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ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the problems affecting Orchard Park, a large, federally-supported public housing project, which is owned and operated by the Boston Housing Authority (BHA). Socio-economic study of the neighborhood is included to determine whether the neighborhood has a positive or negative impact on the project. Community plans and development are described in order to show the existing approaches to problem solutions.

The problem faced by the BHA is how to restore Orchard Park in light of federal cutbacks and the developments in the neighborhood. Findings show that Orchard Park, socially, physically and economically, is more distressed when compared to other BHA family developments; that the BHA may face a 30% cutback in federal operating revenue within a year; and that the residential neighborhood shows widespread disinvestment and abandonment. While the residential neighborhood to the south of Orchard Park has architectural qualities and city programs that may lead to a revitalization, the area abutting Orchard Park does not have similar amenities. The area surrounding Orchard Park is designated by the city for economic redevelopment. Some new industries have located there, but no job commitments have come to Orchard Park tenants to date.

This study concludes that if the economic revitalization around Orchard Park continues, the BHA should capitalize on it by leasing an unused section of the project for light industrial or manufacturing purposes to companies willing to hire and train project residents. This would provide needed revenue to the BHA without its losing ultimate control over the site. As tenants' income increased, they would graduate from public housing to a lesser subsidy. This would allow more needy people to be served by and passed through public housing. It is also recommended that the BHA purchase some of the abandoned properties near the project, rehabilitate them and move Orchard Park tenants into them, so that self-improvement would
not force tenants to leave the neighborhood. Cost estimates are supplied for implementation of the recommendation.

Several areas of inquiry are noted for further study. These include a financial feasibility study for the intervention option chosen by the BHA; a survey of project tenants and neighborhood residents as to their preferences for redevelopment of Orchard Park; a study of wage incentives necessary to draw Orchard Park tenants off welfare rolls; a study of incentives, such as wage subsidies, which would encourage companies to hire project tenants; and legal research and strategies to accomplish any necessary enabling legislation.
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Introduction

Orchard Park is a public housing project owned and operated by the Boston Housing Authority (BHA). It is located in Roxbury near the Dudley Street transit station, Boston City Hospital and the Southwest Corridor redevelopment area. The project is included in the Newmarket Economic Development Area, and as a result, new building is now occurring on the land abutting it, the so-called CrossTown Industrial Park. Currently, there are revitalization plans for the nearby Dudley Station area, which has been designated a Commercial Area Revitalization District. To the south of Orchard Park is the Sav-Mor residential neighborhood which has been targeted by the city for housing rehabilitation funds. The residential neighborhood immediately surrounding Orchard Park to the south and east is badly deteriorated, with widespread disinvestment and abandonment.

The physical condition of Orchard Park, which was built in 1942, is considered to be one of the worst of the public housing projects in the city. The project is made up of 3-story structures and contains 737 rental apartments which are small and overcrowded. Aside from the project's age-related problems, it suffers from a high level of vandalism, which results in a large number of broken windows, walls torn out and copper pipes being stolen. The project has a high vacancy and turnover rate, a large number of families in arrears on rents, and lower average rents than other projects. Relative to other BHA family projects, Orchard Park has a higher proportion of poor, black families who are on welfare and a larger number of young, single, female heads of households. Additionally, there is a large dependent population under the age of 18 years and low educational attainment among residents.

Compounding these problems, last year the BHA was placed in receivership by the Suffolk Superior Court because of violations of the state sanitary code. Further, President
Reagan's proposed budget cuts, if enacted, would cause the BHA to lose $6.4 million in federal operating expenses, which would result in a 30% cut in the BHA's administration and maintenance budgets and a reduction in its 800-person staff by 320. Currently, the BHA has only about $3.1 million for project stabilization at Orchard Park. These funds will be exhausted in re-roofing project buildings, repairing the electrical system, improving the site and relocating tenants. The BHA does not have large amounts of undesignated funds, which can be directed toward innovative improvement at Orchard Park. Other sources of funding such as the city and the state do not look promising. At this time the city of Boston is besieged with its own financial problems in running its school system so cannot be tapped for financial support for the BHA.

Different futures can be projected for Orchard Park depending in large part on the way in which the neighborhood changes around it, and the impact of that change on the project. With economic development and neighborhood revitalization efforts occurring not far from Orchard Park, the morale and spirit may spread to the project, thus augmenting its stabilization. Alternatively, if noncompatible industrial uses expand in the area which immediately borders the project, it may produce a negative impact on the site. Or, Orchard Park may remain an island unaffected by either revitalization effort.

The subject for this thesis then is to analyze the area around Orchard Park, examine the actual and proposed development for this area and assess the likely impact on the project as a result of these developments. To help assess those impacts, the socio-economic make-up of both the project and neighborhood residents are explored. This "problem analysis" will be followed by intervention strategies for the BHA to preserve all or part of Orchard Park and an analysis of their feasibility, given current financial constraints, including
efforts necessary for implementation.

This thesis does not include detailed surveys of tenant preferences on redevelopment options. Once financially feasible development strategies are selected by the BHA, given its staff and financial resources, tenants should be included in the choice and design of a final plan. To present all options, no matter how unrealistic, to tenants before assessing their feasibility, would lead to unmet expectations and disappointment on the part of project tenants. Although tenants were not surveyed, their preferences have been included in this study, as reported by BHA officials, community planning agencies and representatives of the tenant organization.
Location

Orchard Park is a large federally supported housing project located in Boston's Lower Roxbury neighborhood. Owned and operated by the BHA, it covers 15.74 acres of land, contains 737 family apartments and houses about 2,258 people. The project is situated about five blocks south of Massachusetts Avenue on Harrison Avenue and is divided into two distinct parts (Map 1). The wedge-shaped western part of the development is bounded by Harrison Avenue on the west, Eustis Street to the north, Ziegler Street to the south and Dearborn Street to the east. The other segment of the project faces Albany Street to the northwest, Dearborn Street to the west, Eustis Street to the southwest, Prescott Street to the south, Hampden Street to the east and Yeoman Street to the northwest. On this latter sector of the project is a public middle school called the Dearborn School and a city-owned playground called Orchard Park.

The project is served by public transportation via the M.B.T.A. Orange Line which has a station only two blocks away at Dudley and Washington Streets. The area is served by major roads, notably the Southeast Expressway which links it to Boston to the north and coastal towns to the south. On the expressway access is provided to Boston's Logan International Airport which is about one-half hour away. The Massachusetts Department of Public Works has recently completed a crosstown arterial road, a four lane street which runs between Massachusetts Avenue at City Hospital and Columbus Avenue at Ruggles Street. The purpose of the Crosstown Street is to eliminate through traffic from residential streets and provide access for new businesses planned for the CrossTown Industrial Park area which abuts Orchard Park to the north and east. The project is also near other major thoroughfares: Massachusetts Avenue, Harrison Avenue, Warren Street, Bluehill Avenue, Dudley Street and Washington Street.
The project is approximately six blocks south of Boston City and University Hospitals. Two blocks to the south of the project is the Dudley Station area which is considered Roxbury's downtown and main shopping area. Located there is a new Roxbury Municipal Complex, which contains a police station, civic center, court house, regional library and the Roxbury Boys' Club. Boston has received a $1.8 million Urban Development Action Grant earmarked to provide funds to businesses that build, improve, or expand retail facilities there. Across Shawmut Avenue, five blocks to the west of Orchard Park are the recently built Madison Park High School, Occupational Resource Center and Madison Park Townhouses, subsidized moderate and low-income housing.

Much of the proposed development in and around Orchard Park is a result of the Campus High urban renewal and the Southwest Corridor Development Plan. The Corridor is an area which was slated for the continuation of Interstate-95 from Canton through Hyde Park, Roslindale, Jamaica Plain, Roxbury and the South End. In 1972 the expressway was cancelled and its federal construction funds were converted from highway to transit and community development uses. The Southwest Corridor Development Plan calls for transit and commuter rail improvements, new streets, new housing, new parks and industries using the cleared land from the cancelled expressway.
The Orchard Park Development is now about thirty-nine years old. Initially occupied in 1943, the project was named for a pear orchard which once grew on the site. Today little hint of that orchard remains. Presently, the site is paved with asphalt and is dotted with twenty-eight three-story brick buildings, many of which have deteriorated and have the familiar plywood covered windows indicating empty units. The physical condition of Orchard Park is considered to be one of the worst among the BHA's developments. There is noticeable litter, broken glass and refuse strewn about the site. Originally, there were 774 units in the development. By 1975, 4 were dedicated for agency use and 9 lost in the process of expanding several units, thus reducing the useful units to 761. Today there are 737 useable units. This represents about a 5% loss in total number of units since original construction. The reduction since 1975 is due to expanding units and "mothballing", a process the BHA uses to keep the number of units at a manageable level. Units have been expanded because of the large families at Orchard Park who have needed more space. Rooms in the project buildings are small. Although they comply with the federal standard for overcrowding, which is no more than two people per bedroom, the BHA has found that this is not enough space for families with children. Thus, units have been joined to provide more space for one family, which reduced the overall number of units in the project. Another reason for reduction of units at Orchard Park is the high level of vandalism, which increases BHA operating costs. Windows are broken and walls destroyed to expose the copper pipes which are then stolen. Vandalism in one unit causes a chain reaction effect in others due to water damage by broken pipes, or water entering windows and seeping into other units. Repair costs to restore units snowball, which when matched with limited maintenance
resources, results in fewer operating units at any given time.

The vacancy rate at Orchard Park is high. In July 1979 BHA data shows it at about 21%, whereas today it is about 30%, compared to 33% which is the average rate for all BHA family developments. Not only are there many vacancies at Orchard Park, but the number has increased steadily over time. An examination of BHA development reports shows the following changes in gross vacancies over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1966</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1969</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1975</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1975</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1979</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1981</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moveouts, too, are high averaging 92/year measured over a three-year period ending in 1978. Turnover rates reported in 1969 revealed that Orchard Park had a 10.2% turnover rate compared to 10.6% for all BHA projects for that year, which leaped to 20.0% by 1975 at Orchard Park compared to 15.3% for other BHA projects. As a percentage of units occupied in 1974, the 1975 turnover for the development was 21.2% compared to the BHA median of 16.3% for the same time period. An examination of length of residence in the project supports these findings. In 1975 48.9% of Orchard Park residents had lived there for less than five years compared to the median for all BHA projects of 39.6%. In that year only 1.5% of residents had lived at Orchard Park more than twenty years, compared to the BHA median of 9.7%. In 1978 the percentage of families at Orchard Park who had lived there less than five years was 42% compared to 33% for all BHA family developments. Those residing at Orchard Park more than twenty years was listed as 2% while the total BHA family developments show a 15% rate. Although the percentage of short-term residents decreased for both Orchard Park and BHA
family projects, the rates are still high and Orchard Park is high compared to other BHA projects. Additionally, the percentage of those living at Orchard Park less than one year was 13% in 1978, a figure significantly higher than the 4% figure reported for all BHA family projects.

The significance of the high number of vacancies and moveouts is that opportunities for vandalism are increased in the unoccupied units. Additionally, each time a unit is vacated it must be restored before it can be re-leased. These factors lead to high maintenance and operating costs, as well as units being kept off the market because sufficient repair funds are not available.

Even though there are a large number of vacancies and moveouts, there is demand for the project. It is impossible to infer from the data whether this demand is due to preference for the project or abject need. The distribution of vacant units and demand for them as of July 1979 is reported below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Vacancies/% of Total Vacs.</th>
<th>Waiting List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>155 21%</td>
<td>70 45.8%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>272 37%</td>
<td>50 32.7%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>213 29%</td>
<td>29 18.9%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55 7%</td>
<td>2 1.3%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35 5%</td>
<td>2 1.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 1%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>737 100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>153 100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>198</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there is demand, there is often a mismatch between the size of a unit which a family needs and what is currently available in the project. This can be seen above where requests for the 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6-bedroom apartments greatly exceed available space while 28 of the 1-bedroom units could go begging. About 40% of Orchard Park families surveyed in 1978 reported that their reason for moving into the project was need for more space. This was the primary reason
reported for moves into the project. Aside from the mismatch of demand and available units, the other factor which prevents the BHA from meeting this demand is the lack of funds to restore units each time a family moves.

Contributing to the BHA's financial problem of repairing units and re-letting them, is the low rent which is collected on the Orchard Park units, $73/month on the average compared with $80/month for all BHA family projects in 1978. In 1975 a similarly lower monthly rent figure than average was reported for Orchard Park, $54.26 versus $59.41 for all BHA projects. Too, the percentage of families in arrears on their rent adds to BHA operating problems. In 1969, 8% of Orchard Park families were more than one month in arrears on their rent compared to the BHA median of 7%. By 1975 the gap had widened with 47% more than one month in arrears versus a 23% median for all BHA projects. By 1978, 76% were more than one month in arrears at Orchard Park.

The rent-paying ability and the operating income the BHA can expect to receive are naturally a function of who is living in the project. Like the residential neighborhood around Orchard Park, the project has become increasingly composed of blacks and minorities over the years. The table below shows the increase in black and hispanic residents and the decrease in whites. Additionally, the proportion of blacks in all the BHA family projects follows the percentage for Orchard Park.

An earlier study shows that the project population in 1959 was 88% white, which rapidly fell to 49% by 1963.⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>88.8%* / 33.1%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>93.9% / 35.4%</td>
<td>92.32% / 40.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>4.7%**</td>
<td>6.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Oriental</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*non-white  
**other
The significance of the large black and minority population at Orchard Park is that these racial groups experience more job and wage discrimination, particularly so with low-paying jobs. Educational attainment, which affects the ability to obtain and advance in a job, is also low at Orchard Park. In 1978, the median number of years of school completed was 10 compared to 12.1 for the city of Boston in 1970.

