
fact that 'urban removal' for the majority of the South End's
low-income residents."\(^5\) A result of post-planning dynamics
CAUSE emerged as a new interest group specifically represent-
ing the interest of the low income residents, and began de-
manding inclusion in the decision making process. CAUSE
signified a new wave of awareness among the lower income
residents of the South End threatened by urban renewal and,
consolidating criticism of the plan, was instrumental in
creating an atmosphere of protest in the South End among the
lower income residents. The issues focused by CAUSE were valid, and from the standpoint of the newly realized position of low income residents, the results were obviously counter to their interest.

Throughout the renewal process, with emphasis placed on the involvement and participation of the area's residents and, notwithstanding the complexities of how the renewal process would operate, the essential assumption throughout the planning was the thrust at providing a better South End for its existing heterogeneous residents. However, assurances concerning the future of the South End residential composition were difficult to secure in definite terms. Although the approved plan theoretically provided for the area's lower income residents through some public housing and subsidized housing, the dynamics of real estate pressure, city development, social mobility, economic fluctuations, and historical and ethnic migration patterns were difficult, if not impossible, to predict or control. Within the first two years of execution the direction the South End plan was taking became clear.

One of the primary issues identified with CAUSE was that of relocation. The South End Urban Renewal Plan identified and attempted to make provisions for a total relocation load of 3,550 households, consisting of 1,730 families and 1,820 individuals residing in the clearance sections of
the project. Planned to be phased over a seven year period (1966-1972), the relocation provisions estimated that 69% needed one bedroom or similar units, 75% were expected to move into private housing, and 20% were expected to move to into public housing, although 66% of the households were eligible for public housing. Projecting an average of 500 moves per year, relocation was viewed as being phased with units made available through existing sales and rental opportunities, rehabilitation demonstration programs, new and existing low rent housing, and in new housing construction provided for in the plan. A closer look at provisions in the plan specifically dealing with households eligible for public housing illustrates to some extent the reliance on other methods of assistance to provide the necessary units to meet the relocation demand. The following table outlines the provisions for relocatees eligible for public housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisions for Relocatees</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of families displaced eligible for public housing</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals displaced eligible for public housing</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total eligible for public housing</td>
<td>1,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Existing number of public housing in the area | 886     |
| Proposed public housing | 300     |
| Proposed housing for the elderly | 500     |
| Total publicly aided housing - post-renewal | 1,686   |
The estimated South End relocation load eligible for public housing was only half provided for, increasing the pressure to produce acceptable low rent units through other programs such as rehabilitation and rent supplement. Other relocatees not eligible for public housing were presumed to qualify for new BMIR (Federally subsidized, Below Market Interest Rate program, then section 221-d-3) units included in the S.E. plan.

Assuming the relocation situation remained static and the proposed unit production proceeded on schedule, the new housing would have provided a relocation source for the displaced households. Public housing production for the South End in 1967 consisted of 434 units of scattered site public housing, principally for the elderly, "in construction or advanced planning" besides the 102 elderly units in Castle Square. Addressing the approximately two-thirds of the relocation load eligible for public housing, the availability of rental assistance applied to the moderate-rental (221-d-3) units of new construction was critical to the primarily low income relocatees and the relocation schedule. Notwithstanding the delayed production, rental assistance was not readily available. Additional pressure was placed on the relocation phasing by "a high rate of voluntary abandonment," whereby households relocate without assistance from the relocation program. Reasons other than location in a
clearance section of the project, such as increasing property values and rents and competition with higher paying ability, dislocated many low income South End residents, adding to the relocation demand.

Despite the assurance in the S.E. plan that, "Because a majority of families interviewed have (had) voiced a preference for remaining in the South End, the relocation program is (was) scheduled so that housing opportunities will be available to meet the demand," unforeseen delays and unaccountable pressures advanced the projected rate of relocation creating a critical situation in the lower income sector. Unable to remain the the South End, "large numbers of families" relocated without the assistance of the South End Relocation Office, thus forfeiting any financial relocation assistance ($200 maximum at the time) and were forced to seek low rent accommodations elsewhere, primarily in the declining housing stock of the Roxbury and North Dorchester area of Boston.

Compounding the slow progress of new unit construction, rehabilitation in the South End posed another issue. As one of the most significant elements of the S.E. plan was residential rehabilitation of 75% of the existing housing stock, and as the plan suggested that rehabilitation would be carried out for the benefit of the residents wishing to remain in the area, the demand for the rehabilitation units
would come largely from the residents in the South End who were substantially low income. The emphasis placed on residential rehabilitation in the plan required rehabilitation that would generate rents lower income families could afford. Notwithstanding private market "luxury" rehabilitation based on real estates speculation and renewed market interest in the South End and its rowhouses, organized groups, utilizing Federal BMIR loans, were attempting rehabilitation to produce rent levels accessible to low income families.

The concept of rehabilitation was enhanced by the physical potential of most of the South End rowhouses. Also enhancing the concept of rehabilitation was the notion that it would be an efficient and speedy method for providing the necessary standard units in the area. Rehabilitation also worked within the existing community fabric and provided a method of maintaining and reinforcing the community. Phased with relocation, problems were considered to be minimized as the rehabilitation time period is generally shorter than new construction, and possibly the extent of rehabilitation work would be minimal enough to make relocation unnecessary. The compelling reason for rehabilitation with respect to the area's lower income families was the notion that rehabilitation work was less expensive than new construction, and the savings could be passed on through lower rents.
The concept of rehabilitating South End rowhouses for the area's lower income residents ran current with the South End planning period and in 1964 a non-profit corporation, South End Community Development, Inc. (SECD), was formed through the efforts of United South End Settlements (USES) and with the aid of a Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grant, to gather evidence of the feasibility of rehabilitating South End houses for low income families.

In its efforts, SECD utilized a combination of methods to reduce expenses which could influence rents, "including a non-profit corporation eligible for real estate tax relief, acquisition of tax-foreclosed properties from the City of Boston, use of the corporation's own professional staff and construction workers to the extent feasible, financing and loans at below-market interest rates (Section 221-d-3) and ownership and operation of the properties on a not-for-profit basis." The demonstration project, begun in mid-1964 with initial closing in January 1966 and final closing in January 1967, consisted of eleven scattered rowhouses in the South End and produced fifty apartments. The demonstration project generally found that:

1) The buildings had to be substantially gutted and reconstructed as it proved less expensive than tedious restoration and patching.

2) Construction costs were much higher than initially estimated, ranging from $9,600 to $13,700 in
contrast to the $500-$1,500 comparable range originally estimated by the BRA. 26, 27

3) Rehabilitation for lower income occupancy was only feasible when most of the apartments were rented through the public housing leasing program or through HUD rent supplement, where tenants pay only a portion of their rent according to income. The average income of tenants in the project was approximately $3,200 per year. 28

4) The rents produced ranged from $65 to $68 for efficiencies, $79 to $92 for a one bedroom, $86 to $116 for a two bedroom, $140 to $144 for a three bedroom, and $118 to $166 for a four bedroom unit, approaching maximum allowable units under the 221-d-3 program. 29

5) Community improvements to complement and support SECD's housing rehabilitation were not provided. 30

The major impact that residential rehabilitation was to provide for housing the South End's lower income families was not forthcoming. The BRA Annual Report listed a total of 76 units committed or completed. 31 In comparison to the estimated 11,000 substandard units in the South End, the rehabilitation record was dismal. In addition residential rehabilitation under government subsidy did not deliver rents accessible to many South End residents (using 25% of family income as a reference) and required additional rental assistance. "The most dramatic way in which the plan had failed was in its inability to produce residential rehab for low income families." 32

The issues created by the failure of the S.E. plan to produce as intended were further exacerbated by the impact of
urban renewal activity on the private housing market in the South End in concert with the impact of external development affecting the South End. The major development activity to the north, including the Prudential Center, the Government Center, and the Christian Science Complex, began signalling the revitalization of Boston as a major urban center, with the concomitant effect of generating a demand for more "middle-class space for convenient in-town living."^33