A trend which follows is the income level at Orchard Park which was lower than the BHA family development median and decreased relative to it between 1975 and 1978. In 1975 Orchard Park per capita income was $1,105, or 84% of the BHA median of $1,312. By 1978 it was $1,353 or 76% of the BHA family median of $1,785. Mean family income, too, shows a slight reduction from 94% of total BHA family developments in 1975 to 92% in 1978 at $4,736 for Orchard Park. In 1978, 17% of tenants surveyed reported "need for lower rent" as their reason for moving to Orchard Park. This was the third highest frequency of reasons for moving next to "need for space" at 40% and "forced move, medical emergency, fire, eviction, substandard conditions at previous house" at 30%.

Employment, which is usually positively related to income, is low at Orchard Park and also lower than what was reported for all BHA family projects. In 1969, 25% of families at Orchard Park reported having one or more members working, compared to 35% for all BHA family developments. By 1975, 15% reported one or more members working versus 21% for the BHA family developments. In 1978, 16.31% of families surveyed showed one member employed but only 10.25% of the overall adult population was working. Corresponding with a low employment rate is also a high dependence on welfare payments at Orchard Park. Listed below is a table which shows the percentage of families at Orchard Park receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).
Besides the income problem, Orchard Park suffers from social and family problems. One is a large proportion of single-parent households, which has increased from 64% in 1969, to 85% in 1975 and about 95% in 1978. Of the single-parent households, approximately 74% were headed by women in 1978. Although the reporting system was different in 1975, 79.5% of all heads of households were females in that year. Additionally, the female heads tend to be young. In 1978 20%, the highest frequency, of female heads of households were between the ages of 19 and 24 years. The highest frequency for males, at 21%, was in the 45-50 year age group. Coupled with a good share of young, female-headed households is a large proportion of minors, which has remained fairly stable from 1975 to 1978. The details are listed below.

**TABLE 4. BHA Families Receiving AFDC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project has other problems, too, related to crime and daily operations. Crime, vandalism and drug-related activities afflict Orchard Park as they do other public housing sites in the city. Aside from vandalism, Orchard Park has been used as a stolen car drop-off point and a place criminals escape to after committing crimes. Tenants have requested that maintenance and rat control be improved at the site. Specifically, they have asked for increased dumpster
collection and lower dumpsters so that trash can be disposed in rather than beside them. BHA officials have expressed concern for employment for young residents as well as adults, and have noted that no hiring commitments have emerged for project tenants from the new CrossTown Industrial Park, which abuts the project. The land use and zoning around the project tend to isolate it from the rest of the Lower Roxbury community. Driving through the surrounding neighborhood, observation shows the predominant uses to be warehouses, storage companies, junk yards, tire lots, iron works, truck bays, a refuse disposal facility, abandoned or deteriorating houses and vacant lots. As characterized by the BHA:

"except for wood frame structures on Zeigler and Eustis, Orchard Park is a residential island surrounded by industrial, warehouse, small scale commercial use and vacant land which accentuates the development's separation from the community."

See Map 2 for the zoning in the area.

To every bleak story, there are some bright sides, and this is also true for Orchard Park. Although the project has a high turnover rate among the recent arrivals, it has a core of residents who have lived there for 5-15 years. This group represents 53% of the tenants surveyed in 1978, and is displayed below compared to all BHA family projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Residence</th>
<th>Orchard Park</th>
<th>All BHA Family Developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>53%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although these residents are concerned about conditions at the project, they have a strong commitment to Orchard Park and consider it their home. An observation of the project on a Sunday afternoon recently revealed residents outside working on cars, men and women gathered in small groups talking,
### Key to Zoning Map 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Districts</th>
<th>Business Districts</th>
<th>Industrial Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-3 Single Family</td>
<td>L-5 Local Retail &amp;</td>
<td>M-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5</td>
<td>L-1 Service Stores</td>
<td>M-2 Light Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5 Two Family</td>
<td>B-1 Retail</td>
<td>M-4 Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-8 3 Family, Apts.</td>
<td>B-2 Retail</td>
<td>M-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1</td>
<td>B-4 Business</td>
<td>I-2 General Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-2</td>
<td>B-8 &amp; Offices</td>
<td>W-2 Waterfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-3 Apartments</td>
<td>B-10</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
holding babies as children stood by, and several games of basketball going on. Even though the project has physically old structures, cramped quarters, social and economic problems, there is a group of residents who would like to stay together.

Several years ago, the tenant organization considered redevelopment plans for the project prepared by Greater Roxbury Community Development Corporation. Since then they have not discussed redevelopment alternatives with residents because of the lack of funding to implement any massive rehabilitation plan. Representatives of the tenants are working for more realizable goals, such as, hallway and stairwell improvements, expansion of unit size and site maintenance. From the Department of Housing and Urban Development the BHA received about $13.5 million in modernization funds for stabilization and improvement of their projects. Approximately $3.1 million has been earmarked for Orchard Park. These funds will be exhausted in re-roofing project buildings, repairing the electrical system, improving the site and for relocating tenants. Currently, the BHA does not have large amounts of additional, undesignated funds, which could be directed towards innovative structural rehabilitation such as increasing the number of entryways serving groups of tenants. At present, twelve units are served by each entryway.

Services available to project tenants on the site include a city-operated recreational center, which has been very successful, a Headstart Program located in the administration building and a Neighborhood House run by the Lena Park Community Development Corporation. Nearby the project on Dudley Street is the Opportunities Industrialization Centers, an agency which trains minorities for jobs which currently exist or will locate in Boston in the future.

In conclusion, the BHA is saddled with management and maintenance of an old physical plant at Orchard Park which is in bad need of repair. Aside from projected cuts in operating
-17-

Revenue from the federal government, the BHA receives low rents from the site, with a high percentage of them received late. Vandalism at the site increases repair expenses and limits the BHA's ability to quickly re-rent vacated apartments, and which in turn causes the BHA to lose additional rent revenue.

Project residents have their own social and economic problems which affect their own upward mobility and contribute to the BHA's shortfall in financial resources. The image inferred from BHA data is one of a black, dependent poor population, with a low potential for attaining employment, a high percentage of households headed by young women, and a large population under the age of 18 years. Also, the degree of dependency on welfare is above average compared to other BHA family developments. Although there are numerous physical and social problems at the site, there is also a core of tenant families committed to improving Orchard Park.
It is instructive to study Orchard Park in the context of its neighborhood. If a project is failing in a thriving neighborhood, more attention on the internal workings of the project would be suggested. If a project is thriving in a failing neighborhood, attention should be given so the project is not harmed by the neighborhood. Where both project and neighborhood are declining concomitantly, energy must be directed toward both so that the problems of one do not spread to the other. An example of a spreading problem is crime. If a neighborhood has a high crime rate, it is difficult to prevent it from affecting the project or vice versa. An analysis of the HUD Target Project Program, initiated in 1974, indicated that projects located in deteriorating neighborhoods are subject to harmful effects from the neighborhood.11 One evaluation concluded that it was not sufficient to improve just the physical environment of the project: 

"a public housing project does not and cannot exist as an island in the midst of a surrounding neighborhood or environment. There is a complex environment within which the project exists and it must be treated as an integral part of that environment, for the public housing project impacts upon its surroundings as it is impacted by the neighborhood around it."12

Thus, this section will analyze the neighborhood immediately around Orchard Park to provide clues as to the nature and extent of improvements necessary to turn Orchard Park around.

The residential neighborhood in which Orchard Park is located spans two census tracts, numbered 804 and 803 as shown on Map 3. The two tracts directly abutting the project tracts are 801, a large industrial/manufacturing area which has a very small residential component, and 802, which is predominantly residential. Tract 906 reaches further into the North Dorchester area and was examined, in addition to the other tracts, in order to offer some comparison with the
Map 3. Census Tracts
tracts immediately surrounding the project. In addition, trends for the entire city of Boston were used to compare those found in the Orchard Park neighborhood. U.S. Census tract data for 1960 and 1970, the most recent available, and the 1980 tallies for total population and racial composition were examined and incorporated into the discussion.  

The total population for each of the tracts declined dramatically between 1960 and 1970, while the population for the city of Boston for the same period decreased by only 8%. At the same time the population for the entire metropolitan area increased by 6.3%. The 1960-1970 years were a period in the U.S. when people were fleeing the inner cities to relocate in the suburbs. Thus, the large decrease in the population in the Lower Roxbury tracts and the lesser reduction in Boston reflects this national trend. This outward trend is further reinforced when 1980 population figures for Boston are observed. Between 1970 and 1980, Boston lost an additional 12% of its population. The pattern for the Orchard Park neighborhood continued between 1970 and 1980 and is graphically shown in Figures 1 and 2. The total number of individuals leaving each tract and the percentage decrease which it represents are displayed in Table 7 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>40% less</td>
<td>3% more</td>
<td>38% less</td>
<td>1019 less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>26% less</td>
<td>27% less</td>
<td>46% less</td>
<td>2031 less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>20% less</td>
<td>29% less</td>
<td>43% less</td>
<td>1081 less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>32% less</td>
<td>25% less</td>
<td>49% less</td>
<td>1885 less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>17% less</td>
<td>58% less</td>
<td>66% less</td>
<td>594 less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nationally the flight to the suburbs during the 1960's and 1970's left the central cities with a larger proportion of elderly, black, poor and needy people. This phenomenon is also seen in the census data for the Orchard Park neighborhood. From 1960 to 1970 the population became increasingly composed
Figure 1. Total Population
Figure 2. Total Population
of blacks. Between 1970 and 1980 there is a slight reversal of this trend in some tracts. Far from indicating a positive pattern, when the reversal is coupled with a continued loss of population during this period, it probably indicates that the blacks who could were also leaving the neighborhood. The picture is one of evacuation, first by whites between 1960 and 1970 and then by blacks in the following decade.

**TABLE 8. Percent Black Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the figures for Boston during the 1960-1980 period show an increase in the percentage black population, the proportion is much lower than that which is seen in the Orchard Park neighborhood. In 1960 Boston showed a 9% black population; in 1970 it grew to 16% and by 1980 it was about 22%.

Figures 3, 4 and 5 show the population pyramids for each tract. It is interesting to note the increase in the proportion of the population older than 75 years and in the group younger than 18 years between 1960 and 1970. Tract 803 shows a slight decrease in its population older than 75 years. However, Tracts 804 and 803, which Orchard Park spans, graphically show the largest density of children. Tract 801, which abuts the project tract, too, shows a population figure heavily weighted with children. The proportion of each tract's population under 18 years is shown in Table 9 compared with the figures for Boston.
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Tract 801
Additionally, there was a decrease in the ratio of males to females during this period for all tracts except 802. Table 10 itemizes the male/female ratio for each tract and contrasts them with the ratio indicative for Boston.

### TABLE 10. Male/Female Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>1960/Boston</th>
<th>1970/Boston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>86/92</td>
<td>72/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The census tracts in which the housing project is located show lower ratios than the rest of the city. All the sampled tracts show a reduction in this ratio between 1960 and 1970 except tract 802. When there is a large proportion of children in the population, a high ratio of males to females would indicate that there are male figures present to discipline and act as paternal models for the children.

Another indicator of family stability can be derived from the proportion of single women in the population. As can be seen in Table 11, the percent of single women increased during the years under study for every tract. When compared to Boston, all tracts have higher rates of single women in 1960 and 1970. Coupled with lower male/female ratios and a large proportion of children the figures suggest discipline problems in this neighborhood.
TABLE 11. Percent of Single Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>1960/Boston</th>
<th>1970/Boston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>47%/31%</td>
<td>54%/38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income is another variable which is also much lower than that reported for Boston. Median family income for each tract is shown as a percentage of Boston median family income in Table 12 below. Not only is income low in each tract compared to Boston, but it decreases relative to Boston between 1960 and 1970.

TABLE 12. Median Income as a Percentage of Boston Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>1960/Boston</th>
<th>1970/Boston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, these tracts generally report higher rates of unemployment for those in the labor force compared with Boston. However, it is important to note that there are exceptions to this pattern and also that the unemployment rate for these tracts tended to decrease between 1960 and 1970.

TABLE 13. Unemployment Rates for Population in the Labor Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>14%/6%</td>
<td>10%/5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13. Unemployment Rates (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>TOTAL (Males and Females)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1960/Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>11%/5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 1980 report on the Orchard Park neighborhood performed by United Community Planning Corporation indicated that although the 1980 unemployment statistics for the specific tracts under discussion were not available, it was reasonable to assume that the rate is similar to that of the rest of Roxbury by 1977. Their report shows unemployment at 20.3% for Roxbury, while Boston had a 12.8% level in 1977. The high unemployment rate in this section of the city is attributed to the fact that within the last thirty years Boston lost approximately 50% of its manufacturing activity and concurrently about 53,000 jobs.  

Education, a variable associated with income and employment, is also lower for the Orchard Park neighborhood than for the rest of the city. This is exemplified in Table 14 below.

TABLE 14. Median Years of School Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>1960/Boston</th>
<th>1970/Boston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>8.8/11.2</td>
<td>9.4/12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another variable associated with income is house value. Census data shows that the median house value for the tracts examined is about one-half Boston values in 1960 and about 40% the median house value of Boston by 1970. Median gross rent, too, declined relative to Boston rents, but it remained substantially higher than the house value ratio. This is fairly
common in ghetto areas during periods when population is diminishing. Landlords receive less demand for their units and charge relatively high rents in order to cover operating costs. This argument is supported by an examination of vacancy rates which increased in all tracts but 804 between 1960 and 1970. By way of comparison, available vacant units relative to total units in Boston were 6% in 1960 and 8% in 1970. The relatively high rents and increased vacancies cannot be attributed to the construction of new units since the total number of housing units decreased for each tract between 1960 and 1970. Table 15 below displays these details.

TABLE 15. Median House Values, Gross Rents, Vacancies and Change in Total Number of Housing Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>Percentage Change in Number of Units between 1960-70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>-54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on ownership also reinforces the conviction that there was an evacuation from the area. The tracts where the project is located (804 and 803) and abutting tract 801 were affected to a greater degree, reporting decreases in ownership rates between 1960 and 1970. As distance is gained from the project, ownership rates actually stabilized or increased. Although income did not increase in tracts 802 and 906 during this period, unemployment actually went down. With an increase
in employment, relatives may have pooled funds to switch from renting to ownership as wary landlords began to sell and flee the area. Table 16 reproduces the ownership data for these tracts. The picture is one in which residents were abandoning

TABLE 16. Percent Owner Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRACT</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the neighborhood, vacancy rates were increasing, with a subsequent plummeting of house value, and landlords trying to recoup losses by charging relatively high rents to the tenants they could keep.

Another factor which must be examined is mobility. The proportion of people who reported moving into the Orchard Park neighborhood within two years of the census increased between 1960 and 1970. Simultaneously, the percentage of long-time residents decreased as the recent arrivals increased in tracts 804 and 803. For tracts 802, 906 and 801 the residents of 21 years or more increased slightly. Rather than indicating an increase in neighborhood stability, in this instance it mirrors what was happening in inner cities nationally. The elderly, who could not afford to move, ended up staying. It is interesting to note that the long-time residents of the tracts where the project is located got out. Unlike university dominated neighborhoods throughout the city, the high degree of transience here, does not have a common focus, which would tend to unite residents. See Table 17 below for details.
To sum up, the Orchard Park neighborhood is a typical example of a declining inner city area marked by: higher than average losses in total population and total number of housing units; higher percentages of blacks, children, females to males, single women, gross rents, transients and the unemployed; and generally lower income, educational attainment, house values and ownership levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>804</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bost.</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The census data for tracts 804 and 803 is naturally very similar to project statistics, since the project population of 2,292 in 1970 consisted of 47% of these tracts. By 1980 the project population of 2,258 comprised 56% of tracts 804 and 803. Due to the large proportion of project residents in these tracts, it is normal that the census reportings would reflect the trends noted in the project. Looking at specific variables, the following similarities are found. Both show comparable increases and proportions of black residents. The percentage of minors is almost identical for tract 804 and the project. Median years of school completed is low in the project and project census tracts compared to Boston. Income is low in the project relative to other BHA family developments and it is low in tracts 804 and 803 compared to Boston. Unemployment is very high in the project and relatively high in the Orchard Park census tracts compared to Boston. Gross rents collected in the projects are lower than the average ones generated in other BHA family projects. The gross rents in the project tracts are a lower proportion of city rents than Orchard Park rents are compared to average BHA family rents. The proportion of recent movers to the project and neighborhood are both high, while both also show reductions in the number of residents of twenty-one years or more. Vacancy rates are high for both the project and its census tracts. Strict comparisons between the project and the neighborhood are not possible because the data measures slightly different variables and also the reporting periods are not the same. However, similar trends can be seen even if the data is not exactly the same.

Regardless of the form of the data, there is one major difference between the project and its census tracts; that is, housing demand. The Orchard Park project has a waiting list, whereas, its census tracts show large vacancies.
despite sizeable losses in the number of housing units. Tract 804 in 1970 is the only exception, with a 4% vacancy rate. This is not altogether an aberration from the other tracts since 804 lost 54% of its housing units between 1960 and 1970 while its vacancy rate diminished by a mere 2%.

Characteristics similar to the project and its tracts are found in tracts 802, 906 and 801 for the following variables. Population size decreased between 1960 and 1980 in all the tracts except 801 by 38% to 49%. Tract 801 showed a 66% loss, but it had the smallest population of all the tracts initially. Thus, its percentage change in population is highest while the number of people who left it is half or less than half when compared to the other tracts. The percentage of single women is uniformly high compared to Boston among all the tracts, ranging from 45% to 57% in 1970 versus Boston's 38%. Income is also similarly low in all tracts, ranging from 60-70% of Boston levels in 1970. Educational attainment, too, is comparably low in all the tracts, even those beyond Orchard Park's location. Loss in units and vacancies are uniformly high except for tract 804's vacancy rate which was mentioned above.

There are some notable differences between the data found in the project and its tracts (804 and 803) compared to the ones outside of Orchard Park (802, 906 and 801). The proportion of blacks and minors is much lower in the latter tracts. These tracts, too, show higher male/female ratios than are seen in the project tracts or suggested by project data. Additionally, unemployment rates in tracts 802 and 906 are comparable to Boston's rate in 1970. Tracts 802 and 906 also show higher rents than the other tracts. Tract 801 again is an exception to the trends found in the outlying tracts. It had levels of unemployment and rents which more closely resembled the project tracts, 804 and 803. Finally, the tracts outside of Orchard Park show the largest percentages of residents who had lived there for twenty-one years or more.
Are there causal elements for the trends seen in the project and the neighborhood? One contributing force was the Southwest Corridor land clearance which started in 1966. The path cleared for the expressway cuts right through the heart of tract 804 and through the western side of tract 801. As shown earlier tract 804 lost 54% of its units and 801 lost 23% between 1960 and 1970. When land was being cleared businesses as well as residents were relocated. As that occurred other residents perceived that their local businesses were gone and that a major expressway would be built nearby, so chose to leave. Study on housing investment in other inner cities shows that the adverse affects of abutting public works construction and renewal projects can lead to residential abandonment.20 Another influence was the national trend of flight to the suburbs, which left inner cities with reduced populations. The out-migration from this vicinity resulted in abandoned and demolished structures. This neighborhood not only has the typical features of a declining inner city area, but it suffered an additional jolt when land was cleared for the expressway, compounding the disinvestment. Finally, neither the project nor the neighborhood provides an anchor of stability by which the other can improve.
As mentioned in the previous section, traditional socio-economic indicators and observation show that Orchard Park and its immediate neighborhood have declined dramatically since 1960. Neither the project nor its abutting neighborhood provides the stability necessary to reinforce a stabilization effort in one. There are some exceptions to the downward spiral in the neighborhood, chiefly seen in tracts 802 and 906. While residential strength cannot be found on the lands immediately surrounding the project, it is important to examine what is occurring a little further south and east. Moderate revitalization is occurring about five blocks to the east of the project by Portuguese immigrants who have migrated here from the Cape Verde Islands off the coast of northern Africa. Additionally, revitalization is occurring south of Dudley Street in the Sav-Mor neighborhood. It is important to examine what is being done in these areas to see whether it will advance as far as the project, enhancing any stabilization effort there, or if more direct intervention in the Orchard Park neighborhood is necessary to link it to the other activities.

First, what are the city-directed housing programs for the neighborhoods near Orchard Park? The Sav-Mor neighborhood, located south of Dudley Street between Warren Street and Blue Hill Avenue, was designated for the HUD Neighborhood Strategy Area Program in 1978. The program targets neighborhoods for rehab and preservation investment which is funded by Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and the city’s capital budget. Additionally, within the Sav-Mor neighborhood, a subdivision has been designated for $8 substantial rehab money. Under this program three rehab projects have been selected, with a total of 200 units to be rehabbed within this year. The first project will produce 40 units of elderly housing in the Sarah Baker School on Langford Street. Two other projects will produce mixed family and elderly units
but their precise locations are not yet known. What is clear is that these programs will be in the northern part of the Sav-Mor neighborhood, but south of Dudley Street. All of these projects will be for low-income families and will carry $8 rent supplement.\textsuperscript{22}

Another program proposed by the city will extend north of Dudley Street into the Orchard Park neighborhood. In February, 1981, the Mayor's Office of Housing applied to HUD's 510 Demonstration Program for substantial rehab funds for 90 vacant and 10 occupied housing units near Orchard Park combined with the rehab and cooperative conversion of Marksdale Gardens, a "troubled" HUD site with a stable tenant population located in the Washington Park section of Roxbury. The plan calls for using the syndication proceeds from the $8 rehab component as seed money for home ownership at Marksdale Gardens.

The sites chosen for the rehab component of the program are masonry structures of 3 or more units and include:

1) vacant residential brick structures acquired by the city through tax foreclosure,

2) masonry shells which were part of the BRA "in-fill" experiment. These are multi-unit structures completed in the early 1970's on vacant lots between residences but never occupied. They were built for large families and most contain four bedrooms.

3) privately owned tax delinquent properties, and

4) closed or consolidated school buildings.

The following list provides details on the location and ownership of the buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRA In-fill Buildings</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105, 120 George Street</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254, 281-283 Eustis Street</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 Family Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City-owned Buildings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54 Adams Street, 189 Eustis Street</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-58 Adams Street</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35, 39 Blue Hill Avenue</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-owned Buildings (cont.)</td>
<td>Number of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383-385 Blue Hill Avenue</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277-277A Dudley Street</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294-298 Dudley Street</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345 Dudley Street</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618-620 Dudley Street</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Magnolia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 24 Winthrop</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mixed Family/Elderly Units</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privately-Owned Buildings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>387-395 Dudley</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 Dunmore</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204-206 Hampden</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Small Family Units</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Patrick's Elementary</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict Fenwick Elementary</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips Brooks School</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These properties have been placed on "hold" and will not be sold pending the 510 Demonstration application. The developer chosen for the rehab program is La Alianza Hispania, an Hispanic social service and housing counselling agency located on Dudley and Mt. Pleasant Streets about three blocks from Orchard Park. In selecting the developer, the city wanted to find one with experience with community groups, rehab and syndication and a willingness to perform a feasibility study for the conversion of the §8 component into cooperatives in the future. The city also wanted to offer a local group the opportunity for job training and management experience.

The criteria used in selecting the buildings are:
- proximity to service-delivery area of La Alianza Hispania
- availability of buildings
- acquisition costs
- soundness of original construction and present condition of buildings
- stability of surrounding area for residential living
- large units and surrounded by play space for children

Aside from these programs, the BRA has committed itself to increase its efforts in expanding the effectiveness of the
city-wide Home Improvement Program in Roxbury. This program provides rebates to homeowners who bring their homes up to code. The BRA recommends a cash advance program to homeowners to aid them in leveraging loans from private lending institutions, and introducing a low-interest city loan program. Moreover, it calls for greater concentration of \$312 low-interest loans in Roxbury and efforts to increase the amount of these loans to Boston by HUD. Finally, the BRA proposes the implementation of a homesteading program in Roxbury.

How will these programs impact Orchard Park? The only housing developments in the area being actualized at this time are the Cape Verdeans' rehab effort and the Mayor's rehab effort south of Dudley Street. The 510 Demonstration proposal will probably not be approved because it relies on \$312 loans for the homeownership component at Marksdale Gardens. This loan program is slated for large cuts in the Reagan budget. This implies that in order to improve the area immediately surrounding Orchard Park, the BHA may have to take the initiative and rehab the structures itself. If it could raise the revenue, the BHA could lease these units to low- or moderate-income families or possibly sell them to Cape Verdean families, one of the few groups willing to live in this area. By selling to the Cape Verdeans, the BHA would be guiding their expansion into the area nearest to the project. Since the Portuguese have completed striking improvements in blighted neighborhoods in other cities, this would probably produce a positive impact in the Orchard Park neighborhood.
Neighborhood Economic Development

From the earlier sections of this study, it is apparent that Orchard Park and its immediate neighborhood have deteriorated over the years. Some residential rehab is occurring, but it has not reached into the Orchard Park neighborhood yet. In order to fully gauge whether the area around Orchard Park will provide conflicts or opportunities for tenants, it is essential to look at the non-residential activities which have been planned or are being implemented. To gain an understanding of the economic potential in the area, the Greater Roxbury Community Development Corporation (GRDC) economic development plan for Roxbury was examined. This plan offers insight on pressing economic problems in the community and some strategies to overcome them. The efforts of the Community Development Corporation of Boston, Inc. (CDC) and the Economic Development and Industrial Corporation of Boston (EDIC) were explored to indicate what development they are initiating and how Orchard Park fits into it.
Greater Roxbury Community Development Corporation (GRDC)

In August of 1979 GRDC, a non-profit community development corporation founded in 1975, completed a community economic development strategy (CEDS) plan for Roxbury which includes a redevelopment scheme for Orchard Park. The GRDC plan presents a picture of the commercial, economic and social conditions existing in Roxbury today as well as a detailed history of its past. Further, the study analyzes reasons for problems, such as low income, residential and commercial abandonment and strategies to overcome these problems.

Outlined in GRDC's CEDS report, are the racial transition from white to black during the 1950's and 1960's, a continued loss in population and public and private business disinvestment. Specifically, the report notes the continued decline of Roxbury's industrial base. Partly due to the lack of employment generators, commercial activity has also declined since fewer people are working in the area. Also, the switch from transit to automobile use has resulted in people shopping in outlying shopping centers versus Dudley Station, a major transit node. Additionally, the report indicates that the perception of crime in the area has tended to dampen commercial activity. It is felt that the Dudley Station commercial activity will be harmed further when the elevated Orange Line is relocated, unless high-level replacement service is provided by the M.B.T.A.

Another problem discussed in the GRDC plan is housing quality and demand. GRDC notes that 40% of the houses in its primary study area were substandard or in need of major repair, while 18% of the houses studied were either vacant or abandoned. In this study, Orchard Park spans two areas, one which has 0.0% and the other with 14.2% of its housing in sound condition or in need of minor repair. These areas show the highest vacancies of all the areas studied by GRDC in this report. Housing quality is attributed to a lack of
effective demand by consumers. Effective demand was measured by using indicators such as market rents and house prices, which are lower than those in the rest of the city. The low level of demand was attributed to low income in Roxbury, the lack of preference for certain neighborhoods within this area and the perception that it is a minority area by whites and an inferior place by blacks who can live elsewhere. This is not the case in all areas of Roxbury but does apply to the primary area under study by GRDC, which encompasses the area around Orchard Park. It is also noted that local demand is a function of metropolitan population growth, which has stabilized over the last decade. Thus, where demand is low, rents tend to be low and with a low level of operating revenue, landlords cannot provide a high level of housing service.

To alleviate the problems in Roxbury, GRDC has established the following goals:
- increase the number and quality of jobs for Roxbury residents
- induce growth of its economic base
- obtain more city services and improvements
- target infrastructure improvements to those areas of Roxbury where the largest job-creating effect can be obtained
- promote the stability of Roxbury's neighborhoods as places to live and do business.