The adjacency of the South End to the new developments and its central location proved its sensitivity to change and the South End began attracting private residential investment. The advent of urban renewal as an agent of concentrated neighborhood upgrading provided a practical incentive for real estate investment and the influx of "urbanites" by extending the basis of security for financial investment in certain parts of the area. Also the location of the South End and the architectural characteristics of its rowhouses were appealing as a complement to the Back Bay area. The depressed sales prices of many of the rowhouses encouraged speculative investment with subsequent "luxury" rehabilitation producing rents beyond the reach of the original tenants. The increased real estate speculation in the area also improved the market value of many of the rowhouses. The report done in 1967 for CAUSE indicated that real estate speculation and surrounding development pressures in the
South End had driven the prices in the South End dramatically upward:

In an area of the South End known to be the focus for home buying by urbanites (the north-easterly section), a comparison was made between the number and value of transactions in the private market for the periods 1958-1960 and 1962-1964. In the first 3-year period there were 72 transactions with an average value of $5,800; in the second 3-year period there were 240 transactions with an average value of $8,740.34

Passed over by a previous market, urban renewal and major developments, along with the area's unique physical and locational advantages, were bringing the private housing market back to portions of the South End. From this housing market aspect, the assurances that the South End would continue serving its resident population were placed in jeopardy. The threat of a significant influx of "urbanites," that had concerned those involved with renewal planning, had appeared, and real estate investment and home buying, with a responding rise in property values,35 added to the pressures dislocating lower income residents. The upward pressures on property values would naturally benefit a resident home owner and seriously affect the lower income renter. The residents put in competition with the private market and not economically able to compete, added to the relocation supply pressure further aggravating the situation of the low income resident.
CAUSE, representing low income interest, was able to leverage these issues and consolidate criticism of the S.E. plan, thereby mobilizing considerable political power. Following their notice that they would attempt to halt the urban renewal process through court action, CAUSE began demanding to be included in the renewal power structure, and "enlisted the aid of city councilor-elect Thomas Atkins in their fight to change renewal plans." CAUSE also began actively challenging the relocation program carried out by USES under contract with the BRA, and ultimately forced USES to discontinue its relocation activity through confrontation tactics. With the renewal dissidents mobilized, pressure on the BRA to recognize the new interest group in the South End increased, and with the aid of Urban Field Service, a group of volunteer planners from Harvard University "interested in aiding disadvantaged community groups," a proposal to change the direction of renewal in the South End through a massive 5000-unit rehabilitation effort was presented at a public hearing of the Boston City Council. Also during this period, a series of tenant rent strikes were occurring, further publicizing the critical situation in the South End, and the power structure created during the planning process began to yield. In June 1968, the BRA granted management powers over 34 buildings to the South End Tenants Council (SETC), a black community group, following a nine
week rent strike against a realtor with extensive holdings in the South End.⁴¹

SETC was protesting conditions in buildings which they described as "conditions not fit for dogs much less human beings."⁴² This action by the BRA was an evident concession, in light of the pressure to do so, to the growing power of low income residents in the South End, and signified the determination of South End lower income resident groups to engage their situation directly. The action was also unprecedented and was "believed to be the first time in the nation that an urban renewal agency (has) delegated such responsibilities to tenants."⁴³ The BRA had to respond to a new coalition of power in the South End.

Amid these rumblings in the South End the Emergency Tenants Council emerged, arising in specific reaction to the Boston Redevelopment Authority's 1965 Urban Renewal Plan for Parcel 19 in the South End.
Section V
THE EMERGENCY TENANTS COUNCIL

1 ETC EMERGES

Originating in the complex web of housing market factors and the urban renewal process, the Emergency Tenants Council focused in specific reaction to the 1965 South End Urban Renewal Plan for Parcel 19 (Figure V-1). The 14 acre area, situated in the middle of the South End was designated in the 1965 S.E. plan for "diversity of compatible uses (which) should be encouraged in the center of the South End." Within the context of the "Concept" developed during the planning process, the area was to contain the "center community facilities." The area generally referred to as Parcel 19 in the SEURP is bounded by Union Park Street, Washington Street, West Newton Street, Tremont Street, Upton Street, and Shawmut Avenue. Parcel 19 contains a number of originally aristocratic, although now decaying, rowhouses and a number of commercial and industrial establishments (Figure III-3), many
of which are presently abandoned in deference to the 1965 renewal plan for the area.

Parcel 19 was scheduled in the 1965 SEURP for large scale demolition (Figure III-5) because of the condition and diversity of land use, the deterioration of the existing physical plant, and the requirement of providing land aggregation for the envisioned community center facilities.

The 1965 S.E. plan for the Parcel 19 area (Figures II-2, II-3), indicated that a diversity of public and community facilities be constructed in the area to serve as an activity center for the South End. The land use proposal included the construction of a new elementary school, a new recreation building and swimming pool, two unspecified community facilities (institutional uses), parking facilities, and commercial and office space. With respect to housing provisions, the 1965 S.E. plan designated two elderly high rises, one non-specified high rise, and an allowable maximum of approximately 180 residential units based on maximum density guidelines. The housing components were not assumed, nor specified, to be accessible to low income households, and the execution of the designated plan presupposed the accomplishment of relocating the residents out of the area.

There are close to 1,500 residents in the ETC area which include approximately 250 families. Households,
including primary individuals, are approximately 10% black, 40% Puerto Rican, and 50% white. Within the area, Puerto Rican households average 3.35 persons each and the black and white households average 1.7 persons each. Owing to the larger household composition in relation to the 40% total household proportion, Puerto Ricans compose the majority of the population in the area.² The 50% white household proportion includes a considerable number of elderly primary individuals. Notwithstanding the heterogeneous racial composition, the income levels in the Parcel 19 area are relatively low. Of the families in the area, 80-90% have incomes low enough to qualify for public housing.³,⁴ In a 1969 survey, 46% of 132 households interviewed indicated sources of income other than employment, such as welfare, unemployment and disability compensation, pensions and other sources.⁵ Although there has been some degree of resident turnover in the area, the abstract resident socioeconomic profile essentially reflects the characteristics exhibited during the initial phase of ETC's development.

Prior to the emergence of ETC, the designated South End central area epitomized the serious issues generated by the impact of urban renewal. The large relocation demand from the area loomed with devastating potential over the faltering relocation program. Compounded by the majority of low income families in the area, the inability to deal with general
relocation within the provisions of the S.E. plan dismissed any attempt to provide other housing opportunities within the South End for those residents wishing to remain. The impact of urban renewal demolition, without new construction, which further aggravated the low income housing supply situation, increased competition in the area for the remaining habitable units. Physical attrition of the housing stock caused by absentee ownership, waiting for a renewal windfall, manifested itself in poor and non-existent maintenance with a strong housing demand further mitigating any intentions of improvement. Caught in a renewal limbo, barely habitable buildings continued to appreciate in value with the BRA prepared to pay a "fair market value" for property slated for acquisition.

Because of the issues incumbent in the Parcel 19 area in relation to the renewal upheaval and the situation in the South End regarding low-income residents, the Emergency Tenants Council responded as a mechanism to insure the viability of the low income residents in the area. The creation of an organization to insure the redevelopment of the Parcel 19 area in the best interests of those residing in the area also presupposed the existence of a neighborhood ripe for recognition and willing to engage the renewal process committed to the South End. The performance of renewal execution, and vocal opposition to the plan characterized by
CAUSE primed the opportunity.

During the spring and summer of 1967, a series of informal meetings were initiated in the Parcel 19 area by Rev. William Dwyer, associated with Saint Stephen's Episcopal Church located in Parcel 19, and Helen Morton, a long time resident in the area and also associated with St. Stephen's Church. The meetings, involving other church members and residents, concerned the issues of future development in the Parcel 19 area with respect to the proposal contained in the S.E. plan. The intermittent series of informal meetings began identifying the establishment of a non-profit housing corporation as a viable possibility for producing family and individual low rent housing units. The meetings also recognized the necessity of mobilizing a resident organization in the Parcel 19 area to broaden the basis of participation and support. Implicit in this task was the illustration that, in fact, the Parcel 19 area did represent a neighborhood and could explicitly be identified as such.

The mobilization of a resident organization also required of the residents a realization of the common physical, social and economic qualities of the area as a neighborhood. The organizational task also required a focus on short range goals which could mobilize and provide the momentum for a neighborhood organization able to sustain the long range
goal of residential development.