GRDC's priority objectives are the redevelopment of the Dudley Station commercial area and the Orchard Park housing project. In 1978 the Dudley area was designated a Commercial Area Revitalization District (CARD), making businesses there eligible for low-interest mortgages, state mortgage guarantees and property tax relief. For Dudley Station GRDC plans for the development of a major supermarket and a mixed use shopping center of 500,000 square feet. In addition, it plans to monitor and influence M.B.T.A. transit decisions so
a high level of service to the area is continued.

GRDC's recommendation for Orchard Park is to divide the buildings vertically into townhouses on the first two floors and flats on the third floor, served by semi-private stairways and galleries. Each duplex would have a private entry on the street side and a private yard in the rear. A new management and maintenance structure is also recommended, with a strong urging for cooperative ownership by tenants. GRDC also advocates the construction of 50-100 new moderate-income units on the vacant lots around Orchard Park for cooperative housing. The report notes that large concentrations of subsidized housing do not stabilize neighborhoods and thus, emphasizes the ownership component.

Another issue stressed is the need for employment and GRDC looks to the Southwest Corridor project and the CrossTown Industrial Park as major sources for community jobs. In order to take advantage of the emerging jobs, there is need for job training and skill enhancement for community residents and the report lists existing programs to achieve this goal. Finally, this report offers sources of funding and implementation plans for the community development strategies it promotes. Although the GRDC plan has not reached the implementation stage yet, it is useful as a measure of prominent community needs and reinforces the areas noted earlier in this study as problems for the Orchard Park housing project and neighborhood.
CrossTown Industrial Park

In July 1973, after the Southwest Expressway was scrapped, Governor Sargent appointed a Southwest Corridor Development Coordinator to organize the re-use of the lands cleared for the highway. Mass transit planning activities were assigned to the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority and the Department of Public Works. The Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency, the Department of Community Affairs and the Department of Environmental Management were charged with developing new housing and recreation facilities. Finally, the City of Boston took on planning and developing capital improvements in the Corridor, such as, new schools and housing. To facilitate development, the city received grants from both the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Economic Development Administration.

The industrial park development immediately abutting Orchard Park is located on Corridor lands and is the result of the marketing, planning and development enterprise of CDC and EDIC. CDC is a non-profit development organization operating in Roxbury and the South End since 1970, and has identified a specific area here as its Long Term Economic Deterioration/Strategic Impact Area for its concentration. CDC's efforts here are directed at developing vacant and underutilized land, generating new permanent jobs, as opposed to cyclical construction jobs, and improving the local economic base. Its plan focuses on the CrossTown Industrial Park and the Strategic Impact Area, the Newmarket Area and the Southwest Corridor. The Strategic Impact Area surrounds the CrossTown Industrial Park and both are shown on Map 4.

EDIC was established by the state legislature in 1971 to promote economic development and alleviate industrial decay within designated Economic Development areas in Boston. All EDIC plans must be approved by the City Council and Mayor before they can be implemented. EDIC is authorized to acquire
Map 4. Strategic Impact Area and CrossTown Industrial Park
land, buildings, clear and develop parcels. In order to achieve this, it has been granted the power of eminent domain and to borrow money through tax-exempt revenue bonds. In 1966, the Massachusetts Constitution was amended to include industrial development as a public purpose for which public funds could be spent. EDIC's goals are similar to CDC's; that is, increase employment opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed of the city, find productive uses for vacant or under utilized land, conserve and expand existing industries, and attract new industrial and commercial activity which will have the greatest economic impact for Boston.

The CrossTown Industrial Park is being co-ventured by CDC and EDIC. It was designated an Economic Development Area by the Boston City Council and the Mayor in May, 1977. This area consisted of about 40 acres of blighted and vacant land. EDIC's role was to assemble the land, raise revenue for development, and make necessary property tax agreements for eligible projects. CDC's function was to secure federal funding, as a community based non-profit organization, to act as developer, market the project and secure the appropriate tenants. The industrial park plans are displayed on Map 5 and include:

1. A one story, 62,100 square foot Digital Equipment Corporation (DEC) computer assembly plant, which is now in operation and is located on the corner of Albany Street and Massachusetts Avenue. When it located there, DEC obtained an option to expand its facility by another 67,000 square feet. Currently, it plans to exercise that option and expand on its present site. It was anticipated that the initial plant and the expansion each would produce 300 new, permanent jobs. EDIC owns the land and leases it to DEC.

2. A 166,000 square foot, one story service and distribution facility is planned for the parcel, assembled and cleared by EDIC, immediately abutting Orchard Park to the north on Harrison Avenue. The proposed tenant is Healthco, Inc., a national supplier of medical and dental equipment.
Approximately 100,000 square feet of this site will be used for warehousing. It is expected that this plant will generate 200 new jobs, excluding 130 employees who will be transferred from within the company. A CDC subsidiary will develop and own the site and lease it to Healthco under a 20-year lease.

3. The Baltimore Brushes Building renovation is the third project in the industrial park. This 4 story building located on Albany Street has been rehabbed and is currently leased with an option to buy by CDC. A 4 story addition is planned for this site, which will bring the total floor area to 53,000 square feet. CDC is negotiating with Control Data Corporation to establish a Business Technology Center on this site.

Listed below are the funding sources for the industrial park:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federal Funding</th>
<th>Private Financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>$0.6 million</td>
<td>$2.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthco, Inc.</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
<td>$5.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Brushes Bldg.</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.1 million</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9.4 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job training for the new business development will be provided by Opportunities Industrialization Centers of Greater Boston, Inc. (OIC). This organization has one of its centers located on Dudley Street not more than one block from Orchard Park. At a public hearing in connection with the development of the Healthco parcel, it was pointed out that 64% of OIC trainees came from Roxbury, Dorchester, or Mattapan.32

Interviews were conducted with representatives of both CDC33 and EDIC34 to determine the extent to which the area would develop and its perceived impact on or by the Orchard Park Housing Project. When asked whether there would be development pressure for the Orchard Park site, CDC emphasized that they were committed not to destroy housing but, rather saw their goal as restoring jobs to the community.
Although they have no legal or written agreement with the Orchard Park tenants, CDC has a tacit understanding to bring in labor intensive industries, create jobs that can lead to some kind of career path and jobs which would use the skills of community residents or require a minimum of training. The kinds of industries CDC tried to draw into the area are those with growth potential, particularly employment growth, those that thrive in an urban market and do not need a lot of land. CDC stressed that its goal is not speculation since they are a non-profit organization, but is more concerned with bringing neighborhood residents into the work force.

When asked about Control Data Corp., the Minneapolis-based company CDC hopes will reside in the Baltimore Brushes Building, CDC indicated that negotiations were continuing. From the perspective of CDC, City Venture Corporation, Control Data's subsidiary, was heavy-handed in its efforts at securing local municipal funds for its planning and feasibility study for the Business and Technology Center. CDC felt that it had already achieved much of the study which City Venture wanted to undertake. Additionally, CDC expressed concern that City Venture would absorb existing public funds which CDC uses for its operation. CDC emphasized that it would like a small business incubator located at the Baltimore Brushes Building because of its job producing capability, but that City Venture should use CDC's initial feasibility studies and include CDC's staff in continued studies. In essence, there is a battle of turf while both parties are in agreement philosophically.

When EDIC was asked whether there would be development pressure for the Orchard Park project site, it indicated that any new development in and around the project in the future could be absorbed by the Newmarket Area, which comprises 200 acres outside of the industrial park and is largely zoned industrial.

From EDIC's perspective, indications that the area will
continue to grow economically include the DEC plant expansion plans, and the trend for other corporations such as Wang and Teradyne to locate in the inner city, near an available, trainable work force. In addition to the above activity, the city is considering the CrossTown Industrial Park area as a candidate for an Enterprise Zone\(^35\) (if the program ever takes shape at the national level) which would spur the development momentum. The Enterprise Zone concept calls for mixed use, so housing would not be out of place. Also, the funding needed for EDIC's activities was committed during the last administration and there is no expectation that it will be cancelled as a result of President Reagan's budget cuts. Thus, EDIC's current plans should not be hampered. Regarding further EDIC development in the area, it has cancelled the assembly and development of Parcel 3, which lies to the northeast of Orchard Park. EDIC concluded that there were sufficiently viable industries there not to warrant an assembly and land development scheme at the present time.

Asked whether there was a conflict between Orchard Park and the new industrial tenants, EDIC said no. It did not perceive that the project was a deterrent to businesses locating in the area but did concede that Healthco, the company scheduled to locate next to the project, has plans which show no building on the project side of the property, instead there will be a terrace on that side—a buffer. When asked the same question, CDC, however, indicated that prospective tenants asked to locate in the area had expressed fears of crime around the project.
Impact of the CrossTown Industrial Park Tenants

Before locating in Lower Roxbury, DEC built an inner-city plant in the Federal Square area of Springfield, MA. One of the primary reasons DEC opened that plant and the one in Roxbury was to meet its Office of Employment Opportunity requirements for hiring minorities. Local officials in Springfield assert that the initial DEC plant created about 500 new jobs there and DEC's proposed expansion is expected to generate a similar amount. DEC's accounting confirms that the Springfield operation will bring 1,000 or more permanent jobs to that community. Another major company, the Milton Bradley Co., also located in the Federal Square area. Newspaper accounts in Springfield indicate that businesses in the Federal Square area are booming, while the overall trend for the city has not been as active. The President of the Federal Square Business Association felt that much of the business boom in that part of Springfield was due to the location of DEC and Milton Bradley there. As in Roxbury DEC received federal Urban Development Action Grant incentives to locate where it did. Roxbury plant manager, Leroy Saylor estimated that the DEC plant in Roxbury could stimulate business here the way it did in Springfield.

Aside from its growth potential as a computer company DEC has helped to establish training programs with public educational institutions and private agencies. DEC provides the curriculum materials and teaching aids developed at their Educational Services Organization headquartered in Bedford, MA. Its objective is to train for jobs that have advancement. By its own reporting, it is committed to affirmative action and equal employment opportunities. It has provided financial assistance to minority education programs and runs an in-house continuing education program, which offers individual courses, high school equivalency and university level courses leading to degrees.
Stride Rite Shoe Company, which owns a sizable portion of the land between Washington and Albany Streets in the CrossTown Industrial Park, has plans that will improve its site and alter its uses. Production has shut down at this plant and management will be moving from it to Stride Rite's Kendall Square, Cambridge, offices in July. The Roxbury site will be improved, and additional warehousing and freight docks will be relocated to it from Georgia and New Hampshire. Stride Rite runs a day-care center for its employees which will continue in operation at the Roxbury site. Although its site will be improved, the use will be less active than before. When asked whether the Newmarket area would grow, a spokesman for the Stride Rite real estate department, felt that it would but not overnight. His feeling was that in ten years, the area would develop.41

Although the Healthco plant has not yet been built comments by community leaders applauded its plan at a public hearing. For example, Cynthia Harris of the Orchard Park Tenant Council spoke in support of the project and Vermelle Parks, of the Lena Park Community Development Commission and a director of the Orchard Park Neighborhood House, approved the project but emphasized the need for training and employment for Orchard Park tenants.42 James Vincent, Director of the Blue Hill Avenue Commission endorsed the project but also expressed concern about the recruitment of Orchard Park residents, among other issues, and offered his agency's assistance in dealing with these problems.43 Reverend John Mulloy of St. Patrick's Church felt a high priority should be given to hiring community residents rather than suburban commuters and that firm borders be established between the industrial and residential areas, so that industry did not encroach on the existing residents in the Newmarket Area.44 There is community fear of displacement of current residents in the area. Marvin Gilmore of CDC stated that several people
had to be relocated as a result of the Healthco project, but that they were not in opposition to either the project or moving. Daniel Mastean, an occupant of the site who had to be relocated stated that he was agreeable to the move since his house and the surrounding area were so severely blighted. The meeting was closed with EDIC representatives promising to work with the community to insure jobs for its residents.

Control Data Corporation is investigating locating in the CrossTown Industrial Park, and has expressed interest in the Baltimore Brushes Building as well as the housing project site. If it does locate in the area, additional job opportunities will be produced. A short description of this company's programs follows.

1. In 1968 it located a plant in Northside Minneapolis, an economically poor, black area, which was subject to riots and racial disturbances. About 70% of the 360 plant employees lived in the neighborhood. In order to alleviate problems of absenteeism, the firm established a day-care center in a nearby church to serve the plant.

2. In 1970, the company located its own bindery in a renovated bowling alley in a minority area of St. Paul. The plant is operated on "flex-time", with all employees (about 240) working a 25-hour week to accommodate working mothers with school-aged children. About 90% of the bindery workers and all of the managers are from minority groups.

3. It established a training and work program for high school dropouts, called Fair Break, which uses the company's PLATO computer for remedial math, reading and language arts training. High school equivalency diplomas can be earned after working with PLATO over periods ranging from a few weeks to a few months. Fair Break participants spend half a day in the company's learning center and the other half working for $4 per hour in one of the company's subsidiaries. Work assignments advance from sub-assembly work to more complex assembly. Federal Comprehensive Employment and Training
Act (CBETA) funds are used in the educational branch of the Fair Break program. In 1978, Control Data formed City Venture Corporation, a private-for-profit company, which generates clients for its parent company's PLATO computer system and incubates small businesses which may in the future require the computer and financial services of Control Data. Sources of funding for City Venture's activities have come from the U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, local governments and the private sector. Projects launched by City Venture include:

1. Locating a business and technology center in the Warren-Sherman urban revitalization area in Toledo, Ohio. This neighborhood is one of the poorest in the city, 90% of whose residents are minorities and more than 30% of whose heads of households are unemployed. Plans for expanding local day-care services, establishing a Fair Break program (possibly geared to jobs ranging from nurses' aids to paramedics for nearby hospitals) and starting a PLATO computer program are being considered.

2. Establishing an $8 million dollar business and technology center in West Philadelphia. The West Parkside Project, the area designated for the center, is a low-income, minority area with a population of about 90% black and an unemployment figure of about 15%. The goal of the project is to create 2,500 new jobs by 1985, many of which will be supplied by Control Data.

3. Building a $5 to $10 million dollar business and technology center in Baltimore's Park Heights, a run-down area of the city where unemployment is about 40%. The Baltimore-based Commercial Credit Company, another subsidiary of Control Data, will establish a light manufacturing plant in this area too. Commercial Credit Company co-ventured Baltimore's Adult Learning Center with the Baltimore Mayor's Office of Manpower Resources in 1978 which uses Control Data's
PLATO educational system, and also purchased and renovated 10 rowhouses in Baltimore which were targeted for demolition. After they were restored, the houses were sold to community residents at an average price of $15,500 each, with a $500 downpayment and mortgages supplied by Commercial Credit at a 6% interest rate. Telephone interviews were conducted with the Mayor's Office of Manpower Employment in Baltimore and the CETA office in Minneapolis to determine the effectiveness of the Control Data Programs. The Baltimore Office expressed a great deal of praise for the program, but concern over future funding for it. The job training funding for the program comes from CETA, one of many programs likely to be decimated by President Reagan's budget cuts. The Baltimore office indicated that the program was very successful, well managed and appealing to program participants. A CETA fact sheet on their program is included as Appendix A. The Minneapolis program, although successful, was to be discontinued by the end of April, 1981 due to CETA funding cuts. Economically the city could not continue to support the program without federal or outside aid. Moreover, the state of Minnesota funds a competing job training program which will not be harmed by federal budget cuts. If its funding can be secured, Control Data offers the most hope for getting project tenants educated, trained and hired in the industrial park. Further, its subsidiary, Commercial Credit, might be a resource for the BHA to tap for low-interest rehab funds.

To conclude, Orchard Park is located in the heart of an economic development area and abuts the new CrossTown Industrial Park. Light industrial and warehouse uses have increased in this area as a result. The perception of the current tenants and public officials is that industrial and warehouse uses will probably expand, although not at a wildfire rate. In Springfield, MA, the industrial park development spurred
other business activity and created jobs. However, because the major companies received large public incentives to locate in the industrial park, it is difficult to predict whether development will spread without additional funding support. The companies which have received incentives to locate in Roxbury's industrial park have promised a certain number of jobs for Roxbury community residents. To date Orchard Park tenants have not received any job commitments. Job training facilities exist in the neighborhood, and Control Data, a company known for job training and hiring minorities, may locate in the industrial park. At public hearings community residents and Orchard Park representatives expressed support for the new developments, and a hope that they would generate jobs for community residents. With a growing industrial area near the housing project, and an acceptance of this development on the part of project tenants, opportunities for individual growth through employment and training exist and should be taken advantage of by the BHA for its project residents. Employment in the area would be a way of linking project tenants to the, perhaps, non-compatible development around them.
Impact of Neighborhood Development on Orchard Park

As discussed in previous sections there is industrial development to the north and neighborhood restoration efforts to the south of Orchard Park. Orchard Park is in a sort of nether world not directly addressed by either program. It is important to analyze the indirect opportunities or negative effects that may be generated by the neighboring programs in order to show where and to what extent the BHA should intervene to improve the project.

Literature, on the relationship between amenities, on the one hand, and neighborhood value and residential preferences, on the other, emphasizes that transportation accessibility, and proximity to jobs, commercial services and schools (if there are school-aged children in the family) are important priorities. Federal criteria for a good public housing site support traditional residential preference literature. The following are some of the attributes recommended by the government in siting public housing projects:

- proximity of the site to schools, recreational and social facilities, stores and commercial services
- availability of public transportation and scope of its service
- accessibility of employment, the character of available jobs, and the possibility of new opportunities
- adequacy of public utilities and community services, such as, fire and police protection, garbage and snow removal, the condition and maintenance of streets, and street lighting and landscaping
- existence of a park on the site

Evaluated from this perspective, accessibility to commercial services and a park on the site are the only standards which Orchard Park meets. It is very close to the
Dudley Station shopping area, which has deteriorated over the years. If the commercial revitalization slated for this area catches on, the housing project will be ideally sited for commercial services. Meeting the other criteria is less certain. For one thing, the project is now within two blocks of the M.B.T.A. elevated orange line at Dudley Station, but the M.B.T.A. has relocation plans that will move the Orange Line about one-half mile further to the west. Some sort of replacement service is anticipated but at this time the extent of that service is not certain.

Although the housing project is located near to employment generators, which is considered a positive neighborhood benefit, it is not clear that project residents will qualify or be trained for these jobs. As noted earlier, the project tenants are predominantly single women heading households with dependent children and with low educational attainment. A further complication is that the jobs for which these women may be qualified, such as, file clerk, cafeteria worker, etc., may not pay sufficient salaries to entice the women to give up their welfare payments in exchange for a job which may be perceived as a dead end. Additionally, many of the jobs for unskilled workers may be captured by the Portuguese, who have settled in the nearby Sav-Mor neighborhood, who have low level skills but are willing to work two and three jobs in order to support themselves and may also be industry candidates for training programs rather than the so-called "dependent poor" who reside in the project.56

The location of the Dearborn School, too, in the project is, at least on the surface, a positive feature. However, after court desegregation orders were issued for Boston, many project children were bussed to schools in South Boston and South Boston residents bussed to study at the Dearborn School. Hence, the traditional theory of a residential site being more desirable because of its proximity to a school does not hold in the case of Orchard Park, because
the majority of project children are bussed to other schools. Stegman and others classify nearby schools as negative amenities when not used by the abutters, since they create more noise and provide a vacant building which is a source for vandalism, loitering and crime after school hours. Moreover, the Dearborn School is on the city list to be relocated to the Roxbury High School site next September, pending Federal District Court approval of the proposal. It is unknown at this time how the vacated Dearborn School will be used in the future.

If the Mayor's housing rehab proposal, mentioned earlier, is approved the residential neighborhood around the project, which is now dotted with abandoned buildings, will be restored and most likely have a positive impact on the project. This is the only section of the project which is abutted by residential uses, so it is critical whether or not this proposal is implemented. The Mayor's plan also requests that the designated developer for the §8 rehab produce a feasibility study to show whether the rehabbed structures could eventually be converted to owner-occupied units. If certain project residents could increase their incomes to the level required for §8 supplements, this program may provide an opportunity for upward mobility from the project to a lesser subsidy, which may evolve into ownership in the future.

If the residential revitalization does not occur as planned, the Orchard Park Housing Project will be surrounded on three sides by light industrial, commercial or business uses. The fourth side will be a deteriorating, abandoned residential area, not contributing any benefit to the project.

Aside from residential amenities, what are the likely indirect effects to flow from the nearby industrial development? One view is that since the industries locating or expanding in Lower Roxbury are not heavy industrial, and thus do not emit noxious gases or noises, life at the project may
not be harmed. Vacant lots are to be cleared, landscaped and developed. The level of area amenities will increase due to landscaping, new buildings and the new crosstown arterial road, which will alleviate some of the street traffic around the project. Illegal dumping which is now occurring on the Healthco site will probably cease, once the building is completed. The dumping ought to cease because those doing it should perceive that the site is no longer empty and that legal repercussions would more likely ensue from an active tenant than from an absentee owner of a vacant lot, and because Healthco will probably police their property, once the building is completed.

Municipal services, such as refuse removal and street cleaning in the area are minimal at the present time. There are studies which indicate that sanitation workers perceive which neighborhoods house people of a lower socio-economic status from themselves and respond by giving these locales poorer service. Without asserting the applicability of this notion to the neighborhood around the housing project, personal observation shows that there are visible quantities of uncollected papers and debris. If the theory about sanitation worker's perceptions of neighborhood status is valid, as the area is developed garbage collection and street cleaning should improve. Since the city wishes to encourage industrial and commercial revitalization, it may become more vigilant in monitoring its maintenance workers to insure that basic services are performed.

If, in the process of economic development, vacant lots are cleared and developed in addition to abandoned buildings either being demolished or rehabbed, culs-de-sac for certain types of crimes will be eliminated. Historically, the abandoned buildings and the lightly trafficked streets here have furnished hideaways in which to store stolen goods and areas to retreat to in fleeing from crimes committed in the Dudley Station area. Once neighboring sites are improved, there
will be fewer hiding places for criminals and their stolen merchandise and thus, the intensity and numbers of attacks by vandals on the project may be reduced. It also seems reasonable to assume that the industries in the neighborhood would hire their own security guards for their buildings and grounds, which would increase the visibility of police in the area. Additionally, these industries may have sufficient clout to get more city police patrolling in the neighborhood. Equally compelling, if the general level of crime in the area is not reduced, is the argument that vandalism in the project may increase if it is the last unprotected oasis to commit crimes.

If the economic revitalization is achieved, the local tax base should expand which means increased tax dollars flowing to the city. If this occurs, there may be additional revenue for social, welfare or housing services for the poor, which would benefit Orchard Park tenants. Additionally, there may be political pressure exerted by the new industrial tenants which are restoring the neighborhood to steer some of these funds into goods and services to improve the Orchard Park project tenants.

On the negative side, if the industrial uses expand, there may be industrial or manufacturing development pressure for the project site in the future. Examples of housing projects in Boston which have been threatened by development pressure are Fidelis Way and Columbia Point. Fidelis Way, due to its location on the top of a high hill and its commanding view of the city has been sought by private developers for conversion into market-rate condominiums or cooperative apartments. Columbia Point faced a different kind of pressure. After the University of Massachusetts was built on the Point and the Kennedy Library opened, the BHA was given strong political pressure to improve the image and crime levels in the project. The result in both cases is that redevelopment plans have been proposed which would alter the projects' low income
housing statuses. If the Lower Roxbury neighborhood successfully achieves a face lift and new industries are drawn to the area, it is not unreasonable to believe that those industries may put considerable pressure on the BHA to improve the appearance of the project and to control the behavior of its tenants if the new industries perceive that they cause crime or other problems. This type of conflict has been documented in studies of gentrifying neighborhoods where the new residents move into older, poorer neighborhoods, primarily because of an economic advantage, and then try to edge out or limit the number of older, poorer, generally lower status residents. If the industries have any political clout, the city and the state, which want to stimulate industrial development for the public good, may be convinced to take the side of the newcomers against the BHA. The ultimate outcome may be that the low-income status of Orchard Park will be altered in the same way as Columbia Point.

Theories of land ecology and land economics suggest that when there is a need for more land on the part of a user, the one which commands the highest rent, which is the industrial/manufacturing use in this case, prevails. Even if the housing site is not threatened by development, but becomes surrounded by industrial or manufacturing uses, without a supporting residential component nearby, the area around the project could become a lifeless ghost town after working hours. Also, traffic congestion in the area might increase due to the new developments, despite the new arterial road meant to prevent it. This would produce secondary environmental hazards to project residents, such as increased noise and air pollution.

In summary, if the residential and economic revitalization in Lower Roxbury is successful, the positive impacts to spring from it are as follows: The neighborhood around Orchard Park should experience an increase in municipal services, in
public and private police patrolling, in the tax base, which would mean greater services to Orchard Park, in private transportation accessibility via the new crosstown arterial road, in employment opportunities, in the number of stores and in residential activity. Vacant lots should be cleared, developed and landscaped, and abandoned buildings rehabbed and put to active use. Illegal dumping as well as the overall crime rate should be lessened. Negative impacts include: crime at the project site may increase, the Dearborn School will probably relocate, public transportation will probably become less accessible, traffic and congestion may increase, there may be development pressure for the project site or pressure to get rid of the project, and the current zoning is light industrial, manufacturing, business and commercial surrounding the project. Thus, the neighborhood revitalization may produce both positive and negative effects. The BHA's strategy should be one of capitalizing on the good aspects of neighborhood development and softening the blow of the negative aspects.
Alternative Courses of Action for the BHA

Given this backdrop which can be read as having a negative or positive impact on Orchard Park's future, what course of action should the BHA pursue? A range of action can be defined depending on one's reading of the impact of the development activity on the project. Along a continuum there are a series of actions which range from retreating from the neighborhood by selling or leasing the project, to keeping the project, rehabbing it and also buying up additional parcels in the area to leverage favorable treatment toward the project residents by the expanding industrial tenants. In the center of the continuum are a couple of options which include modernizing the project site or buying vacant lots immediately abutting the site in order to create a protective barrier from the industrial uses.

Option 1

On one end of the continuum, the BHA could conclude that theories of highest and best use dictate, that the industrial expansion is likely to subsume or threaten the project and thus, sell or lease the site to the highest bidder and leave the immediate area. This position could be supported by arguments that the project is not a suitable site for public housing according to traditional housing preference literature and federal criteria for public housing sites. For example, the Dearborn School will be relocated, public transportation will become less accessible in the future, the project is not located in a residential neighborhood but rather abuts conflicting uses and also there is little employment opportunity for project residents with the new industrial/manufacturing tenants. The positive benefit to this retreat alternative is that the BHA could recoup a large profit from its housing project and use that money for capital improvements.
in other projects. If a lease rather than sale option were chosen, the BHA would gain an income stream from the site which, again, could be used to improve other sites. Although selection of this option would result in fewer public housing sites, the money could be used to repair and re-open the vacant and vandalized units at other sites. This would maintain the overall number of units available for current occupancy.

Another potential benefit to flow from this alternative is that the BHA could sign agreements with the buyer or lessee to the effect that they would be obligated to hire a percentage of project tenants for a minimum period of time. If demand for the site were strong enough, the BHA would not have to offer additional incentives to achieve this employment bonus. If industrial tenants were hesitant to buy or lease under this type of arrangement, the BHA could provide a percentage write-down on the lease or selling price for each block of tenants hired. The model for this type of program is called Project Destiny and was implemented in Winslow, Arizona, in 1979 by their Economic Development Department. Another alternative is to use the revenue gained on a lease agreement to subsidize companies at different sites to hire project residents. This strategy was recommended by Pressman and Wildavsky as an employment generating alternative to capital-intensive economic development.