In September 1968, under the auspices of St. Stephen's, two seminarians, Richard Lampert and Houston Horn, began the process of establishing a Parcel 19 resident's organization. Not anticipating any BRA action on the parcel until 1970, there was ample lead-time to proceed with a systematic approach and arouse the residents' sense of self-determinism.

"They began going door to door setting up house meetings to inform residents of the situation" and in doing this provided the valuable interface of dialogue between the residents in the area and the organizers. The meetings also initiated discussion and resident feed-back concerning the SEURP proposal for the Parcel 19 area and of the impending issues and opportunities of revising the S.E. plan.

Without exception, it was agreed that only with full neighborhood participation and a strong people's organization would any proposal (for Parcel 19) have validity for a developer or business.

This initial phase of organization also consisted of activities intended to motivate and encourage resident participation, which included bus excursions to other low and moderate income housing developments in the Boston area, various neighborhood social functions, and "clean up efforts of various trash covered sights."

Resident motivation was brought to a specific focus
during the fall of 1968 by a demonstration, involving about 60 residents, concerning the presence of an illegal and "rat infested junk yard between Pembroke and W. Brookline Streets." With community pressure brought to bear, the junk yard was eliminated. The action manifested recognition that a neighborhood organization based on collective effort could directly effect change. The action also precipitated a common sense of purpose in the area.

Paralleling the organizational efforts were the logistic requirements for firmly establishing a viable neighborhood mechanism. Primarily, this meant securing funds, staff and technical assistance. The fledgling organization was able to secure an offer of development assistance from Spaulding and Slye, a Boston based development corporation, in the fall of 1969. Through St. Stephen's Church, an invitation to participate in the Parcel 19 project was extended to the Cooperative Christian Ministries (CCM) a non-sectarian association of churches and temples. Being a member of CCM, St. Stephen's was able to insure the interest of the association. In January 1969 CCM voted to participate in the Parcel 19 project, and in March 1969 CCM secured a two-year $25,000 grant from the Permanent Charity Fund as an initial financial base for ETC. In addition to securing an additional funding source, the involvement of CCM led to an offer by the Arthur D. Little Company as a consultant to the
The evidence of commitment by outside individuals and organizations began establishing credibility for the neighborhood organization.

An Emergency Tenants' Council ad hoc steering committee, composed of two Spanish speaking residents, one black resident, and one white resident, was elected in April 1968 by the residents of Parcel 19. The committee was responsible for policy-making decisions concerning the project and for developing a summer program and hiring a summer staff. This event signified resident acceptance of project involvement and the assumption of substantial control from the auspicious nurturing by individuals from St. Stephen's Church.

Beginning late in June with a staff of ten people, a consultant from Arthur D. Little, a community coordinator, a planning team of five students from Urban Field Service and a neighborhood team of four residents, the summer program endeavored to increase resident involvement, collect basic neighborhood information, and prepare an outline plan for Parcel 19 redevelopment. Again CCM provided a significant support function in enlisting the services of UFS and securing VISTA funds for paying the neighborhood team. Working with the neighborhood residents, the planning team developed a report, *Survival and Development of the South End Central Community: Architectural Considerations*, the basis of which was a list of demands.
The report identified on-site development phasing and relocation as the primary component of redevelopment:

The one thing known for sure about the desires of the residents was that they wished to remain in the area and that their neighborhood survive and prosper.16

Throughout the summer, ETC also began ad hoc social and welfare aid for the Parcel 19 residents. Especially in relation to the majority of Spanish speaking residents in the area, this activity began providing a previously neglected service necessary to absorb any difficult transitional or cultural disadvantage.

However, for all its planning and organizational activity, ETC still lacked sufficient leverage and recognition to gain entrance to the renewal mechanism committed to the South End. Occupied by the Parcel 19 project, the steering committee and planning team neglected to establish itself with either the BRA on one hand, and other South End neighborhood organizations concerned with the adverse impact of urban renewal on the other.17 Although ETC was gaining resident momentum through its summer program efforts, it overlooked its social context in the South End and failed to engage it. Nevertheless, in October 1968 following "a community meeting of some 400 residents,"18 ETC was incorporated as a non-profit organization and officially became the Emergency Tenants' Council of Parcel 19, Inc., with the
purpose of

...combating poverty and the deterioration of the community through charitable and educational programs directed at insuring the participation of the community in the planning and development of low-cost housing ...with the objective of preventing dispersal of residents, limiting the dislocation caused by Urban Renewal and in general improving the housing conditions of community residents.19

Written by three members of the steering committee, the intentions of ETC were clearly articulated to extend "beyond 'we shall not be moved,' to encompass the objective of rehabilitating their own community for themselves and their children."20

Incorporation signified progress; Progress measured by the indication of a legally legitimate existence and the specification of a commitment to deal with real housing issues. However, analyzing its summer experience, ETC realized that if further progress toward its articulated goal was to be made, their organization would have to exhibit viability within the South End community. In doing this, ETC directed its post-incorporation efforts at increasing its involvement in the overall issues plaguing the South End as well as establishing direct relationships with other South End organizations resisting renewal. Through these efforts, ETC began expanding its power base by enlisting support from other groups in the South End and the City. In addition to
establishing a more viable organization, ETC realized the need for a planning approach having more credibility than that offered by the student team. ETC thus focused its activities on three levels: continual day-to-day services for its residents, establishing recognition and support, and creating a sound planning approach for future development.

Within the charged climate of the South End concerning urban renewal, ETC had no difficulty in enlisting allies attempting to redirect the renewal process.\textsuperscript{21} Representatives from ETC began establishing contacts with various institutional and community groups which provided ETC exposure on an organizational level of endorsement. Opportunities for greater involvement in the issues confronting the South End were abundant, especially in respect to the changing coalition of power. Gaining a leverage in the community power structure which reviewed BRA activity in the South End certainly posed an advantage and ETC became actively involved in the urban renewal committee issue.\textsuperscript{22}

On the neighborhood level, ETC began directly engaging the distressing conditions in their area. As an organization, ETC began pitting itself against absentee landlords. A group of contiguous buildings in the area, half of which had undergone a change in ownership, resulted in one central and undependable boiler heating buildings under separate
ownership. This absurd situation, not remedied by the unconcerned landlords, proved a satisfying focus for ETC. Following a series of demonstrations, ETC pressured one of Boston's largest real estate barons to make the necessary repairs and improvements on his buildings. ETC also began keeping a tight watch on rents in the area and convinced the Boston Housing Authority to take five buildings into the Leased Public Housing program when the owner proposed a rent increase. Acting as a mediator between the Boston Housing Authority and the owner, ETC exhibited its growing role of neighborhood responsibility. Responding to these problems directly with ensuing results, ETC demonstrated its capability as a resident/tenant organization able to deal, not only with existing housing conditions, but also with upper levels of power. ETC had loosened recalcitrant purse strings.

However, in terms of the physical planning process, progress was slow and unproductive. Unable to pull together the auspicious neighborhood organizational aspects and the long range developmental aspects, ETC was not in a position to initiate a physical development proposal. Frustrations and disagreements resulted in the dissolution of the planning team, and ETC again had to search for competent planning assistance. Nonetheless, Urban Planning Aid, active in the renewal issue in the South End, offered planning aid if UPA was able to secure the necessary funds.
Convening their first annual meeting in February 1969, attended by approximately 300 parcel residents, ETC elected its first permanent steering committee. The elected steering committee, the main governing body of ETC with the power to hire and fire all staff and to determine policies and goals of the organization, consisted of six Puerto Rican residents and four English speaking residents. Also at the convention, Israel Feliciano, a bilingual resident of Parcel 19, was installed as Executive Director of ETC, assuming the responsibility from Richard Lampert who had been associated with St. Stephen's Church. Having an Executive Director truly representative of the neighborhood enhanced the organization's attraction to neighborhood residents and ETC's attraction as a capable ethnic group.

The entrance of Feliciano into the organization signified a new dynamic power for ETC, as Feliciano was able to demonstrate astute political ability in dealing with the issues incumbent on moving the development process toward realization. Feliciano also understood the leverage of publicity which he used throughout his tenure. His administrative ability and leadership later won him the characterization of, "if it wasn't for Israel...." Although an area resident, Feliciano was a "professional."

Following the convention, UPA secured funding and was
able to provide ETC the services of John Sharratt as a full-time architect. Sharratt took over on a consultant role with UPA to work with ETC. Under the arrangement, UPA simply provided the money for Sharratt's services and Sharratt worked directly with the ETC steering committee and Executive Director. UPA also secured the services of Urban Field Service (UFS) students as a manpower source.

The arrival of John Sharratt brought a different attitude to ETC's planning approach. Having worked with another neighborhood group, Sharratt was familiar with the issues involved with creating a viable physical planning program for a community organization. Sharratt's previous involvement with community groups had also brought him in contact with the attitudes and policies of the BRA in dealing with community groups, and he resolved that ETC's best planning strategy was to engage the BRA and "beat them in their own game."

As a professional, Sharratt recognized that "beating the BRA at its own game" required having more information than the BRA had available concerning the ETC area and any future development, and having ETC assume the initiative in the planning process while keeping the BRA informed of ETC progress. Both Feliciano and Sharratt realized that throughout the planning process ETC had to present a united
front and that any negotiations with the BRA had to involve both technical/planning aspects and neighborhood organization/endorsement aspects.

Proceeding with this strategy, ETC began exhaustive physical and social surveys of the area, documenting the basis for an ETC plan proposal. Continuing contact was also established with the BRA South End site office through a BRA planner sympathetic to ETC's efforts. During the spring of 1969, ETC and the BRA project staff in the South End began putting together a development plan proposal for the Parcel 19 area, with ETC initiating and developing the main part of the actual planning activities. With the exception of the sympathetic planner, ETC had a cool reception at the BRA site office, although the site office staff did cooperate with ETC.

Working through the BRA site office, ETC desired some form of commitment from the S.E. project planners before approaching the BRA central office. The initiation of aspects of a development plan by ETC and the subsequent series of negotiations with the BRA planners concerning each aspect, put ETC's development outline together piece by piece following BRA agreement to each aspect. At the meetings with the BRA, ETC was continually represented by Sharratt, concerned with planning issues on a professional
level, and Feliciano, concerned with providing neighborhood endorsement. As the actual plan development began to take shape, a slide presentation was put together and Feliciano and Sharratt began meeting with other neighborhood and community groups in order to secure political support for ETC's impending development proposal. Through this presentation effort ETC was able to enlist letters of approval and endorsement from numerous organizations in the South End and Boston. Development momentum had been created but ETC still had to get on record as the legitimate agent for development in the Parcel 19 area.

In May a full presentation to Mayor Kevin White was made of ETC's development plan proposal for Parcel 19. On June 30, 1969, ETC made a formal request to the Boston Redevelopment Authority to be designated "Sponsor-Redeveloper" for the Parcel 19 Area of the South End Urban Renewal Plan. The request contained "documents [that] prove that the Emergency Tenants' Council has the support of the South End leaders, agencies, and people."  

In his letter of request, Feliciano squarely placed the responsibility of determining the future of the Central South End area on Hale Champion, BRA Administrator succeeding Logue. Feliciano wrote, considering the BRA policy toward community groups at the time:
It is our desire to work with the Boston Redevelopment Authority.... Your action will determine whether we will be able to do this or not. The responsibility is up-on you. If we are designated "Sponsor-Redeveloper" the responsibility will be ours.... We have acquired competent technical and ample financial resources.... We want the responsibility to determine our destiny. We are tired of other people making our decisions.

In his letter Feliciano also expressed the tenacity with which ETC would pursue its objectives and privileges.

The 'South End' of Boston is in turmoil. We represent a stable and strong element in this 'Urban Renewal Area.' We cannot be ignored. We must be dealt with fairly. My people have been mistreated and misrepresented for too long. We are capable, intelligent, hardworking and deserving of the opportunity to make this a better city. We intend to rebuild our community.

Included in the request was what Feliciano termed "our community concerns, planning criteria and objectives," which formed the basis and general outline of the ETC proposal elicited from the BRA South End site office. They were:

**Housing**
- A) There must be on site relocation.
- B) All buildings worth saving must be saved.
- C) 400 to 600 new units must be built (more if justified).
- D) There must be a form of community ownership.
- E) There must be adequate recreation facilities.

**Education**
- A) Schools must serve the community.
- B) The community must be allowed to participate in development, policy, and management.

**Social Services**
- A) Total services must be provided.
- B) These services must relate to the community language and needs.
Economic Development  
A) There must be adequate training and employment.  
B) Efforts are being made to form a community development corporation.  
C) Community people must be economically involved in the rebuilding of their neighborhood.

Commercial Facilities  
A) A shopping center should be developed which could serve our community as well as those adjacent.  
B) The Community Plaza (Spanish) should also have commercial facilities.

Traffic  
A) Traffic must be efficient but safe.  
B) The basic conflict between auto and pedestrian must be minimized: closing of certain streets, overpasses.

Transportation  
A) There must be adequate public transportation.  
B) The auto should participate but not dominate.

Security  
A) The city must provide adequate security.  
B) The plan must reflect a concern for security.

With ETC placing its intent on public record, pressure came to bear on the BRA to officially respond to ETC's position. The BRA South End Project Director, Walter Smart, reluctantly recommended in July that ETC be designated, signaling the beginning of a more exhaustive round of negotiations with the BRA central staff. In effect, with his recommendation, Smart had to endorse the project as "planning with people," considering it "an improvement over past BRA-community relationships." However, he also expressed the reservation that

The South End is the most heterogeneous community I've ever known. But it is
becoming polarized. We [BRA] have to be sensitive to the needs of all the people in the South End. We cannot create a section just for the Spanish speaking people.  

Moreover, an administrative charge in the BRA during the summer of 1969 proved to set the stage for the most crucial phase in ETC's determination to become developer of Parcel 19. Hale Champion, frustrated by the enigma of the BRA, was leaving his post as Administrator. Amid community attempts to gain control of their situations, Champion's administration had been viewed as one of "community hostility," provoking continual confrontation between community interests and the BRA. 

With Champion's resignation and Walter Smart's recommendation, ETC's situation was considerably enhanced. Furthermore any apprehension about future BRA policies toward negotiating with community groups was eased with the appointment of John D. Warner as BRA Administrator in September 1969.

Warner, assuming the burdens of the BRA, was an individual with a "flexible policy and new ideas," and completely reversed the negative BRA policies toward community participation in development activities under the BRA. With Warner, ETC had easy access to the BRA central planning office from where final plan approval would come. However, still staffed by "Logue's men," ETC's plan met with resistance
in the BRA Urban Design section. The BRA planning staff informed Warner that it would require six months to review ETC's plan for the Parcel 19 area. Obvious as a delaying tactic, Warner, under pressure from ETC to shorten the review period, gave the design review staff two weeks to review the plan, whereupon "Logue's men left" the BRA in protest. Warner then assigned two staff members of the urban design section to meet with ETC in an intensive two week design review period beginning October 23, 1969 and ending November 5, 1969.

Meanwhile, Feliciano and Sharratt, realizing the future "show-down" with the central BRA planning staff, prepared, during the summer, extensive documentation of ETC's S.E. plan changes and further refined their development proposal previously worked out with the BRA South End project planners. The preparation of these reports (discussed in the following section) during the summer allowed Feliciano and Sharratt to literally overwhelm the two BRA staff planners during the two week review period. Consistent with the overall planning strategy, Feliciano and Sharratt had more information and familiarity concerning the ETC area than did the BRA planners. Sharratt and Feliciano also seized the opportunity by taking the initiative in scheduling the meetings and preparing a detailed agenda itemizing their proposed S.E. plan modifications as a basis for discussion during the two week
plan review. Essentially the review procedure consisted of ETC presenting a specific proposal item, producing background information and documentation concerning the proposal, and, following discussion on the proposal, securing a documented approval on the specific aspect from the BRA planners. Sharratt later said, "We always stayed ahead and did our homework while the BRA people considered it a 9 to 5 job." Needless to say, ETC was able to receive plan approval.

Feliciano also secured approval from the South End Project Area Committee (SEPAC), which has the power to veto BRA recommended sponsors or developers, and on November 26 SEPAC voted to support ETC in its plans for Parcel 19.