In either case, precautions would have to be taken to insure that the types of jobs obtained from the industries would supply training or act as a stepping stone to future opportunities. An example of this kind of job would be a file clerk job in an accounting office with the proviso that the person be taught procedures of bookkeeping and other aspects of organizing accounts. This endeavor could be bulwarked with classroom training at OIC, whose role it is to train minorities for jobs in the local industries.
Implicit in this scheme, is that project residents would not be too far from the site when they are relocated so that it will be feasible for them to work there. Other inherent assumptions here are that the project cannot be sold until 1990 when its bond is repaid and it is no longer receiving operating contributions from the federal government, unless a replacement housing plan acceptable to HUD is provided\textsuperscript{64}; that there are a sufficient number of units in other BHA projects to absorb all the displaced Orchard Park tenants; and that a zoning change for industrial use can be obtained.

The major reason why the BHA might not adopt this alternative is the cost and difficulty of relocating Orchard Park tenants. Relocation would exact a financial and administrative burden on the BHA and an emotional strain on the tenants. Any move, even when it is the individual's choice, requires an adjustment period during which shopping areas, transit connections, schools and health facilities are discovered. The kind of psychological dislocations in relocating a group of tenants are too well documented by Herbert Gans, Walter Firey and others for the BHA to ignore the implications.\textsuperscript{65}

Option 2

A less extreme position on the spectrum of alternative actions for the BHA is to lease or sell part of the project site, such as, the part facing Harrison Avenue which is most surrounded by industrial uses. This option implies that at least part of the site can be made more suitable for residential use. This section of the project is farther from Harrison Avenue, it is larger and contains a park and swimming pool. Since the vacancy rate in the project is high (approximately 30%), the buildings in this section could be modernized and tenants relocated into them. Again, the
BHA cannot sell or dispose of part of this site until 1990 without an acceptable replacement housing plan. Like the first alternative, the sale or lease agreement could contain a stipulation to the effect that project residents be hired by the buyer/lessee or that subsidies could be used by the BHA to encourage that action. While it is similar, the advantage of this option over the first is that it ameliorates the financial, administrative and psychological burdens of relocation while, like the first option, it achieves jobs for project tenants and recoups capital from the project which can be used in modernizing the remaining units. Like the first, this scheme also assumes that current and future project demand is constant and can thus be met by using only the section near to the residential neighborhood.

Option 3

A variation of this second option addresses the problem of current and future project demand. In the first two alternatives, it was assumed that the Orchard Park project tenants could be relocated and absorbed one, in other BHA projects or two, in one section of the project. Since it is not clear what will happen with our national and state economies, it is not easy to forecast whether need for public housing in the future will be constant or greater than what it is today. Thus, in this third alternative the BHA could purchase some of the vacant lots or abandoned buildings in the residential neighborhood behind Orchard Park. In addition to selling or leasing the portion of the project on Harrison Avenue for industrial purposes, the BHA would relocate the current tenants to the section of the project abutting the residential neighborhood and into this neighborhood. This would insure that there would be an adequate supply of units if a lower density per unit were desired for current residents or if future demand for public housing in this area
grew. It also contains the same assumptions and advantages as options 1 and 2, except that it does not ignore larger per unit space or growth in future public housing demand. If future demand for public housing does not grow, the BHA could sell off the extra properties for market-rate residential use.

The assumption that there will be future market-rate residential demand grows out of land use theories, such as, the Lowry model. The theory behind this model indicates that as basic industries locate in a region, they will create demand for employees who will need housing and commercial services. When commercial services come into an area to serve the businesses and newly settled employees, they will need employees, who will also be seeking places to live, thus a multiplier effect emerges.\textsuperscript{66} Hence, if new industries are locating in Lower Roxbury, it stands to reason that there will arise a population of employees seeking local housing. This theory would not hold, however, if the new employees for the primary industries and the supplementary services were already located within an easy commute so did not feel compelled to move. Even if residential demand did not surface, land use literature indicates that new industries generate a need for and location of complementary industries to supply them with raw materials. Assuming a zoning change would be granted, the BHA could sell off any unnecessary residential units for industrial use.

Option 4

Toward the opposite extreme of the spectrum, the BHA could decide to keep the project, modernize it and work on ameliorating the socio-economic problems of tenants. This position would be supported by the belief that the area around Orchard Park will improve, even if the neighboring uses are non-residential. Evidence pointing to acceptance of this idea is the trend toward mixed use and planned unit
development. Also, there is literature which supports the location of industrial parks near residential areas. The major advantage of this alternative is that the BHA owns the site, it would not be losing units, and it would not have to relocate any of its tenants.

Option 5

The most aggressive stance on the continuum of alternative interventions for the BHA is to keep the entire project and also buy additional residential properties or vacant lots in the area. The purpose of assembling and banking the properties is:

1) to satisfy future public housing demand,
2) to develop it and gradually relocate Orchard Park residents to it,
3) to landscape it and use it as a buffer from the abutting non-residential uses,
4) to lease or sell it to future industries locating in the area,
5) to keep the value of land down in the neighborhood and affordable to low and moderate-income residents, or
6) to achieve all of the objectives listed above.

Like some of the other options, this one assumes that there is not an overwhelming conflict between the housing project and the abutting industrial uses. It also assumes that if the BHA sold or leased some of the assembled properties to businesses, it could obtain hiring commitments for project tenants as in the previous options.

There are some problems with land banking to leverage favorable treatment for project residents by new industries or for future public housing demand. If the banked land is not developed within a year or two, it will perpetuate the blighted, empty lot syndrome with its negative impact
which currently exists. Secondly, maintaining this area as vacant lots may sabotage the efforts of the public sector actors who are trying to develop the area's economy by enticing private sector industries and market-rate residents into it. Third, the BHA's action may steer complementary industries to locate elsewhere and employees to find housing in other parts of the city to avoid dealing with the BHA. Hence, in an attempt to hold a key piece of the puzzle, the BHA may devalue its own holdings. A fourth problem is that the city may object to additional land going into the BHA in-lieu-of-tax status when market-rate demand could be rising. Finally, there is the problem of financing. The BHA would have to buy an enormous amount of land to make a significant impact on neighboring uses and market values. For example, if the BHA can only buy a small number of properties, industries which do not want to hire project residents will simply buy other available lots. Considering the BHA's current financial state and that of the municipal bond market, it may not be feasible to raise enough money to significantly influence land use or market value in the area.

To develop it for the current Orchard Park tenants would entail a shorter time horizon and a smaller acquisition, which would be more feasible than large scale land banking. This is also true if the BHA were to buy parcels immediately abutting the project to create an open space buffer from the industrial tenants.

Summary

In summary, the series of options open to the BHA include:

1) selling or leasing the project and leaving the area,
2) selling or leasing part of the project and relocating
tenants to the other part,
3) selling or leasing part of the project and relocating tenants to the other part and the abutting residential neighborhood,
4) keeping the entire project intact and rehabbing it, and
5) keeping the entire project but also buying up additional properties in the area.
Feasibility for the BHA of the Proposed Intervention Alternatives at Orchard Park

In order to provide a clearer understanding of which alternative intervention would be preferable to the BHA, this section adds hypothetical cost estimates to each option. Once general feasibility has been analyzed by the BHA, a complete financial feasibility study of one alternative should be performed. This would include actual income and operating figures; precise rehab costs and leasing revenues; the actual number of people to be relocated multiplied by the current relocation costs; and a determination of desirable per family or per unit densities at the site.

Option 1

The first option suggests a retreat from the project and the Newmarket area. An examination of current industrial sales in the area, gives a suggestion of what the BHA could gain if it sold the Orchard Park Site.71

1. 17+ Shetland Street was sold by Brattle Corporation to Avis Leasing Corporation in June of 1980 for $535,000. It contains 94,860 square feet, and hence sold for about $5.64/square foot. It is zoned I-2, general manufacturing.

2. 33 Norfolk Avenue was sold by E. & P. Enterprise Inc. to Richard A. Kaplow Trust in November 1980 for $225,000. It contains 15,192 square feet, has buildings assessed at twice the value of the land, is zoned I-2, and sold for about $14.81/square foot.

3. 65 Gerard Street was sold December 12, 1980 by Bay State Truck (Flexi-Van Leasing) to the Brian A. Maloney Trust for $490,000. It contains 34,254 square feet, with no buildings; it is zoned I-2; and it sold for about $14.31 per square foot.

These sales show the variability in sales price in the
Newmarket area. An interview with Hunneman and Company, Inc., real estate appraisers, revealed that prices are affected by many variables. For industrial properties in this area, if the property contains a building built in the last twenty years, it can be sold for $15.00/square foot. Older warehouses and light manufacturing properties sell for $5.00 or less/square foot. Rents, too, vary significantly and are affected by the size of building, its location and whether or not it has refrigeration. This is an important factor since there are many meat and fish storage companies located in Newmarket. Rents range from $1.00, $1.50 to $2.00/square foot. If the building has refrigeration it can rent for $5.00-$6.00/square foot.

Office space sells and rents for higher prices. If a property has nice buildings on it and a good location it could sell for about $25.00 to $30.00/square foot, and draw rents between $8.00 to $10.00/square foot. Retail properties generally base rents on a percentage of income generated by the business, not a flat square footage rate. An example of a recently negotiated rent agreement is the Healthco site, which will provide $1.5 million to CDC in annual building rent (about $9.00/square foot) and $1 million to EDIC in ground rent (about $6.00/square foot). Total rent is $15.00 per square foot for this single story warehousing and laboratory facility which abuts Orchard Park on Harrison Avenue. Appendix B lists other recent sales in the area.

For purposes of estimating a sales price for Orchard Park an average value of $14.50/square foot is used, based on recent sales near the project. For rental purposes, a $9.00/square foot average has been used. Orchard Park contains 703,654 square feet according to BRA maps. At $14.50/square foot Orchard Park could be sold for $10,202,983 or produce an annual rent of $6,332,886. This assumes, of course, that a zoning change from H-1 (apartments) to I-2 could be obtained. Additionally, it assumes that a purchaser
would be able to use the existing buildings. If the buyer were unable to use the housing structures with moderate rehab, large demolition costs would be necessary, which would naturally drive down the price of the property.

The gross sales or rental price would be reduced by usual transaction costs, the remainder of the bond owed to the federal government and tenant relocation costs. Relocation costs are the most substantial, estimated by BHA officials at approximately $250,000 plus $1,000 per occupied unit, if all the tenants are moved. As of February, 1981, there were 220 vacancies out of 737 units, leaving 517 occupied. Total relocation expenses would come to $250,000 plus $517,000 or $767,000, or a unit cost of about $1,483.56. This sum covers costs for switching telephone service, rental of moving vans, hardship costs and a relocation consultant (used for massive moves). Netting out relocation costs and bond repayment costs from the gross estimated sales figure, would leave the BHA with:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gross Sales Price} & \quad \$10,202,983 \\
- \text{relocation cost} & \quad (767,000) \\
- \text{bond repayment} & \quad (100,000) \\
\text{Net gain to the BHA} & \quad \$ 9,335,983
\end{align*}
\]

If a lease option were chosen the computation would be:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gross Lease Price} & \quad \$ 6,332,886 \\
- \text{relocation costs} & \quad (767,000) \\
- \text{bond repayment} & \quad (100,000) \\
\text{Net gain to the BHA in the first year} & \quad \$ 5,465,886
\end{align*}
\]

If the BHA chose a lease option, the second and each subsequent year would bring them the gross lease price. Bond repayment and tenant relocation are one-time charges which will only occur the first year. The BHA would have to evaluate its own financial status to determine whether $9 million received today would be worth more than $5.5 million received annually over the life of the lease. In either case the net gain could be invested in high yield securities to generate additional revenue if it were not needed to cover
rehab or operating costs in other projects. If the Orchard Park tenants were moved to some of the BHA sites which are currently being redeveloped, the relocation costs itemized above might be less and the BHA gain higher. On the other hand, if rent or sales write-downs were given to the buying or leasing industry in order to secure jobs for project tenants, the net gain to the BHA would be less. This could be offset if funding is available to create jobs for tenants via HUD's Job Opportunities Program.76

Aside from the financial aspect, are there a sufficient number of vacant units in other sites to place Orchard Park tenants? As of March 1981, BHA records show that of the 16,595 total BHA family units, 12,749 were occupied. Of the 3,846 vacant units, about 1,000 were "mothballed", leaving 2,846 for habitation. Thus, there is an ample supply of units to relocate the 517 families from Orchard Park.

Option 2

This option recommends consolidating project tenants to one part of the site, rehabbing this part and leasing or selling the other half for additional revenue to the BHA and for favorable job treatment to project residents. The section of the project along Harrison Avenue contains approximately 350 units, while the section to the northeast contains about 424. This sum is an approximation and does not net out units lost in expansion or dedicated to agency use. As of February 1981, a total of 517 units were occupied. If the parcel on Harrison Avenue were leased or sold and those tenants relocated to the other part, 93 families would be left homeless.

Since the Dearborn School is to be relocated in September, this building could become available for rehabbing for housing. BRA maps show that the school and annex cover 63,962 square feet. The current density in the project,
assuming the density is uniform in both sections, requires about 909 square feet per unit including open space. This is computed by dividing total square feet at Orchard Park (703,654) by the number of units (774). Dividing the amount of per unit space needed into the square footage on the school site yields enough space for about 70 additional units. Due to the coverage of the building on the site, this may be an exaggerated number of units to be housed in the school. However, assuming the same square footage found in the rest of the project, perhaps an addition could be added to the school to yield 70 units. This would bring the total number of units on this part of the site to 494, which implies that 23 families would have to be relocated to other BHA projects. Additional families would have to be relocated if the BHA wanted to reduce the existing densities on the site.