On December 10, 1969, a televised press conference was held in the basement of St. Stephen's Church, where Feliciano and Warner jointly announced the approval of ETC's development proposal and Warner's recommendation to the Boston Redevelopment Authority Board that ETC be designated tentative redeveloper of the Parcel 19 area.

Msss Helen Morton, ETC Treasurer, said Warner had cleared up the previously stormy atmosphere between the BRA and the South End group's 'like sunshine after a thunderstorm.'

Feliciano summed up:

We haven't been militant.... We've been the first group that, without demonstration, has gone to the BRA and prepared a plan with them.
On December 11, 1969, the BRA Board voted to designate ETC tentative redeveloper of the Parcel 19 area. Not mitigating the actual recognition of ETC as a viable redevelopment mechanism, the tentative nature of the designation was conditioned on items necessarily disposed of following tentative designation, such as formation of a l21A Corporation to take title to the land, evidence of necessary financial support and equity, and posting of a $100,000 penalty bond to insure ETC's adherence to the development schedule finally approved by the Authority.57
Gearing up for plan development negotiations, the ETC planning team, throughout the summer of 1969, extensively documented aspects of its proposed plan changes which were then synthesized into a total concept. Although the ETC plan most obviously benefits the residents in the area, the ETC planning team also kept under consideration the total context of the South End. The plan therefore attempts to integrate the pressing needs of the Parcel 19 area as well as the South End community as a whole by coordinating housing development within the area with the development in the area of the community center facilities, retaining the "heart" of the 1965 Urban Renewal Plan.

Articulating the necessity of maintaining the integrity of the ETC neighborhood during the redevelopment process, a significant component of the ETC plan is phased rehabilitation and new construction, allowing relocation of residents within their own community. Although the actual phasing process was later altered, the original ETC plan called for:

**Temporary rehabilitation:** providing initial resource for relocation from buildings designated for first stage permanent rehabilitation.

**Rehabilitation:** all available vacant buildings in the area will be rehabilitated, with an original proposal of 32 buildings providing 200-250 units, done in two stages
coinciding with the relocation loads brought about by new construction.

New Construction First Stage: clearance and redevelopment directed at providing new housing in the portion of the area that can accommodate the greatest number of new units while at the same time displacing the least number of people.

New Construction Second Stage: clearance and redevelopment in the areas which have the heaviest concentration of residents, delayed so that these residents can be re-located to units built during First Stage New Construction.

In total ETC proposed to build between 400-600 new living units, with a unit distribution of 30% efficiency and one bedroom, 40% two and three bedroom, and 30% four, five, and six bedroom, reflecting the composition of the ETC population.

The ETC planning team investigated the traffic pattern in the South End and the relationship it had with the Parcel 19 development. The ETC team identified three problem areas in the traffic pattern established by the 1965 urban renewal plan (Figures V-4 and V-5). The ETC recommendation, which was accepted by the BRA, was to close off W. Brookline Street and open the Dedham-Malden connection which had been closed off in the 1965 plan (Figures V-6 and V-7). In proposing that a W. Dedham and Malden connection replace W. Brookline Street as a local collection street, ETC substantiated that W. Brookline Street (BRA proposal) had
considerably more residential use than did the W. Dedham-Malden connection (Figures V-8 and V-9). With the closing of W. Brookline Street the ETC physical neighborhood could be consolidated (Figure V-10).

With regard to the proposed community facilities in the area, ETC recommended that they be rearranged to provide a more comprehensive integration of the community center area and the ETC housing development (Figure V-11).

Realizing the significance of supporting commercial facilities, ETC proposed a shopping center on Washington Street, facing the Cathedral of the Holy Cross. The proposal represented a change in the 1965 plan in the relocation of commercial facilities from Tremont and W. Dedham streets (Figure V-12). After an extensive survey of shopping and commercial facilities distribution in the South End, the ETC planning team concluded that a shopping area on Washington Street, which already had existing commercial uses, would provide better service to that area of the South End. The commercial use relocation was also necessary in view of the proposed rehabilitation on Tremont Street. Considering the proximity of the shopping area to the Cathedral, the ETC team stressed that:

It is the intention...to fully utilize this asset by making a plaza before the Cathedral and to promote activity on this plaza by means of shopping facilities so that the
ETC thus looked upon shopping, not only as an economic or service opportunity, but as a civic opportunity as well. Moreover, ETC also proposed a "Spanish style" plaza on W. Dedham Street as an identity focus for the Parcel 19 development. Given the ethnic background of its mainly Spanish speaking residents, the community plaza was envisioned to serve as a focus for outdoor social activities (Figure V-12).

Perhaps most significantly, ETC requested to extend its designation from just Parcels 19A, 19B, and 19C, to include all designated reuse parcels in the area contingent on ETC's development. ETC realized the necessity to have greater control of the area to insure development and phasing success. Thus, ETC's development area of responsibilities extends beyond Parcel 19 per se and includes the areas indicated on Figure V-14.

In addition to its own development proposal, ETC intensively involved itself in developing the program for the neighboring elementary school proposed in the 1965 S.E. plan, in conjunction with the South End Community Education council. ETC's expressed interest in the Blackstone School was that, being part of the physical and social
neighborhood, children from the ETC area would be attending this school.

The general physical synthesis of the ETC area approved during the intensive negotiations during the fall of 1969 are illustrated in Figure V-15, as compared to the 1965 BRA plan illustrated in Figure V-3. Although the changes were considered "minor" by the BRA to facilitate any legal complications, the ETC plan proposal does significantly alter the original concept of the 1965 "community center area."

The designation of ETC in December 1969 signified a secured recognition by the redevelopment mechanism committed to the South End since 1965. ETC's designation also consolidated cooperative effort by all the "actors" participating in the renewal mechanism, recognizing that ETC had substantially established its prerogative to initiate and create a development mechanism "to commence, execute, and complete construction." ETC stood on the threshold of entry into the housing development business "with exclusive right to develop all new housing, stores, and recreation areas within the Parcel 19 area."

By June 1970, ETC made substantial progress on the development plans for Parcel 19. First phase permanent rehabilitation processing, involving 13 buildings having a total of 71 apartments and 4 stores, was well into FHA
feasibility processing under Section 236 of the National Housing Act. Although originally submitted as non-profit sponsorship, the rehabilitation project was ultimately converted to a limited dividend situation, with a subsidiary of ETC and a contractor forming the general partnership.

ETC also had added the construction of a high rise for elderly to its development plans. The elderly high rise, under a public housing Turnkey Program, was included in development plans because of the need for units for low income elderly persons and FHA's limitations under the 236 program with respect to single occupancy and leasing. Application to the Boston Housing Authority was made in May 1970.

In June 1970 applications for feasibility and allocation of funds, under Section 236, were submitted for both phases of new construction for low rise family units. Also, negotiations were underway to form a limited dividend partnership in which a subsidiary corporation of ETC would be a general partner.

ETC had also put together an excellent team of consultants.65 Best summarizing the concern for cohesive planning and development of the neighborhood by ETC itself is an excerpt from an ETC community newsletter:

All of these projects are underway because we, the People of Parcel 19, organized and formed recognition of our needs and desires.
Had we not done so, there would not have been this kind of planning. The area would have been turned over to some private developer who might have had no interest for the community and whose main concern would have been profit for the company.66

Presently, the ETC plan calls for (Figure V-16):67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EFF&amp;1BR</th>
<th>2BR</th>
<th>3BR</th>
<th>4BR</th>
<th>5BR</th>
<th>6BR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REHAB</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNKEY</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE I</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE II</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completed in 1971, the 71 unit rehabilitation package began rent-up in November. Under the limited partnership arrangement ETC was able to retain substantial control over syndication proceeds by selling the tax-shelters themselves, thus insuring the return of the proceeds to ETC for use, after necessary legal obligations are met, to back up the management operation and to help the community organization cover overhead cost. Also, through an agreement with its general partner, ETC retained control over management of the project.

Since basic rents under Section 236 are in reality for moderate income families, ETC negotiated for and obtained
70% combined leased public housing and rent supplement for the rehabilitation project in order to provide units for low income Parcel 19 residents. This was obtained when usual limits for such supplement is 40% of project units. Rents in ETC's feasibility studies for Phase I and Phase II new construction are also considered moderate rents requiring at least a 40% subsidy to accommodate the present low income residents in Parcel 19.

The amount of new construction and the rent levels reflect ETC's intention not to "create a low income ghetto within the South End...instead ETC is dedicated...to integrating low and moderate income families in the development."
3 THE FUNCTIONING NEIGHBORHOOD

To carry out its activities, ETC has structured its organization in such a way as to insure resident participation and control throughout all aspects. In an annual spring election, residents of the Parcel 19 area select the 15 members of the Emergency Tenants Council Steering Committee. (At the May 1971 election of the ETC Steering Committee some 231 residents voted.) As the main governing body of ETC, the Steering Committee has the power to hire and fire all staff and to determine policies and goals of the organization. At least two-thirds of the members of the Steering Committee must be residents of Parcel 19. However at present only two members live outside the Parcel.

In turn, the Steering Committee, at its first meeting following election, selects, and reserves the right to recall at any time, the 15 members of the E.T.C. Development Corporation Board. The Development Corporation Board has the responsibility for decisions concerning housing development. The composition of this board is made up by community residents and housing professionals outside the community.
In order to carry out the limited-dividend rehabilitation venture, which ETC's non-profit entities cannot do, ETC formed a subsidiary business corporation, E.T.C. Developers, Inc. Formed specifically as a mechanism to carry out a housing business venture, E.T.C. Developers, Inc., also hires and sets policies for the housing management staff.

Providing at least a partial solution to housing problems for the lower income residents in the South End, the activities of ETC are focused around three major goals:

1) to rehabilitate and construct new housing for and with the full participation of the present residents of Parcel 19;

2) to provide back-up social services and economic development within the community which relate to and will insure the success of the housing development;

3) to insure community control of the housing, once constructed, through community-controlled management.

The reflection of these goals is in the staff structure of ETC under its Board organization. Generally, the structure of ETC is illustrated in the following diagram.
The Housing Development Sector is responsible for seeing that all phases of ETC's housing development plans advance on schedule and are properly phased with relocation plans. Also, one staff member is responsible for community participation in all phases of housing development, insuring that the community is aware of and contributes to housing development plans. This response provides continual supervision of the housing plans by the residents. The participatory relationship involves residents in the struggle related to producing housing
and helps develop a sense of resident identification with the development process.

In the Community Development Sector, ETC's resident advocacy position is clearly defined. The commitment to social and economic development recognized that there must be improvement in the community itself to insure success in housing development through the provision of appropriate community services. The original focus was on immediate housing problems as a means of maintaining a strong link with residents while long range housing development plans were carried out. Social services centered on dealing with residents' immediate needs to find decent housing at reasonable rents, removing sanitary code violations in area units, and with fighting illegal eviction and rent increases. ETC also provided legal, health, and educational referral services and assistance with welfare problems in direct response to problems of the Spanish speaking residents. As a result, ETC spent a great deal of time educating its area residents, which also aided in establishing neighborhood support and confidence.

With the reality of rehabilitation; there appeared the issue of long-run project viability, and the Community Development Sector placed additional focus on providing social services more closely related to housing development and housing management. Through housing oriented sessions,
resident education and tenant input into management increases familiarity with housing and management aspects. Also:

ETC is dedicated to seeing that some of the present low income residents of Parcel 19 become middle income through construction training and jobs programs and development of minority small business. 75

Resident education focuses on efforts to increase the earning and saving power of Parcel 19 residents. Working in phase with the Management Sector, the Community Development Sector intends to provide back-up support for ETC's management once the completed housing comes off the line. Providing these services will insure that the housing management can devote full energies to efficiently managing the housing. Economic improvement efforts will insure rental payments and sustained provision of social services will develop specialists experienced in dealing with the problems of community residents. Experienced social service specialists sensitive to the problems which might arise mitigates situations which often obstruct efficient management of low-rent housing. Moreover, by preserving the present functioning community and its inter-relationships, the ETC development will have a strong basis for structuring tenant involvement in the up-keep of the property.
4 FIGURES REFERRED TO IN SECTION V
Figure V-1
LOCATION OF PARCEL 19 AREA IN THE SOUTH END

SOUTH END AREA
Figure V-2
LAND USE AND BUILDING REQUIREMENTS FOR DESIGNATED RE-USE PARCELS IN THE
PARCEL 19 AREA - 1965 SOUTH END URBAN RENEWAL PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reuse Parcel Number</th>
<th>Permitted Land Uses</th>
<th>Height (in ft.) Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Max. Net Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19a, b</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>24 40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19c</td>
<td>Residential - upper floors Commercial - ground floor</td>
<td>90 120</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7,8,16</td>
<td>Public Mall or Plaza</td>
<td>NA  NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P36</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>12 40</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial or Offices</td>
<td>12 40</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking Structure</td>
<td>24 24</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>24 40</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB7</td>
<td>Recreation Institutional</td>
<td>12 40</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB8</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>12 40</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB10</td>
<td>Elementary School and Playground</td>
<td>12 40</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB11</td>
<td>Institutional, Commercial, Residential</td>
<td>24 40</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>24 60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE5</td>
<td>Residential: Housing for Elderly or Other Residential subject to BRA approval</td>
<td>AA AA</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>AA AA</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>AA AA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE6</td>
<td>Residential: Housing for Elderly or Other Residential subject to BRA approval</td>
<td>70 120</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA: Not applicable  AA: Subject to BRA approval
Figure V-2a
REUSE PARCEL DESIGNATIONS - 1965 S.E.U.R.P.
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Figure V-3
1965 URBAN RENEWAL PLAN PARCEL 19 AREA

- Residential
- Commercial
- Community Facilities

1. Electric Sub-station
2. Mall area
3. Recreation Building and Swimming Pool
4. New Elementary School and Playground
5. Blackstone Square
6. O'Day Playground

DEVELOPMENT AREA
EMERGENCY TENANTS COUNCIL
South End Urban Renewal Area
Figure V-4
1965 TRAFFIC PATTERN

- Limited Access
- Through Connector
- Local Collector

SOUTH END AREA
Figure V-5
1965 ANTICIPATED TRAFFIC VOLUME

10,000 cars per day = 1/8"
30,000 cars per day

SOUTH END AREA
Figure V-6
1969 E.T.C. PROPOSED TRAFFIC PATTERN

- Limited Access
- Through Connector
- Local Collector

SOUTH END AREA
Figure V-7
1969 E.T.C. PROPOSAL - ANTICIPATED TRAFFIC VOLUME

- 10,000 cars per day = 1/8"
- 30,000 cars per day

SOUTH END AREA
Figure V-8
1969 USE DISTRIBUTION ALONG STREET FRONTAGE - W. BROOKLINE COLLECTOR

- Residential 85%
- Commercial 1%
- Institutional 10%
- Industrial 4%

SOUTH END AREA
Figure V-9
1969 USE DISTRIBUTION ALONG STREET FRONTAGE - DARTMOUTH MALDEN COLLECTOR

- Residential: 30%
- Commercial: 24%
- Institutional: 38%
- Industrial: 8%

SOUTH END AREA
Figure V-10
STREET CHANGES

- OLD THROUGH COLLECTOR
- NEW THROUGH COLLECTOR
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South End Urban Renewal Area
Figure V-11
COMMUNITY FACILITY LOCATION CHANGE

- - - Old Facility Location

□□□□ New Facility Location
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South End Urban Renewal Area
Figure V-12
SHOPPING CENTER LOCATION CHANGE

- - - - Old Shopping Location

- - - - New Shopping Location
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South End Urban Renewal Area
Figure V-13
COMMUNITY PLAZA

COMMERCIAL USE
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EMERGENCY TENANTS COUNCIL
South End Urban Renewal Area
Figure V-15
1969 E.T.C.-B.R.A. COMPOSITE PLAN

- Existing or Rehabilitated Buildings
- New Housing
- Commercial Use
- Institutional
- Recreation/Open Space

DEVELOPMENT AREA

EMERGENCY TENANTS COUNCIL
South End Urban Renewal Area
Figure V-16
PRESENT ETC PLAN (1972)

Residential
Commercial
Community Facilities

1 O'Day Playground
2 ETC Spanish Plaza
3 ETC Tower for the Elderly
4 Blackstone Square
5 New Elementary School, Recreation Building, Swimming Pool
6 ETC Market Plaza
7 ETC Rehabilitation

DEVELOPMENT AREA
EMERGENCY TENANTS COUNCIL
South End Urban Renewal Area
Planning for Urban Renewal in the South End was a five-year process of political realization and community organization for both the Boston Redevelopment Authority and the diverse interest groups in the South End. Within the bargaining power structures mobilized during this long period of planning lie some basic ideological precedents in recognizing legitimate mechanisms of control or decision. The planning period and the process of planning mobilized an evolution of a recognizable structure of interests within the South End, which became the basis of bargaining and compromise. This decision and control framework developed during the planning period had as its base a network of neighborhood associations identified by recognizable and homogeneous territorial possession.
Aside from this resident base of interests were welfare, institutional, and business groups which had their respective representation of input. The instigating agent, operating within the context of Boston's $90 million development program, was the Boston Redevelopment Authority, charged with carrying through to approval and execution a plan commensurate with the image and goals of the "New Boston."