This option assumes that the remaining 316,644.3 square feet on the project site could be sold or leased for industrial or office use. From the gross sales or rental price, bond repayment apportioned to about 45% of the project must be repaid. This was computed by determining the proportion of units in this section compared to total units on the site, of 350/774 (45%). Also relocation costs for 338 families must be paid to the 23 families who would be relocated to other BHA sites and to the 315 families who would have to be moved within the project. Although the overall vacancy rate in the project is 30%, a greater proportion of those vacancies are in the section farther from Harrison Avenue to which tenants would be moved. For purposes of relocation expenses a 10% vacancy rate is assumed for the section of the project on Harrison Avenue. Finally, rehab costs must be deducted from the sale or lease price. Per unit rehab costs are based on the recently proposed Maverick Housing Project rehabilitation in East Boston, which were estimated to be $43,500 in 1980. A $50,000/unit cost is used in this computation to reflect annual inflation in construction costs.
Since the rehab costs for 494 units would not be paid in one year, only the approximate annual financing charges are deducted. An 11% annual interest rate is being assumed on the rehab cost and a constant amortization payment over a 30-year period. Eleven percent is the rate that the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency hopes to secure on its mortgage revenue bond issue, which will be floated in about a month, so is a reasonable rate to assume if the BHA were to float a bond to fund the rehab. An 11% annual interest rate, for 30 years, assuming quarterly payments, generates an 11.45% constant annual finance payment, which includes repayment of both interest and principal. Financial computation using these assumptions is listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Sales Price</th>
<th>$4,591,342.40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- relocation costs</td>
<td>(501,443.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- bond repayment</td>
<td>(45,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- annual debt service at 11.45%</td>
<td>(2,828,150.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain to the BHA in the first year</td>
<td>$1,216,749.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second year the BHA would not have to pay the bond repayment or relocation costs, but it would have to pay its annual debt service which could not be met by the remaining net gain even if it were compounded at 11%, nor from the rents generated by the project. Some of this shortfall could be contributed by the federal government if budget cuts in public housing do not occur. Moreover, annual debt service would probably be lower if the BHA could secure its rehab funding from HUD rather than by floating a bond.

If part of the project site were leased rather than sold, there would be a shortfall in the first year which would subsequently become an annual gain of $21,648.70 starting in the second year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Lease Price</th>
<th>$2,849,798.70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- annual debt service at 11.45%</td>
<td>(2,828,150.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain in second year</td>
<td>$21,648.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If this gain were used to offset the loss in the first year, it would take about 24 years to cover it. If interest charges
were added to the loss in Year 1, it would take longer to repay it, using only the gain from the lease as the means of repayment. Again, if federal programs are not slashed, rehab funds could be borrowed at a lower interest rate which reduce total costs. Also, reducing the number of units re-habbed or the extent to which they are rehabbed, would lower initial costs. Alternatively, initial development costs could be lowered by enlisting the redevelopment services and financing of the Government Land Bank. Its program is described more fully later in Option 5.

Mixed income housing is another means of reducing costs to the BHA and at the same time making the project less economically and socially isolated. If part of the site is leased for industrial uses, and moderate and market rate units are interspersed in the other section of the project, relocation of existing tenants would increase and thus, relocation costs, but rents in the future would be higher. Mixed income housing would not reduce up-front costs, but would increase long-range operating revenue.

The feasibility of mixed income housing at Orchard Park is questionable. Unlike Columbia Point, Orchard Park does not have an ocean view and unlike other projects, it does not have a strong neighborhood. Market-rate residential demand in this neighborhood has been dwindling since the 1950's and 1960's. Since city-wide population has also been declining, it is hard to imagine who would want to live in a redeveloped Orchard Park for low- and moderate-income families. If the economy worsens, there may be more demand for public housing in the future, but if interest rates fall as a result of Reagan's economic policies, the inner city housing market may soften. People who could previously only afford to rent or buy bargain properties may buy in the better neighborhoods.

Finally, the BHA could lease the site to a private, non-profit developer, who could syndicate tax benefits to
raise development revenue. The BHA could maintain control over the site by owning the land, and either lease or buy back the project after redevelopment for its low-income tenants. Whereas this would reduce initial costs, the BHA would still have to secure permanent financing if the site is bought back or have sufficient operating revenue to pay the rent for its tenants.

Option 3

This option is identical to option 2 except that it expands BHA ownership into the abutting neighborhood. Orchard Park is surrounded by large quantities of vacant land and abandoned buildings. Appendix C lists vacant lots around Orchard Park. Appendix D provides the most recent list of boarded buildings which the city has declared abandoned. Appendix E lists tax defaulted and tax delinquent properties in the neighborhood. The demonstration program described in the section on neighborhood housing programs, itemizes 172 masonry buildings containing three or more units in good condition for rehabilitation. Since the Mayor's program depends upon receiving federal low-interest mortgage money under the 312 rehab program, it is unlikely to be implemented. The 312 loan program is slated for large budget cuts under the Reagan Administration. If the program is not approved, these structures will provide an available stock of structures for the BHA to acquire if it wishes to expand into the neighborhood.

In computing the likely costs and benefits of this option, the same assumptions and figures are used as in option 2, except that there is an added cost due to acquiring additional structures or land. The city's demonstration grant application indicated that the 19 city-owned properties could be obtained for a maximum price of $2,000 each or $38,000, and that the privately-owned structures had about
$88,852 due to the city in back taxes. If the back taxes were paid and no other costs were charged for the privately-owned structures, the total costs for 76 additional units would be $126,852. The cost of the BRA In-fill buildings and three schools was not included in the city's demonstration grant application. Also, what is not clear is how the cost of the city-owned properties compares to the cost for the Dearborn School and if the Dearborn School could house the same number of units.

If the BHA attempted to integrate project residents into the nearby residential neighborhood, these units could be rehabbed instead of the 70 estimated units in the Dearborn School and the costs would remain approximately the same as in the previous option. Additionally, the BHA might be able to acquire the Dearborn School to add to the total parcel it could lease or sell for industrial or manufacturing purposes. If this were possible, its costs would increase by the costs of the school, but its revenues from leasing or selling would also grow. To achieve an increase in value, some sort of redevelopment of the school would be necessary.

Sources of financing mentioned in Option 2 should be explored if this option is chosen. Even if the Mayor's application is accepted and the program implemented, the BHA might graduate some of its tenants out of the project and into these §8 rental supplement apartments. Since the §8 program eligibility floor is above the maximum income allowable for public housing projects, it would be necessary for the BHA to supplement tenants incomes or it implies that tenants incomes will rise if they are provided employment opportunities in the section of the project designated for industrial or manufacturing use.

Option 4

This option recommends keeping all of Orchard Park and
rehabbing it. Cost figures are listed below showing different numbers of units being rehabbed, total rehab cost and debt servicing. Per unit cost for rehab is assumed to be $50,000. If the units are demolished and new structures are built, costs will run about $50,000 per unit for construction and about $9.55 per square foot for demolition. Demolition cost is based on what EDIC paid to clear the site abutting Orchard Park. That site contains about 166,000 square feet and total demolition and clearance came to $1,585,000, or a square foot cost of $9.55.80 Debt service is assumed to be 11% for 30 years with quarterly payments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Gross Cost</th>
<th>Annual Debt Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>774 units rehabbed</td>
<td>$38.7 mill.</td>
<td>$4,431,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517 units rehabbed</td>
<td>$25.9 mill.</td>
<td>$2,959,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774 units new construction demolition cost</td>
<td>$45.4 mill.</td>
<td>$5,198,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517 units new construction demolition cost</td>
<td>$30.4 mill.</td>
<td>$3,480,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal public housing funds would be the principal source of financing, if a bond were not issued by the BHA. Also, a private non-profit developer could be used as was discussed in previous options. If only 517 units are rehabbed, assuming existing densities, the remaining space could be leased or sold. The remaining space is 232,205.82 square feet81 which would yield a one-time $3,366,984.40 or an annual rent of $2,089,852.40, if previous assumptions are followed. If the whole site is rehabbed or built anew, the BHA cannot use its land to leverage jobs or increase its income. While the site were being rehabbed, project tenants would have to be relocated thus relocation costs similar to the previous options would have to be added to BHA costs.
Option 5

This option calls for expanding the BHA holdings by assembling and land banking in the area around Orchard Park. The most plausible reasons for doing this are to create an open space buffer between the project and the non-residential uses nearby, for redevelopment for current Orchard Park residents, or for redevelopment as mixed moderate- and market-rate housing. Studies on land banking efforts in the United States in the last ten years show that large scale land banking for the purpose of preventing land speculation or to control land uses is prohibitively expensive. European land banking, particularly in Holland and Sweden, has been more successful but these countries have a tradition and ideological acceptance of large scale public ownership of land. In addition to acceptance of the concept, there is public financial support to achieve it. In the United States, land banking has been used most successfully for specific development projects which are to be accomplished within three to five years. To keep land in an unproductive state for longer periods increases costs such as liability insurance, maintenance and taxes, with no counterbalancing income.

The cost figures to achieve redevelopment of the project and abutting areas have been detailed in the previous options. The additional costs in this option would be for the land banking effort. If the BHA wanted to create an open space buffer around the project funds could be secured from:

1. The Trust for Public Land provides money for acquiring and clearing vacant land and the legal assistance necessary for establishing neighborhood ownership.

2. The Land and Water Conservation Fund supplies federal funds up to 50% of the acquisition and development cost of land for recreational purposes.

3. Similarly, state Urban Self Help funds are available for 50% of the acquisition and development cost for land for
open space or passive recreational purposes.

4. The Boston Natural Areas Fund does fund raising for acquiring open lands.

If the BHA wanted to land bank vacant lots or abandoned buildings in the neighborhood for housing redevelopment, it could call on the aid of the Massachusetts Government Land Bank (GLB). Among other eligible properties, those which are determined to be "decadent, substandard or blighted" by a municipality qualify for GLB programs. The GLB could acquire, clear and redevelop the properties and then sell them back to the BHA at the redevelopment cost to the GLB. Upon this sale the GLB would supply a short-term mortgage at 9% to 9 1/2% for periods from three to fifteen years. The GLB mortgage does not preclude permanent financing, but does eliminate up-front development costs. However, this would be a sufficient help to make the lease scheme under Option 2 and 3 viable. Aside from BHA, city and mortgage revenue bond funds, grants under the Community and Development Act of 1974 may be and are being used for land banking.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Although it is not yet certain whether the Newmarket Economic Development Area is going to expand and thrive in the future, it is clear that project residents have high levels of unemployment, they have not received any job commitments from the industrial development, the BHA has small resources to improve Orchard Park, and the site is old and in need of rehabilitation. The intervention option which most closely addresses these issues is the third in which part of the site is leased to an industrial tenant willing to train and hire project residents, the rest of the site is rehabbed for existing tenants and some are relocated into the abutting residential neighborhood. Necessary initial redevelopment could be performed by the GLB and the BHA could secure permanent financing by floating mortgage revenue bonds, if lower-rate federal public housing financing were not available.

The lease should be negotiated so that it covers debt servicing plus an additional amount to cover future BHA operating costs. If this would make the lease too exhorbitant at this date, escalator or renegotiation clauses should be included to anticipate future inflation. The lease would be preferable to the BHA since that would provide annual revenue to cover its rehab debt servicing. A sale would provide a one-time boon not as attractive as a lease, and implies that the BHA would lose control of the land in the future. Motivations for an industry to lease rather than buy include a smaller up-front cost than if the site were purchased, and greater tax write-offs, since the lease is a tax deductible operating expense.

If the BHA decides to keep all or a part of the project in the Newmarket area, it should secure legally binding or public, politically binding agreements with the city stating that the city-owned park not be sold and that the BHA be
granted right of approval over the future use of the Dearborn School. Additionally, a legal or open political agreement preventing encroachment by industrial development agencies on the project site should be secured. Also, the BHA should work with other agencies to legally and physically secure an open space buffer around the project site.

Aside from written documents preventing loss of BHA control over the site, the best defense is a good offense. The BHA should draft several workable redevelopment plans and then secure approval by the Orchard Park tenants and the community of one. Otherwise, "mothballed" units or inactivity on the part of the BHA may be interpreted by city officials as a lack of interest in the site. This may prompt city plans for heightened industrial development on or around the Orchard Park site.

In addition to developing a plan to physically rehabilitate the project, more aggressive tactics should be taken to obtain jobs for project residents. Some efforts have been taken by the BHA to give construction jobs to project tenants. This attempt is laudable, but permanent, career advancement jobs and training are really necessary. In a period of dwindling city, state and federal resources, it is important for the BHA to graduate as many of its tenants as possible to moderately subsidized and market rate units. If project residents' incomes are not increasing, this will be impossible. Also, if public housing is used as a launching pad, more units will be turned over for other needy families.

In order to advance tenants out of public housing, education, job training, counselling, job placement and day care services will be necessary. If Control Data locates in the CrossTown Industrial Park, the BHA should push to have project tenants included in its program, since it includes not only job training but also jobs in a Control Data subsidiary. This assumes, of course, that Control Data can obtain an alternative source of funding if its
CETA money is cut. A way of insuring that Control Data locates in Newmarket is to negotiate with it to lease part of the project site and also secure job commitments for project tenants. If Control Data does not locate in Newmarket, the necessary pieces of its program exist in the Roxbury community; it is just a matter of the BHA tapping into the network of social service programs, providing financial incentives to project residents in order to wean them from welfare, and possibly offering incentives to companies to hire project tenants. It might also be useful to secure agreements with the city, if their neighborhood rehab program is successful, to the effect that project residents can graduate into these nearby houses. Thus, self-improvement would not imply radical physical relocations, if a tenant felt the area to be "home".

It is difficult to predict what program cuts and compensating benefits are to emerge during the Reagan Administration. Even though this study emphasizes budget cuts for social services and housing, business may be spurred by investment tax credits, employment may increase and the interest rate may fall during Reagan's Presidency. If this happens business may expand in the CrossTown Industrial Park, which will provide opportunities if Orchard Park tenants can obtain jobs there. Since there is so much uncertainty regarding the impact of Reagan's economic programs, the BHA could adopt a "wait and see" attitude toward Orchard Park. Major rehab efforts could be postponed two or three years until developments in the neighborhood become more certain.