The process and the political and organizational strategy which pieced together the South End Urban Renewal Plan during the five year planning period found its validity in a mandate given to the residents in the neighborhood associations in making specific inputs and decisions concerning the sanctity of its territory. Although the official voice of the South End concerning Urban Renewal was through a coalition of the divergent interests groups in the South End, representation on this determining body included spokesmen from the various neighborhood associations.

During the initial phase of the urban renewal process neighborhood associations were organized to broaden the base of the community agent in the South End. However, the resident input was limited to their representational power on the SEURC. The initial plan, the "green strip," based on assumed support, was created without practical
knowledge or support of the residents in the neighborhoods of the South End.

In contrast, the second phase, based on the "Concept," was a series of specific refinements, developed through a process of horizontal input and direct bargaining procedure between neighborhood groups and the BRA. Each neighborhood association was knowledgable of its scope of concern and responsibility. The dynamics of plan creation was on a cogent level much lower than the previous hierarchial or central decision making. The BRA project director recognized during the second phase that a "grass roots" mandate was necessary for approval of an urban renewal plan. In return, the BRA was required to extend the power base from a leadership level and present its intent at the lowest level of community decision making. During the second phase of the renewal process, associated with the development of the "Concept," representation on the SEURC increased and the emphasis placed on the neighborhood associations' participation in the plan development consolidated their positions and influence.

Throughout the process, emphasis was on residential rehabilitation, evidenced, and supported, by the resident power base. The community's desire to retain the South End as a residential neighborhood was asserted during the controversy over redevelopment of the Castle Square
area; a portion of the South End under an accelerated early land acquisition process during the early stages of the second phase of urban renewal in the South End. The original proposal for Castle Square designated one-third of the site for residential use. However, through the efforts of the SEURC the plan was revised so that two-thirds of the site would be used for residential purposes, providing 500 units under the government subsidized 221-d-3 program.

Public housing was an issue throughout the planning process which was pervasive in its necessity. Although many of the neighborhood associations opposed concentrated public housing development in the South End, there was the realization that some public housing was necessary to meet the housing needs of the area's large number of low income residents. An alternative which offered potential low rent housing, and seemed a lucrative proposition at the time, was the rehabilitation of tax-foreclosed properties in the South End by non-profit corporations under government subsidized programs. As urban renewal in the South End presented principally a rehabilitation effort, significant emphasis was placed on this process.

The importance in the operative evolution of a resident power base, throughout the renewal planning process, lies within a political recognition of the amount of pressure
concerted resident groups can exert. The mechanism through which the urban renewal plan was composed, had, as its power base, a range of resident control, participation, and sense of self-determinism which, to an extent, established a precedent of a resident power base in the urban renewal process in the South End.

The political recognition of the resident interest groups, represented on the SEURC, established through the term of renewal planning also legitimized the balance of resident bargaining power attempting to determine and control the future of the South End. The planning product, created through the horizontal decision input, displayed a manifestation of the resolution of issues identified by the diverse groups included in the renewal planning process. The South End Urban Renewal Plan owed its existence and providence to those interests which participated in its creation. Correspondingly, it was incumbent upon the BRA to recognize and support the community coalition pieced together by the BRA project director in order to keep the renewal plan politically viable through the execution stage. At the point of project approval, the South End represented a power equilibrium between the interest groups involved in the process and the BRA; a power equilibrium focused on approval of a product.
However, presupposing the future dynamics of the South End, the renewal power coalition inherently had a major flaw: it lacked the flexibility to deal with a rapidly changing context. Moreover, it lacked any specific mechanism directly engaged in dealing with the changing context and implementing the development process. Lacking this, any participatory control gained during the renewal planning process was lost. In addition, the atmosphere of renewal protest among the lower income residents brought the committed renewal process back down to a newly emerged power base to which renewal had to respond.

The newly recognized interest groups, not content with general concessions and speculated implementation, were able to express clearly a specific desire to exercise a right to self-determinism and take on directly the redevelopment of portions of the South End.

Within the context of the mood of discontent with the BRA record in the South End and opposition by low income residents to the South End plan, the emergence of ETC offered the BRA an opportunity to rectify its reputation in the South End, by recycling, in a sense, the participatory process in the South End. Also, Warner probably recognized, during ETC's crucial summer, that the jammed renewal process could only progress if the BRA revised
its stubborn commitment to the original process and initiate new policies regarding community groups and urban renewal.

Besides being located in the strategic center of the South End, ETC emerged as a concerted and viable mechanism through which the BRA could vicariously respond, on a smaller scale, to the issues in the South End manifested on a larger scale. ETC's initiative engaged in its area all the aspects characteristic of the South End plan: overall physical and social planning, provision of social services, assured relocation provision, control of the development implementation mechanism, new housing and commercial facilities to meet the area's low income needs, back-up community services, and, most importantly, direct involvement and participation of neighborhood residents. ETC represented the entire South End urban renewal process on a smaller scale. In its resident mandate, and BRA designation, for overseeing development in the Parcel 19 area, ETC also accepted the risk of being responsible for failure.

Many similarities can be drawn between the total South End renewal process and the ETC redevelopment process, although ETC is obviously on a smaller scale. Nevertheless, although both processes had essential differences, they both had generic counterparts. ETC's planning approach
involved strong neighborhood organization and hard work, as did the renewal planning process. However, ETC's resident advocacy position was clearly defined by its Community Development Sector activities and ETC had the neighborhood support and confidence. Whereas, the BRA had to contend with diverse interest groups, ETC represented one interest group and negotiated as such. Yet, ETC did receive widespread support from other interest groups in the South End.

The ETC plan illustrated the kind and amount of components to be developed, as did the 1965 South End plan. However, throughout the plan development ETC had a parallel vision of how implementation of its plan could be achieved. Furthermore, ETC provided a mechanism through its organizational structure of renewing resident participation and control yearly. ETC had definite goals, a dynamic process, and a method of achievement. The ETC housing plans originated from and are continually supervised by the community.

The failure of the renewal planning power structure induced "participation" in the post-planning stages and ETC was able to capitalize on this "participation" by consolidating agreement between renewal "actors" in relation to specific issues taxing the South End plan.
The implications of urban renewal to change the "behavior" of the South End affected many residents and had a tremendous impact on peoples' lives with respect to aspirations and values. The process of planning urban renewal aided in identifying existing aspirations and values of various interest groups in the South End as well as externalizing aspirations and values of residents and interest groups usually suppressed by self non-recognition. The product of the planning stages, although structured by pragmatic compromises, represented the manifestation of collective interests included in the planning process, ostensibly satisfying a complex layering of divergent goals, aspirations, and values, through a common vehicle. Through urban renewal were perceived new opportunities by various groups in the South End to substitute former aspirations and construct new ones, the extent of which was dependent on the ability of articulation of desired change and the point of view of the new opportunities relative to different socioeconomic positions in the South End.

Discussing aspirations and change, Herbert Gans noted in "The Levittowners" that:

most often aspirations change as a result of necessary behavior change: if a transformation in the economy or social structure requires people to act differently, their aspirations will change accordingly.3
Although discussing planning for behavioral change and its implications for policy-makers seeking change in peoples' behavior or community, as in the planning stages in the South End, the thought is also valid as a reflection of the post-planning stage events, especially as applied to the aspirations transformation of the participants comprising the Emergency Tenants Council.
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EXISTING MAJOR REDEVELOPMENT IN THE SOUTH END AS OF JANUARY 1972

Post-Renewal Planning

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castle Square</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>subsidized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Square Elderly</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>public housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxse Homes</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>subsidized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camfield Gardens</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>subsidized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methunion Manor</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>subsidized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuckerman Homes</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>subsidized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grent AME Housing</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>subsidized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland Square Housing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>subsidized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAJOR REHABILITATION

- Greater Boston Community Development (South End Community Development)
  - Tenant's Development Corporation I 100 subsidized
  - Emergency Tenants Council 71 subsidized
  - Columbus Avenue Tenants Association 100 subsidized

OTHER DEVELOPMENTS

- South End Branch Library
- Carter Playground Improvements
- James Hayes Park
- Eight Streets Playground
- Wholesale Flower Market
- Cultural Arts Center

Source: (Boston) City Record, January 17, 1972
Boston's Urban Renewal Areas, Fact Sheets, BRA, August 1971
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APPENDIX "B"

DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

INTEREST SUPPLEMENTS ON RENTAL AND COOPERATIVE HOUSING MORTGAGES

A program to reduce costs on certain rental and cooperative housing projects designed for occupancy by low-income families

Nature of Program

HUD makes monthly payments to mortgagees, on behalf of mortgagors, of a part of the interest on market-rate mortgages financing rental or cooperative housing projects for lower-income families. Interest-reduction payments may also be made on rental or cooperative housing projects owned by private nonprofit, limited-dividend, or cooperative entities which are financed under a State or local program providing assistance through loans, loan insurance, or tax abatement.

Interest-reduction payments cannot exceed the difference between the amount required for principal, interest, and mortgage insurance premium on a market-rate mortgage and the amount required for principal and interest on a mortgage at 1 percent interest. The purpose of the payments is to bring the monthly rental charges down to a level that low-income families can afford to pay with at least 25 percent of their adjusted monthly income.

Applicant Eligibility

Applicants for mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration and for interest-reduction payments may be nonprofit, limited-dividend, and cooperative entities.

Applications for insured mortgages are made to lending institutions approved by FHA as mortgagees.

Applications for interest-reduction payments where no FHA insurance is involved are made directly to the local FHA insuring office.

Information Source

HUD area office or HUD-FHA insuring office.

Legal Authority

Section 236, National Housing Act (Public Law 73-479), as added by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-448).

Administering Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Secretary for Housing Production and Mortgage Credit – FHA Commissioner</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretary for Housing Management</td>
<td>Aid development and construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management and loan servicing for multifamily projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RENT SUPPLEMENTS

A program to make decent housing available to low-income individuals and families

Nature of Program

Federal rent supplement payments are made to owners of certain private housing projects. The rent supplement payment for a tenant amounts to the difference between 25 percent of his income and the fair market rental for the unit he occupies. As the tenant's income changes, the rent supplement is increased or decreased accordingly. If his income rises to the point where he can pay the full rent, he may continue living in the same unit without rent supplement.

The housing on which rent supplements are paid must be financed under certain HUD programs; or under State or local programs that provide loans, loan insurance, or tax abatements – if the projects are approved for rent supplement before completion of construction or rehabilitation.

Rental projects must be part of an approved Workable Program for Community Improvement or approved by local government officials.

Applicant Eligibility

Tenants whose incomes fall within prescribed limits may be eligible for rent supplements if they also qualify in one of the following ways: are elderly or handicapped (or have an elderly or handicapped wife or husband); are displaced by governmental action; are occupants of substandard housing; are present or former occupants of dwellings damaged or destroyed by a natural disaster since April 1, 1965.

Tenants apply to the owner of the housing project.

Housing owners eligible for contracts to receive rent supplements are nonprofit, cooperative, or limited-dividend organizations. Owners apply for rent supplement contracts at HUD regional offices.

Information Source

HUD regional or area office; HUD-FHA insuring office.

Legal Authority

Title I, Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-117), as amended.

Administering Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Secretary for Housing Production and Mortgage Credit–FHA Commissioner</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aid development and construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Secretary for Housing Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEASED PUBLIC HOUSING

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING—LEASING

A program to provide low-rent public housing for low-income families through the use of private housing accommodations

Nature of Program

Annual contributions made to authorized local housing authorities enable them to work with real estate agencies, owners, and developers in providing housing for low-income families. Local housing authorities lease dwellings from private owners and make them available to low-income families at rents they can afford. Local authorities may also acquire structures containing leased units and sell these units to the tenants on terms that would enable them to make the purchase without undue financial hardship.

Applicant Eligibility

Applicants may be local housing authorities and other authorized public agencies. The local governing body must have passed a resolution approving the application of the housing program to the locality.

Application is made to the HUD regional or area office serving the locality.

Information Source

HUD regional or area office.

Legal Authority

Sections 23 and 10(c), U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1423 and 1410c).

Administering Office          Function

Assistant Secretary for Housing Production and Mortgage Credit—Aid development and
FHA Commissioner              construction

Assistant Secretary for Housing Management—Administration
Management

of Subsidies
LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

A program to help public agencies provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for low-income families at rents they can afford.

Nature of Program

Financial and technical assistance is provided by HUD to local housing authorities to plan, build and/or acquire, own, and operate low-rent public housing projects. Federal annual contributions are made to cover the debt service on local authority bonds sold to pay for the development or acquisition of public housing. HUD financial assistance is also provided in the form of preliminary loans to the authority for planning and temporary loans to build low-rent housing, as well as the annual contributions subsidies.

The local housing authority provides housing in various ways — by construction, by rehabilitation of existing structures, by purchase from private developers or builders (the Turnkey method), and through lease from private owners — and then rents these dwellings to low-income families. Special provisions allow for the purchase of such housing by low-income families under a variety of homeownership programs.

There are special provisions for people of limited income which apply in the public housing program; in particular, there are special subsidies for those displaced by urban renewal or other governmental action or by natural disasters, for the elderly and the handicapped, and for families of unusually low income or with more than four minors.

Relocation assistance and Federal relocation payments must be provided for individuals, families, and businesses displaced by this program. More detailed information will be found under the heading “Relocation” in this catalog.

Applicant Eligibility

Applicants must be local housing authorities established by a local government in accordance with State law, authorized public agencies, or Indian tribal housing authorities. The proposed program must be approved by the local governing body. The community must have a certified Workable Program for Community Improvement.

Application is made to the HUD regional office serving the locality.

Information Source

HUD regional or area office.

Legal Authority

U.S. Housing Act of 1937 (Public Law 75-412), as amended.

Administering Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Name</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretary for Housing</td>
<td>Aid development and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and Mortgage Credit</td>
<td>construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretary for Housing</td>
<td>Management and administration of subsidies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX "C"

INCOME LIMITS & HOUSING QUALIFICATIONS
## INCOME LIMITS

Public Housing  
Section 23 Leased Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># OF PERSONS IN FAMILY</th>
<th>REGULAR LIMITS</th>
<th>DISPLACED BY GOV'T ACTION</th>
<th>CONTINUED OCCUPANCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,480</td>
<td>6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>6,840</td>
<td>7,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>7,560</td>
<td>7,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,280</td>
<td>8,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>8,520</td>
<td>8,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>8,760</td>
<td>9,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>8,880</td>
<td>9,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

1. Approved by HUD for the Boston Housing Authority, December 17, 1971.

2. Rents in Public Housing and Section 23 Leased Housing are 25% of adjusted income.

3. Section 236 income admission limits are 135% of Public Housing Income Limits.

4. Rent Supplement Income Limits are the same as Public Housing Regular Income Limits, but recipient must qualify in one of 6 categories:
   1. Physically handicapped
   2. Sixty-two years of age or older
   3. Displaced by government action
   4. Present housing substandard
   5. Disaster victim (natural)
   6. Military or active duty
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11. Cooperative Christian Ministries is a non-sectarian association of 23 churches and temples who have come together in an effort to combine resources to deal with inner-city social issues.

12. Permanent Charity Fund is a private foundation endeavoring to provide financial support to organizations dealing with inner-city social issues.
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