This study is a preliminary one which aims at defining the problems at Orchard Park and providing general approaches to solutions. It should be followed by a detailed financial feasibility study of one option which seems most viable; a survey of Orchard Park tenants' and neighborhood residents' preferences for redevelopment at Orchard Park; a study on the incentive necessary for industries to hire project tenants
and on the salary range, whether subsidized or not, that would cause Orchard Park tenants to give up welfare and accept a job; and if legal changes are necessary, research and strategies designed to accomplish that.
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Appendix A

CETA
Fact Sheet
Adult Learning Center

Who is served:
Unemployed and economically disadvantaged adults, and low-income youth between the ages of 16 and 19 who dropped out of school and read below an 8th grade level.

What services are provided:
The Learning Center is a unique facility in that it uses computer learning to help both adults and youth become more competitive in the local job market. The computer learning curriculum is provided locally by the Commercial Credit Company, a subsidiary of the Control Data Corporation. Known as PLATO, the program is highly individualized so that users can proceed at their own pace with their own personal learning program.

How it works:
The Learning Center has 3 separate components. The first is a secretarial science training program conducted by the Hamilton Business School, where adults can acquire marketable secretarial skills while at the same time pursuing a high school equivalency (GED) with the help of PLATO. The second component offers CETA participants, from a variety of programs, an opportunity to brush-up on their reading, math, and language skills and work towards their GED while they continue to participate in their respective employment or training program. The third component utilizes the PLATO learning program to help former dropouts enrolled in the Youth Incentive Entitlement Program in completing their high school education (in combination with a 15-hour per week, paid work experience). Counseling services are available to all the various users of the Learning Center.

Contact for more information:
Any Manpower Service Center or Career Wagon. Call 396-3009 for the nearest location.

The Baltimore Metropolitan Manpower Consortium
Appendix B Recent Sales in the Orchard Park Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Sales Price</th>
<th>Date of Sale</th>
<th>Buyer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>337 Bluehill Ave.</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>2-20-81</td>
<td>Philip E. Sheridan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Langdon St.</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>2-11-81</td>
<td>Manuel A. Pina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Moreland St.</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>1-23-81</td>
<td>Robt. J. Handy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Moreland St.</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>1-06-81</td>
<td>Johnnie Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-26 Moreland St.</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>1-06-81</td>
<td>Henry Graves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>1-16-81</td>
<td>Donald R. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 Warren St.</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>2-09-81</td>
<td>Eric T. Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Gerard St.</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>12-11-80</td>
<td>Brian A. Maloney TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mt. Pleasant Ter.</td>
<td>$15,900</td>
<td>12-31-80</td>
<td>Allieu B. Massaquoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318 Bluehill Ave.</td>
<td>$30,136</td>
<td>11-24-80</td>
<td>Earl Fitzhugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334 Dudley</td>
<td>$64,117</td>
<td>12-04-80</td>
<td>Bost. Miss. Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-21 Dudley</td>
<td>$36,500</td>
<td>11-06-80</td>
<td>Edgar L. Milford, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Dunmore St.</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>12-05-80</td>
<td>Miguel Brandao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Norfolk Ave.</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>11-06-80</td>
<td>Richard A. Kaplow TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 Bluehill Ave.</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>10-17-80</td>
<td>Jesse O. Dixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 Dudley St.</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>10-16-80</td>
<td>Eleanor A. Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 Dudley St.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>10-22-80</td>
<td>Robert Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren St.</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>10-21-80</td>
<td>E.C. Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2679 Wash. St.</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>10-29-80</td>
<td>Ruby Joyce Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Dudley St.</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>9-04-80</td>
<td>Christine Casserly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>10-06-80</td>
<td>Richard White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Dudley</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>8-07-80</td>
<td>Norma J. Harrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren St.</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>9-11-80</td>
<td>Circle Venture Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28+ Warren St.</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>7/80</td>
<td>Rosella Waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Dudley St.</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>7/80</td>
<td>Frances Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Dudley St.</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>6/80</td>
<td>Frances Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17+ Shetland Estrella St.</td>
<td>$535,000</td>
<td>6/80</td>
<td>Avis Leasing Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471+ Dudley</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>5/80</td>
<td>Leonard Grossman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475+ Dudley</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>5/80</td>
<td>Joaquin Serret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124 Shirley St.</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>5/80</td>
<td>Joaquin Serret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sunset St.</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>5/80</td>
<td>Felix Ayiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18+ Sunset St.</td>
<td>$113,500</td>
<td>5/80</td>
<td>Claire L. Miceli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18+ Sunset St.</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>5/80</td>
<td>I.D. Raacke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Worthington St.</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>6/80</td>
<td>George W. Koch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 George St.</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
<td>4/80</td>
<td>Thos. P. Pasquine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104 George St.</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>4/80</td>
<td>Manuel D.L.C. Dardoso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>4/80</td>
<td>Manuel D. Livramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>5/80</td>
<td>Ann Hackel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ Dudley St.</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
<td>4/80</td>
<td>John P. Corraghan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Williams St.</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>4/80</td>
<td>Alex Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190 Dudley</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td>Perlyia Pasche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Dunreath St.</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td>Burgos Realty TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206+ Eustis St.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td>Edwin Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24+ Langdon St.</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>3/80</td>
<td>Nimbo TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Ave.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td>Olivio Deandrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Kemble Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Sales Price</td>
<td>Date of Sale</td>
<td>Buyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren St.</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>3/80</td>
<td>Warren Liquor Mart Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Centre St.</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td>Laurence A. Loffredo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 George St.</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>1/80</td>
<td>William R. Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Jarvis Place</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>1/80</td>
<td>Eleanor Gillis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Magazine St.</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>2/80</td>
<td>Domingos Mendes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372+ Warren St.</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>1/80</td>
<td>Arthur H. Walker, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Williams St.</td>
<td>$16,400</td>
<td>1/80</td>
<td>Billie D. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot B Worthington St.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>1/80</td>
<td>Dilip K. Patel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Suffolk County Real Estate Transfer Directory, February 28, 1981. This volume covers 1/80 to 2/81.
Appendix C Vacant Lots around Orchard Park

Adams Street - numbers 41-43, 52, 54, 56, 58, 62, 64, 66

Albany Street - number 880

Allerton Street - numbers 25, 27, 31, 39

Blue Hill Ave. - numbers 7, 13, 35, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47 (vacant buildings)
number 31 shows a vacant lot

Chadwick - numbers 38 to Crosstown Road, 40-42, 50

Chesterton - numbers 1, 3, 12

Crosby Place - numbers 3, 4

Dearborn Street - numbers 53, 54, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63


Dunmore - number 8 is a vacant lot; number 16 shows a vacant building


Farnham - numbers 9, 11-13

Forest - numbers 9, 10, 15, 33-35, 64, 68, 72

George - numbers 46-64, 71, 73, 74 to Magazine St., 100, 145 number 75 shows a vacant building

Gerard - numbers 98-100 are vacant in front, building in rear, 128, 148

Greenville - numbers 20, 28-40

Hampden - numbers 55-57, 68, 90, 92-98, 100-102, 104-106, 108, 112-114, 118, 152, 170-172, 182, 188-190, 195, 196, 197, 198, 200B, 202 number 120-124 Hampden shows a vacant building (corner of Hampden and Norfolk)
Appendix C (cont.)

Harrison Ave. - numbers 1107, 1109, 1111, 1113, 1115, 1117 show vacant buildings

Island - numbers 39, 41, 63

Kearsage Ave. - number 4 (vacant building)

Kemble - 3, 7, 27-51, 51-55 vacant in front, building on Norfolk Ave., 76, 78, 80, 97, 100, 120

La Grange Place - number 1

Magazine - numbers 50, 51, 52, 63-65, 66-68, 85

Massachusetts Ave. - number 927

Mt. Pleasant Ave. - numbers 4, 4-12, 9-21, 51, 139; numbers 88, 92, 94, 98, 114-116, 120 show vacant buildings

Norfolk Ave. - numbers 2, 89, 91-93, 97-99, 101-109, 119-121, 117, 180-182, 268, 270-276; numbers 191-196 show a boarded up building

Pompeii - numbers 6, 8

Reading - numbers 44-46, 56-58; number 62 shows a vacant building

Shirley - numbers 132, 134

Thorndike - numbers 8-20

Topeka - numbers 47-71

Vine - number 56; number 26 shows a vacant building

Winthrop - numbers 18, 25, 52, 60-62, 68-70; numbers 10, 24, 21-23 show vacant buildings

Yeoman - numbers 1, 11, 17, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 54-56, 66-68

Zeigler - numbers 91, 109, 115, 117, 123-125, 127, 129; numbers 93 and 107 show vacant buildings

Appendix D  Buildings Boarded or Taken Down by the City for
the Period, July 1980–June 1981

120 Blue Hill Avenue - take down
618-620 Dudley Street - boarded up
37-39 Langdon Street - take down
41-43 Langdon Street - take down
29-31 Magazine Street - take down
35 Magazine Street - take down
15 Shirley Street - take down
17 Shirley Street - take down
16 Eustis Street - boarded up
50-52 Eustis Street - boarded up
100 Blue Hill Avenue - take down
118 Winthrop Street - boarded up
133 Zeigler Street (garages) - take down
80-82 Burrell Street - take down
38-40 Vine Street - take down
13 St. George Street and garages at 13 1/2 and 13 1/3 St.
    George Street - boarded up
14 St. George Street - boarded up
2077-2079 Washington Street - take down
899 Albany Street - take down

Buildings designated for take down may already be razed at
this writing. Source: Ellie McDermott, Mayor's Boarding
and Demolition Program, Real Property Department, Boston, MA.
Appendix E Tax Defaulted and Delinquent Properties

Properties listed for city auction May 27, 1981:

26-30 Vale Street
Roxbury

39 Moreland Street
Roxbury

26 Dunreath Street
Roxbury

19 Ruthven Street
Roxbury

The City Record, which lists properties to be taken by the city for back taxes, listed no properties in Ward 8 to be taken as of May 18, 1981.
Appendix F

Federal Register, Fri., Nov. 9, 1979, Part VII, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing - Federal Housing Commissioner, "PHA-Owned Public Housing Projects -- Demolition of Buildings or Disposition of Real Property; Policy and Procedures," pp. 65368-65370.

Action: Final Rule
Effective: Dec. 10, 1979

Applies to PHA-owned, low-income public housing projects which are subject to Annual Contributions Contracts (ACC) under U.S. Housing Act of 1937. Does not apply to §23 and §10(c) Leased Housing Programs. Does not apply to sale of dwellings to homebuyers pursuant to and in accordance with HUD homeownership opportunities program.

"demolition" - razing of one or more buildings of a public housing project or razing of a part of a building comprised of one or more dwelling units and/or nondwelling space.

"disposition" - conveyance by a PHA, pursuant to sale or other transaction, of any interest in the real estate of a public housing project (e.g., fee title, leasehold, right of way or easement) and the improvements located thereon, except for leasehold interests incident to the normal operation of the project for low-income housing permitted by ACC.

"intent" - keep the property within low-income housing inventory unless it, or a portion of it, is excess to local needs for low-income housing.

- rehab it if it is deteriorated, if need is there.
- written approval of Assistant Secretary of Housing must be secured for PHA action
- PHA submit written request to HUD field office including:
  1. description of property
  2. statement of proposed PHA action
  3. supporting documents according to §870.6
  4. if dwelling units are occupied, PHA must submit a tenant relocation plan for decent, safe and sanitary housing within the tenants' means. PHA to pay actual reasonable moving expenses.

§870.6 Criteria for demolition or disposition
a. Primary
  1. Excess of low-income housing currently and for projected needs in the jurisdiction served by PHA, taking into account both demand and supply factors. If there is need for low-income housing, the PHA must provide a replacement housing
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plan; subject to HUD's finding as to the availability of funds.

2. Physical condition of property and feasibility of rehab. Rehab will be deemed feasible if estimated cost does not exceed the published prototype cost limit for similar structures in the same prototype cost area.

   b. Secondary criteria
      1. location, in terms of any conditions in the surrounding neighborhood that adversely affect the life, health, or safety of project residents.
      2. social conditions which have seriously affected the marketability of the project.
      3. project's density - population density and needs for open space for recreation, parking or other purposes, which have seriously affected the marketability of the project.
      4. benefits to the project or the public interest from disposition of a limited interest in project r.e. (e.g., easement, right of way of dedication for public use.)
      5. views of tenants and the local governing body.

§870.7 Tenant Participation
- PHA must submit written notice to tenants and tenant organization of their proposed request and afford them time to submit comments, including suggested alternatives, concerning proposed action of the PHA. PHA must give copies of comments to HUD with PHA's position concerning each comment and alternative.
- notify tenants and tenant organization that request submitted to HUD and a copy with all documents is available for their review.
- after HUD's decision, PHA must notify tenants and tenant organization of decision.

§870.8 HUD approval of a PHA's request for demolition and/or disposition shall be subject to applicable regs. of National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

§870.9 A-95 Clearance, for disposition or demolition of 50 or more units in urbanized area
   a) 45 days prior to submission of the PHA's request to HUD, send copy of request to appropriate state and areawide A-95 clearing house for comment.
   b) PHA transmit clearinghouse comments with request to HUD.
   c) if A-95 review comments inconsistent with state, areawide or local plans or non-compliance with environmental or applicable regs., PHA must indicate how it proposes to resolve the finding or provide justification for proposing to proceed with the requested action despite the finding.
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§870.10 Disposition of excess property

After receiving HUD approval for disposition, PHA shall determine such property to be excess and shall sell it as soon as practicable at a public sale for not less than the fair market value thereof, unless another method of disposition is approved by HUD. Proceeds of sale or other disposition shall be applied as directed by HUD in accordance with the ACC.
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